

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE LOS ANGELES AERIAL RAPID TRANSIT PROJECT LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

December 2023



State Clearinghouse No. 2020100007

VOLUME V

Prepared for:

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority



Prepared by:

Kimley-Horn



This page intentionally left blank.

List of Volumes

VOLUME I

- 1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**
- 2.0 INTRODUCTION**
- 3.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION**
- 4.0 COSTS AND FINANCING**
- 5.0 CORRECTIONS AND ADDITIONS**
- 6.0 RESPONSES TO COMMENTS**
 - 6.1 Introduction
 - 6.2 Topical Responses
 - 6.3 Responses to Comments
 - 6.3.1 Responses to Public Agencies [S1-S5, L1-L2]

VOLUME II

- 6.0 RESPONSES TO COMMENTS**
 - 6.3 Responses to Comments
 - 6.3.2 Responses to Groups and Organizations [GO1-GO36]
 - 6.3.3 Responses to Public/Individual Comment Letters [P1-P72]

VOLUME III

- 6.0 RESPONSES TO COMMENTS**
 - 6.3 Responses to Comments
 - 6.3.3 Responses to Public/Individual Comment Letters [P73-P600]

VOLUME IV

- 6.0 RESPONSES TO COMMENTS**
 - 6.3 Responses to Comments
 - 6.3.3 Responses to Public/Individual Comment Letters [P601-P751]

List of Volumes

(Continued)

VOLUME V

6.0 RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

6.3 Responses to Comments

6.3.4 Responses to Public Hearings [PH1-PH364]

7.0 MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

8.0 ACRONYMS

9.0 LIST OF PREPARERS

10.0 REFERENCES

Table of Contents

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	
1.1 Purpose of this Environmental Impact Report	1.0-1
1.2 Environmental Review Process and Community Outreach	1.0-2
1.3 Project Objectives	1.0-4
1.4 Project Overview.....	1.0-5
1.5 Project Location	1.0-5
1.6 Proposed Project Alignment and Components	1.0-6
1.7 System Operations.....	1.0-13
1.8 Required Permits and Approvals	1.0-18
1.9 Project Cost and Funding	1.0-20
1.10 Significant and Unavoidable Environmental Impacts	1.0-21
1.11 Alternatives to Reduce Significant Impacts	1.0-21
1.12 Design and Use Options	1.0-23
1.13 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures	1.0-25
2.0 INTRODUCTION	
2.1 Summary of The Proposed Project.....	2.0-1
2.2 Purpose of This Final Environmental Impact Report	2.0-1
2.3 Environmental Review Process and Community Outreach	2.0-2
2.4 Senate Bill 44.....	2.0-4
2.5 Final EIR Organization.....	2.0-4
3.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION	
3.1 Overview of the Project	3.0-1
3.2 ART Background	3.0-1
3.3 Project Location	3.0-2
3.4 Description of the Proposed Project	3.0-16
3.5 Proposed Project Alignment and Components.....	3.0-24
3.6 Ridership	3.0-51
3.7 System Operations	3.0-52
3.8 Construction	3.0-60
3.9 Project Buildout.....	3.0-61
3.10 Required Permits and Approvals.....	3.0-71

Table of Contents

(Continued)

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
4.0 COSTS AND FINANCING	
4.1 Introduction	4.0-1
4.2 Costs and Funding	4.0-1
5.0 CORRECTIONS AND ADDITIONS	
5.1 General Corrections and Additions to the Draft EIR	5.0-1
5.2 Corrections and Additions to Draft EIR Sections and Appendices	5.0-19
5.3 Effect of Corrections and Additions	5.0-125
6.0 RESPONSES TO COMMENTS	
6.1 Introduction	6.0-1
6.2 Topical Responses	6.0-29
Topical Response A: SB 44	6.0-29
Topical Response B: Ridership Model; Pre-game and Post-game Transportation	6.0-37
Topical Response C: Project Features.....	6.0-46
Topical Response D: Metro Is the Proper Lead Agency for the Proposed Project As the Region's Transportation Authority; Metro Named and Consulted With the Applicable Responsible Agencies	6.0-53
Topical Response E: The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing.....	6.0-57
Topical Response F: Los Angeles State Historic Park.....	6.0-68
Topical Response G: No Improper Project Segmentation: The Proposed Project Is Intended to Create a Transit Connection from Metro's Union Station Transportation Hub via an Aerial Gondola System to the Dodger Stadium Property	6.0-79
Topical Response H: The Draft EIR Considered an Appropriate Range of Alternatives and Design Options.....	6.0-84
Topical Response I: Use of Project Design Features and Plans in Mitigation Measures.....	6.0-95
Topical Response J: Gondola Design and Operations	6.0-102
Topical Response K: Signage and Lighting	6.0-110
Topical Response L: Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis	6.0-114

	Topical Response M: Comparable Urban Aerial Transit Systems	6.0-116
	Topical Response N: Environmental Justice	6.0-122
	Topical Response O: Response to UCLA Mobility Lab Study	6.0-132
	Topical Response P: Gondola System Noise Modeling	6.0-144
6.3	Responses to Comments.....	6.0-148
6.3.1	Responses to Public Agencies	6.0-149
6.3.2	Responses to Groups and Organizations	6.0-195
6.3.3	Responses to Public/Individual Comment Letters	6.0-943
6.3.4	Responses to Public Hearings	6.0-2,577
7.0	MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM	
7.1	Introduction	7.0-1
7.2	Organization	7.0-1
7.3	Program Modification.....	7.0-1
8.0	ACRONYMS	
8.0	Acronyms	8.0-1
9.0	LIST OF PREPARERS	
9.0	List of Preparers	9.0-1
10.0	REFERENCES	
10.0	References.....	10.0-1

List of Figures

<u>Figure</u>	<u>Page</u>
Figure 1-1: Regional Location Map	1.0-10
Figure 1-2: Proposed Project Location.....	1.0-11
Figure 1-3: Proposed Project Alignment.....	1.0-12
Figure 3-1: Aerial System Key Components	3.0-1
Figure 3-2: Regional Location Map	3.0-7
Figure 3-3: Proposed Project Location.....	3.0-8
Figure 3-4: Proposed Project Alignment.....	3.0-14
Figure 3-5: Illustrative Design of a Station	3.0-19
Figure 3-6: Illustrative Design of a Tower	3.0-20
Figure 3-7: ANSI Requirements and Additional Separation Buffer	3.0-25
Figure 3-8: Proposed Alignment Over Public ROW/Publicly-Owned Property and Private Property.....	3.0-26
Figure 3-9: Proposed Pedestrian Plaza at El Pueblo.....	3.0-28
Figure 3-10: Proposed Improvements at Alameda Triangle	3.0-29
Figure 3-11: Proposed Alameda Station Location	3.0-30
Figure 3-12: Alameda Station Cross Sections.....	3.0-31
Figure 3-13: Proposed Alameda Tower Location	3.0-32
Figure 3-14: Alameda Tower Elevations	3.0-33
Figure 3-15: Proposed Improvements at Alpine Tower.....	3.0-34
Figure 3-16: Proposed Pedestrian Improvements at Chinatown/State Park Station.....	3.0-35
Figure 3-17: Proposed Park Amenities including Restrooms and Covered Breezeway...	3.0-36
Figure 3-18: Proposed Park Amenities including Concession and Covered Breezeway..	3.0-36
Figure 3-19: Proposed Alpine Tower Location	3.0-37
Figure 3-20: Alpine Tower Elevations	3.0-38
Figure 3-21: Illustrative Design of Pedestrian Improvements at Chinatown/State Park Station	3.0-39
Figure 3-22: Proposed Chinatown/State Park Station Location.....	3.0-40
Figure 3-23: Chinatown/State Park Station Cross Sections	3.0-41
Figure 3-24: Proposed Broadway Junction	3.0-42
Figure 3-25: Proposed Stadium Tower view from Arroyo Seco Parkway/SR-110 towards Downtown Los Angeles.....	3.0-43
Figure 3-26: Proposed Broadway Junction Location	3.0-44
Figure 3-27: Broadway Junction Cross Sections.....	3.0-45
.....	3.0-46
Figure 3-28: Proposed Stadium Tower Location	3.0-46
Figure 3-29: Stadium Tower Elevations	3.0-47

List of Figures (Continued)

<u>Figure</u>	<u>Page</u>
Figure 3-30: Illustrative Drawing of Pedestrian Connection between Dodger Stadium Station and Dodger Station	3.0-48
Figure 3-31: Proposed Dodger Stadium Station Location.....	3.0-49
Figure 3-32: Dodger Stadium Station Cross Sections	3.0-50
Figure 3-33: Alameda Station Buildout Conditions	3.0-63
Figure 3-34: Alameda Tower Buildout Conditions	3.0-64
Figure 3-35: Alpine Tower Buildout Conditions	3.0-65
Figure 3-36: Chinatown/State Park Station Buildout Conditions.....	3.0-66
Figure 3-37: Broadway Junction Buildout Conditions	3.0-68
Figure 3-38: Stadium Tower Buildout Condition.....	3.0-69
Figure 3-39: Dodger Stadium Station Buildout Conditions.....	3.0-70

List of Tables

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
Table 1-1: Proposed Project Construction Details.....	1.0-18
Table 1-2: Summary of Environmental Impacts	1.0-27
Table 3-1: ART Precedents	3.0-5
Table 3-2: Proposed Project Station and Junction Details.....	3.0-52
Table 3-3: Proposed Project Tower Details.....	3.0-52
Table 3-4: Proposed Project Construction Details.....	3.0-60
Table 4-1: Capital Cost Estimates for the Proposed Project	4.0-1
Table 6-1: Comments from Public Agencies, Groups, Organizations, and Individuals	6.0-2
Table 7-1: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program	7.0-3

List of Appendices

Appendix A – Public Outreach Report

Appendix B – Public Hearing Transcripts

Appendix C – Public Comments on the Draft EIR

Appendix D – Public Resources Code Section 21168.6.9 Notice

Appendix E – Senate Bill 44 and Senate Bill 91 (Public Resources Code Section 21168.6.9)

Appendix F – Memo on Structural Engineering

Appendix G – Supplemental Biological Resources Report

Appendix H – Aesthetics

Appendix H.1 – Memo Regarding Preparation of KOPs

Appendix H.2 – Supplemental KOPs in Response to Comments

Appendix I – Airspace Analysis Comment Response for the Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit Project

Appendix J – Reax Memo re: Attorney General Guidance

Appendix K - Trees

Appendix K.1 – Updated Tree Report

Appendix K.2 – Avocado Tree Memo

Appendix L – 3S Sound Measurements Memo

Appendix M – Potential Excavated Material Disposal Analysis

Appendix N – Additional Separation Buffer

Appendix O - Supplemental Graphics of Proposed Alignment Plan and Profile

Appendix P – Design Option A Plan and Profile

Appendix Q – Design Option B Plan and Profile

Section 6.3.4 Responses to Public Hearing Comments

Public Hearing Comment PH1 – Xiagtian Xu

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH1

Comment PH1-1 My name is Xiagtian Xu. I've been a resident of Chinatown for over 20 years..

Response PH1-1 This comment is noted and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Comment PH1-2 ..and now that the government has invested a lot of resources into the LA ART project, once I heard of the news, I was very happy along with a lot of my neighbors. Not only is this project not going to cause any environmental impact in any negative way, it provides great convenience to people who want to get around.

In Chinatown, many years we haven't seen many other issues and I hope that the government is able to invest more resources to bring about more projects like this that is going to provide great convenience and reap benefits to the people who live in this area.

Response PH1-2 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities including, but not limited to, sustainability features and open space enhancements, the Community Access Plan for fares, access to parks, mobility hubs, signage, utilization of local artists for site specific artwork at each station reflective of the unique neighborhood culture, design of each component of the proposed Project to complement and reflect the unique character of the surrounding neighborhood, the Business and Community Support Program during construction, and benefits to local businesses along the proposed Project alignment. The Project Sponsor would convene stakeholder groups to coordinate on issues related to proposed Project features. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan. Refer

to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the Draft EIR addresses environmental justice by considering the proposed Project's ability to reduce congestion and emissions from on-road vehicles in an area disproportionately burdened by pollution, and including an analysis of the proposed Project's potential impacts to the surrounding community, concluding that the proposed Project could result in air quality benefits for the surrounding communities.

Comment PH1-3 In terms of our environment and our ecology, these are the things that we find very beneficial. And other problems that I mentioned before, the bus arriving on time, is making our commute very difficult and inconvenient. So this time, the LA ART project is bringing huge benefits to us. We are very much supportive. We're happy and we hope to see more of similar projects in our community to benefit the people and to benefit our environment.

And I would like to thank the government and everybody who are involved in this project to bring such great convenience and benefits to us and as a community.

Response PH1-3 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Response PH1-2 regarding the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities.

Public Hearing Comment PH2 – Andy Hall

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH2

Comment PH2-1 I was born and raised in LA and I'm a long time community member of Chinatown.

Response PH2-1 This comment is noted and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue of the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Comment PH2-2 I, my family, my neighbors, and the people of LA do not need the gondola project. This project is yet another misuse of our collective time, funds, and energy. No one asked for this and no one wants it. There are already public transportation and shuttles that bring people specifically to Dodger Stadium.

Response PH2-2 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at Los Angeles Union Station (LAUS), Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Refer to Topical Response O, Response to the UCLA Mobility Lab Study, for a discussion of how the Dodger Stadium Express would not be precluded from operating by the proposed Project. While existing riders of the Dodger Stadium Express may choose to switch to the proposed Project to take advantage of its substantial travel time savings, some riders may prefer to ride the Union Station Dodger Stadium Express for other reasons. The opportunities for more mobility choices through improved connections to additional public transit options created by the proposed Project are projected to increase the number of attendees of games or events at Dodger Stadium to ride public transportation.

Comment PH2-3 \$125 million for a limited worth and limited use project is an irresponsible use of funds when what we desperately need is better public transportation and infrastructure. I am all my elderly-working neighbors should not have to wait an hour or two hours for the bus just to get home or anywhere.

Response PH2-3 Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. Refer to Section 2.1, Overview of the Project, of the Draft EIR, discussing how the proposed Project would operate daily to serve existing residents, workers, park users, and visitors to Los Angeles. As discussed on page 2-42, in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the proposed Project would provide service to all pre-season, regular season, and post-season Los Angeles Dodger

games and any special events (e.g., concerts, the Los Angeles Marathon) at the Dodger Stadium property. The proposed Project would also provide service to events at the Los Angeles State Historic Park. In addition to providing service on game and special event days at Dodger Stadium and events at the Los Angeles State Historic Park, it is anticipated that the proposed Project would also provide daily service between 6:00am to 12:00am, for the surrounding communities, including Chinatown, Mission Junction, Elysian Park, Solano Canyon, and the Los Angeles State Historic Park. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan. Compared to the Metro L Line (Gold), accessible at the Chinatown Station, the proposed Project's Chinatown/State Park Station would be closer to the Los Angeles State Historic Park, the shorter headways would result in more frequent service, and the travel time would be less.

Comment PH2-4 There is no hospital in Chinatown because of gentrification. Many residents have to go to the USC hospital and the quickest bus route from Chinatown can be a 28 minute bus ride. Nineteen minutes of that is walking.

Response PH2-4 This comment is noted and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Comment PH2-5 Many residents in Chinatown are elderly or disabled living on \$1,000 a month with limited support networks. Put \$125 million more towards eliminating transit fare and faster public transit to station hygiene to bus shelters and real ventures to affordable and free housing.

Response PH2-5 Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of how the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the Draft EIR addresses environmental justice by considering the proposed Project's ability to reduce congestion and emissions from on-road vehicles in an area disproportionately burdened by pollution, including Chinatown. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project.

Comment PH2-6 Chinatown and LA as a whole has seen too many developments that ultimately harm this place and gentrify our communities. It's insulting that the people behind this project tried to mislead us into thinking that this project is a community good, to fool people into thinking that this is good for us. We know better than that. Yes, that's it. Thank you.

Response PH2-6 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not exacerbate gentrification or result in displacement of residents in the surrounding neighborhoods and is consistent with Metro's considerations regarding gentrification and displacement. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities, including but not limited to, sustainability features and open space enhancements, the Community Access Plan for fares, access to parks, mobility hubs, signage, utilization of local artists for site specific artwork at each station reflective of the unique neighborhood culture, design of each component of the proposed Project to complement and reflect the unique character of the surrounding neighborhood, the Business and Community Support Program during construction, and benefits to local businesses along the proposed Project alignment. The Project Sponsor would convene stakeholder groups to coordinate on issues related to proposed Project features. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the Draft EIR addresses environmental justice by considering the proposed Project's ability to reduce congestion and emissions from on-road vehicles in an area disproportionately burdened by pollution, and including an analysis of the proposed Project's potential impacts to the surrounding community, concluding that the proposed Project could result in air quality benefits for the surrounding communities.

Public Hearing Comment PH3 – Julie Rico

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH3

Comment PH3-1 I am opposed to the gondola project. I don't want the cars that are going to be displaced from the Dodger Stadium parking lot sent down to Chinatown where I live as a senior. It will create havoc in our neighborhood. It will suck all of the energy out of our neighborhood. There will be pollution, garbage, disease, and people will get run over because there's a lot of seniors in Chinatown.

Response PH3-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Traffic congestion is not required to be analyzed under CEQA in the Draft EIR following the implementation of Senate Bill 743, which designated “vehicle miles traveled” as the method for assessing transportation impacts on the environment for CEQA projects. Refer to the Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit Project Non-CEQA Transportation Assessment, which found that there could be localized increases in traffic at the intersections closest to the proposed Project’s Alameda Station and Chinatown/State Park Station due to some riders choosing to park and ride or take Uber/Lyft and recommended the proposed Project work with Metro to identify a transit partnership for the proposed Project riders to further encourage them to take transit, walk, or bike to the proposed Project’s stations. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project’s features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities. As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, and Topical Response C, Project Features, the proposed Project creates a first/last mile transit link for residents and businesses within Chinatown while unifying and connecting communities through transit mobility access. This new mode of transportation will expand rider access to the regional transit system by attracting new visitors including Dodgers fans, and represents an opportunity for additional visitors along the proposed Project alignment, creating economic opportunities for local businesses, including shops and restaurants, through potential partnerships that drive customers to Chinatown and other businesses along the proposed Project alignment, which, consequently, adds revenues to these small businesses in the communities the proposed Project hopes to serve.

Comment PH3-2 It doesn't -- the gondola does not belong in Chinatown or anywhere near Chinatown. It will be intrusive to homes. It will be intrusive to our lives. It will change the flow of Chinatown as it is now.

I'm just vehemently opposed to the gondola project. That's it.

Response PH3-2 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, and Appendix A, Scoping Report, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project team’s outreach efforts to neighborhoods along the proposed Project alignment and the proposed Project’s features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities. Metro sought to engage with stakeholders in neighborhoods along the proposed Project alignment in each stage of the environmental review process. Refer to Topical Response M, Comparable Urban Aerial Transit Systems, for discussion of comparable aerial transit systems in cities around the world and their operations, integration with nearby residential and open space uses, community benefits, promotion of public art and collaborations with local artists, and evidence that such systems can reduce violent crime in nearby areas and promote a sense of security compared to other modes of public transportation.

Public Hearing Comment PH4 – Miguel Melgoza

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH4

Comment PH4-1 I have been a proponent of this project from the beginning. As a 15 year business operator in East Chinatown, I believe that this will be helpful to the community and also with transportation to Dodger Stadium. It will ease up on congestion with traffic.

Response PH4-1 Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the potential added benefits from the proposed Project, including potential partnerships with and benefits to local businesses in Chinatown. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by connecting LAUS to Dodger Stadium via an aerial gondola system, including an intermediate station at the southernmost entrance of the Los Angeles State Historic Park. Dodger Stadium draws large regional crowds, with approximately 100 baseball games and other events each year, but there are no permanent transit connections to the venue. Given the capacity of this system, approximately 20 percent of the fans could take aerial transit connected to Metro's regional transit system. This would reduce vehicular congestion in and around Dodger Stadium, on neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways during game and special event days, thereby reducing VMT and GHG emissions. Accordingly, the proposed Project would result in air quality benefits to the surrounding communities.

Comment PH4-2 I think that we need to push this project and with the new city council coming into office, I think that she should also be very supportive of this project. Thank you very much.

Response PH4-2 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Public Hearing Comment PH5 – Jennie Linheya

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH5

Comment PH5-1 I find the gondola ugly because I've been to like several cities and I've never seen a gondola in big cities. The only city that I saw that gondola is Medellin, Colombia because they have no roads and it would cause –

Response PH5-1 Refer to Table 2-1, ART Precedents, in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, which provides examples of gondola systems in cities around the world. Refer to Topical Response M, Comparable Urban Aerial Transit Systems, for discussion of comparable aerial transit systems in cities around the world and their operations, integration with nearby residential and open space uses, community benefits, promotion of public art and collaborations with local artists, and evidence that such systems can reduce violent crime in nearby areas and promote a sense of security compared to other modes of public transportation. Refer also to Section 3.01, Aesthetics, and Appendix C, Visual Impact Assessment, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the aesthetic impacts of the proposed Project, which would be less than significant.

Comment PH5-2 I don't want the taxpayer to shoulder the cost of this project because McCourt is rich enough to pay for his own.

If that's going to be built with public funding, the public funding should be for the people, not for a private company. And I know that they -- I read somewhere that it would cost \$300 million with the inflation rate. I don't think it would be costing us more than \$300 million to build this gondola. I'm done.

Response PH5-2 This comment is noted and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project.

Public Hearing Comment PH6 – Patrick Chen

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH6

Comment PH6-1 My name is Patrick. I'm a resident of Chinatown for over seven years and I just want to give my comment on this proposed project, LA ART.

Response PH6-1 This comment provides a general introduction to comments contained in this letter. Responses to the comments contained in this letter are provided below in Responses PH6-2 through PH6-3.

Comment PH6-2 It does not look like it has the community's welfare in mind with its proposed plans. It doesn't seem like it's prioritizing the needs of the community in terms of transportation, housing, and other impacts. It seems like it's just like a vanity project for a billionaire.

Response PH6-2 Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the Draft EIR addresses environmental justice, how the proposed Project supports Metro's goal of prioritizing equity opportunities, is designed to extend affordable, regional access and mobility options to the communities adjacent to the proposed Project alignment, how the public outreach for the proposed Project was designed with environmental justice principles in mind, how the proposed Project would not preclude development of uses including housing, grocery stores, and/or healthcare facilities in the surrounding communities, and would itself address a need for a permanent transit connection to one of the region's most visited venues and would alleviate existing congestion on surrounding neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways, thereby reducing associated air pollution and improving safety, and how the proposed Project is designed to be ADA compliant. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project.

Comment PH6-3 And yes, Chinatown is facing lots of challenges, especially around gentrification, displacement of tenants, due to rising costs of housing and threats of eviction and another Metro project like that does not have community interest in mind does not seem like it would help the community at all.

So I oppose this project as it stands and I don't see really a path forward for it to actually benefit the community. Thank you.

Response PH6-3 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent

Planned Housing, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not exacerbate gentrification or result in displacement of residents in the surrounding neighborhoods and is consistent with Metro's considerations regarding gentrification and displacement. Additionally, refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities, including but not limited to sustainability features and open space enhancements, the Community Access Plan for fares, access to parks, mobility hubs, signage, utilization of local artists for site specific artwork at each station reflective of the unique neighborhood culture, design of each component of the proposed Project to complement and reflect the unique character of the surrounding neighborhood, the Business and Community Support Program during construction, and benefits to local businesses along the proposed Project alignment. The Project Sponsor would convene stakeholder groups to coordinate on issues related to proposed Project features.

Public Hearing Comment PH7 – Rebecca Ocegueda

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH7

Comment PH7-1 Hello, good morning. My name is Rebecca Ocegueda. And I am a resident of Northeast Los Angeles.

Response PH7-1 The comment provides a general introduction to the comments raised in this letter. Responses to the comments contained in this letter are provided below in Responses PH7-2 through PH7-7.

Comment PH7-2 As a resident, I am concerned about his project for many reasons. First of all, the enormous towers of the gondola will cause aesthetic impacts on my community. I am concerned that the towers and the views of the wagons of the gondola will be used for publicity and as billboards.

Response PH7-2 Refer to Section 3.01, Aesthetics, and Appendix C, Visual Impact Assessment, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the aesthetic impacts of the proposed Project's towers, which would be less than significant, and for visual simulations of the proposed Project's towers. The Alameda Tower's modern architectural style is evident and would complement the buildings within The California Endowment. The neutral light-tone gray color scheme of Alameda Tower was designed for consistency with the surrounding urban environment, and to not distract from visually distinct structures such as the United States Post Office Terminal Annex building. Alpine Tower would consist of a neutral light-tone gray color scheme that would provide visual lightness to the form and their design would complement the existing buildings in this area, as well as not distract from the visually distinct Chinese architecture within this area. Stadium Tower would consist of an architectural design that provides visual lightness to the form to complement the existing buildings in this area. In addition, the neutral light-tone gray colors and material finishes of the Stadium Tower were selected to complement the surrounding urban environment, and to not distract from existing visually distinct structures, such as Dodger Stadium. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, discussing how the proposed Project's design takes cues from the immediate neighborhood culture, including how each component of the proposed Project would be designed to complement and reflect the unique character of the surrounding area.

Refer to Topical Response K, Signage and Lighting, for discussion of how the proposed Project's Sign Concept Plan included at Appendix B of the Lighting Study, which is included in Appendix C, Visual Impact Assessment, of the Draft EIR, provides that across the entire proposed Project, including stations, the junction, towers, and cabins, the proposed Project is proposing static signage and digital signage. The digital signage would be limited to the Alameda Station and the Dodger Stadium Station. No

digital signage is proposed on the exterior of the cabins. Signage proposed for the exterior of the cabins is static non-illuminated naming rights signage. In addition to the naming rights signage, the proposed Project is proposing that two cabins be designated for the display of community programming graphics and that one cabin be designated for the display of artwork by local arts collaborators.

Comment PH7-3 The gondola project will promote gentrification of our communities, in particular in Chinatown.

Response PH7-3 Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not exacerbate gentrification or result in displacement of residents in the surrounding neighborhoods and is consistent with Metro’s considerations regarding gentrification and displacement.

Comment PH7-4 The gondola project will have a great impact on our public lands, especially in the Los Angeles State Historic Park with its enormous towers.

Response PH7-4 Refer to Response PH7-3 for discussion of the proposed Project’s towers. As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, Section 3.16, Parks and Recreational Facilities, and Section 5.0, Other CEQA Considerations, of the Draft EIR, the Chinatown/State Park Station would have a footprint of 2,195 square feet in the Los Angeles State Historic Park (~.1% of the total 32-acre park), and the station canopy would have an overhang of 9,320 square feet over the park. The proposed Project alignment crosses over the westernmost edge of the Los Angeles State Historic Park, adjacent to the existing Metro L Line (Gold) and the associated overhead catenary system. The proposed Project’s required aerial clearance would be located above approximately 59,470 square feet of the total 32-acre park, plus an Additional Separation Buffer. With the required clearances and the height at which the cabins would cross over the Los Angeles State Historic Park, the ability to use the vast majority of the Park for kite flying, special events (e.g., concerts, craft fairs, partnership events, 5K/10K runs, workshops, cultural festivals, and the farmers’ market), and other passive recreational opportunities (e.g., picnicking, jogging, walking, and informal play) would not be affected by the proposed Project. Refer Topical Response C, Project Features for discussion of the proposed Project’s features to enhance and provide additional benefits to surrounding communities, including access to parks.

Comment PH7-5 This project will increase the impacts of air pollution on account of the emissions from the vehicles in the area that are already overloaded with air emissions.

Response PH7-5 Refer to Section 3.03, Air Quality, Section 3.08, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 3.17, Transportation, Appendix D, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project’s ability to reduce vehicular travel, to improve air quality through reduced emissions, and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through reduced vehicular travel.

Comment PH7-6 This project will provoke displacement and will increase the cost of rent in the area and we cannot allow that and this is especially because for a lot of people it will increase the cost of rent and people will not be able to pay that and then we will have more homeless people.

Response PH7-6 Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not exacerbate gentrification or result in displacement of residents in the surrounding neighborhoods and is consistent with Metro’s considerations regarding gentrification and displacement.

Comment PH7-7 And I beg you not to approve this project which will use federal funds and will use our taxes. And this will just enrich one person who will be benefitted by the project. And do not allow yourselves to be deceived by Mr. McCourt who has plans to develop the parking lot in the Dodger Stadium with the pretext that he’s concerned about environmental pollution.

Thank you very much. Thank you.

Response PH7-7 This comment is noted and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project’s capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project’s capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response G, No Improper Project Segmentation: The Proposed Project Is Intended to Create a Transit Connection from Metro’s Union Station Transportation Hub via an Aerial Gondola System to the Dodger Stadium Property for a discussion of how the proposed Project solely proposes an aerial gondola. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project.

Public Hearing Comment PH8 – Esperanza Ramirez

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH8

Comment PH8-1 My name is Esperanza. And I'm here regarding the gondola project that does not have benefits for our community. It is a lie that they will replace the vehicles that are going to the Dodger Stadium.

Response PH8-1 Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at LAUS, Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Dodger Stadium draws large regional crowds, with approximately 100 baseball games and other events each year, but there are no permanent transit connections to the venue. The vast majority of visitors drive their personal vehicles to access the venue. These vehicles create congestion on the surface streets leading up to and around Dodger Stadium, including Sunset Boulevard/Cesar E. Chavez from LAUS and throughout the surrounding communities. Given the capacity of the proposed Project's system, approximately 20 percent of the fans could take aerial transit connected to Metro's regional transit system. This would reduce vehicular congestion in and around Dodger Stadium, on neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways during game and special event days. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities including but not limited to sustainability features and open space enhancements, the Community Access Plan for fares, access to parks, mobility hubs, signage, utilization of local artists for site specific artwork at each station reflective of the unique neighborhood culture, design of each component of the proposed Project to complement and reflect the unique character of the surrounding neighborhood, the Business and Community Support Program during construction, and benefits to local businesses along the proposed Project alignment. The Project Sponsor would convene stakeholder groups to coordinate on issues related to proposed Project features. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan.

Comment PH8-2 The gondola project will impact our cultural and historical resources such as our state parks, Union Station, and El Pueblo.

Response PH8-2 The Draft EIR fully analyzed and addressed the proposed Project’s potential impacts to historic resources, including to the Los Angeles State Historic Park, LAUS, and El Pueblo, in Section 3.05, Cultural Resources, with supporting data provided in Appendix F, Archaeological and Paleontological Resources Assessment for the Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit Project, and Appendix G, Historical Resource Technical Report for the Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit Project (HRTR). As discussed in Section 3.05, the Draft EIR’s analysis concludes that all potential impacts related to historical resources would be less than significant and all potential impacts related to archaeological resources would be either less than significant or reduced to less than significant with mitigation.

Comment PH8-3 The Chinatown community and our neighbors will be seriously impacted with the displacement from the property. The draft environmental report does not take into account our complaints and is concentrated on the benefits for our community and it's nothing but lies.

Response PH8-3 Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not displace housing or prevent planned housing. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the proposed Project would not displace businesses and represents an opportunity for additional visitors along the proposed Project alignment, creating economic opportunities for local businesses, including shops and restaurants, through potential partnerships that drive customers to businesses along the alignment, which, consequently, adds revenues to these small businesses in the communities the proposed Project hopes to serve. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of how during construction, the Project Sponsor would create a Business and Community Support Program to assist local businesses affected by proposed Project construction activities. The proposed Project would provide numerous benefits to local businesses in El Pueblo, Chinatown, and other areas along the proposed Project alignment, including through potential partnerships with these businesses as well as by providing an accessible and affordable mobility option for employees and area residents. Refer to Appendix A, Scoping Report, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of outreach and community engagement during the Draft EIR scoping period. Metro sought to engage the community in each stage of the environmental review process. Metro engaged the public in decision making for the proposed Project beginning with the public scoping period for the Draft EIR in October 2020 to receive public comment on the proposed Project’s scope of environmental review under CEQA. In June 2021, the Project Sponsor conducted two virtual public outreach meetings. The input from the public, including local community stakeholders, as well as from agencies, organizations, and interested parties, during

this period led directly to changes to the proposed Project to incorporate public feedback.

Comment PH8-4 The gondola will be nothing more than an invasion of the properties of the Chinatown residents whose homes are underneath the trajectory of the gondola.

Response PH8-4 Refer to Section 2.5, Proposed Project Alignment and Components, with supporting data provided in Appendix Q, Proposed Alignment Plan and Profile, of the Draft EIR for discussion of how the proposed Project maximizes alignment along the public ROW and publicly owned property and minimizes aerial rights over private properties. Refer to Topical Response M, Comparable Urban Aerial Transit Systems, discussing how, like the proposed Project, comparable aerial transit systems in cities around the world are integrated with their surrounding urban environments. In particular, comparable aerial transit systems in other locations demonstrate that such systems can operate safely, efficiently, and in concert with nearby residential and open space uses, including parks and other recreational facilities. The proposed Project would be located in a densely-populated, urban environment surrounded by a variety of commercial, industrial, and residential development types. In this type of environment, it is common for public transportation, such as Metro's light rail, to be located adjacent to residential uses and modern aerial transit systems in other cities, including Portland, Oregon and New York City, operate adjacent to residential uses. Nevertheless, as discussed in Topical Response J, Gondola Design and Operations and Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, cabin windows can be equipped with privacy glass that can become opaque while adjacent to sensitive views, and the proposed Project would work with stakeholders adjacent to the proposed Project alignment to identify locations where the use of privacy glass would be warranted. Considerations as to the locations along the proposed Project alignment where the privacy glass could be activated include the subject adjacent sensitive views and the vertical and horizontal distance between the proposed Project cabins and the adjacent sensitive views.

Comment PH8-5 Mr. McCourt is taking advantage of our resources for his personal benefit. We do not want the gondola and we will fight for this project not to take place. That's all. Thank you.

Response PH8-5 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project.

Public Hearing Comment PH9 – Robert Macias

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH9

Comment PH9-1 My name is Robert Macias. And I am the president of the Youth Soccer organization and community organization, the name is Anahuak. For many years, we have been fighting for the welfare of our families and for better recreational opportunities for our community.

Response PH9-1 This comment provides a general introduction to the comments raised in this letter. Responses to the comments contained in this letter are provided below in Responses PH9-2 through PH9-5.

Comment PH9-2 We are strongly opposed to someone with personal interest constructing an air highway over our state parks.

Response PH9-2 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project. Refer to Section 2.5, Proposed Project Alignment and Components, with supporting data provided in Appendix Q, Proposed Alignment Plan and Profile, of the Draft EIR for discussion of how the proposed Project maximizes alignment along the public ROW and publicly owned property and minimizes aerial rights over private properties. As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, Section 3.16, Parks and Recreational Facilities, and Section 5.0, Other CEQA Considerations, of the Draft EIR, the Chinatown/State Park Station would have a footprint of 2,195 square feet in the Los Angeles State Historic Park (~.1% of the total 32-acre park), and the station canopy would have an overhang of 9,320 square feet over the park. The proposed Project alignment crosses over the westernmost edge of the Los Angeles State Historic Park, adjacent to the existing Metro L Line (Gold) and the associated overhead catenary system. The proposed Project's required aerial clearance would be located above approximately 59,470 square feet of the total 32-acre park, plus an Additional Separation Buffer. With the required clearances and the height at which the cabins would cross over the Los Angeles State Historic Park, the ability to use the vast majority of the Park for kite flying, special events (e.g., concerts, craft fairs, partnership events, 5K/10K runs, workshops, cultural festivals, and the farmers' market), and other passive recreational opportunities (e.g., picnicking, jogging, walking, and informal play) would not be affected by the proposed Project. Refer to Response S2-4 for additional discussion regarding the ability of uses to continue at the park. Further, through collaboration with State Parks, the proposed Project has been designed to provide

additional benefits to the Los Angeles State Historic Park, including pedestrian improvements between Metro’s L Line (Gold) and the park, and integration of the Chinatown/State Park Station into the southern boundary of the park with hardscape and landscape enhancements, a mobility hub, and other park amenities including concessions, restrooms, and a breezeway connecting the concessions and restrooms.

Comment PH9-3 I ask myself where will we retain privacy for persons?

Response PH9-3 Refer to Topical Response M, Comparable Urban Aerial Transit Systems, discussing how, like the proposed Project, comparable aerial transit systems in cities around the world are integrated with their surrounding urban environments. In particular, comparable aerial transit systems in other locations demonstrate that such systems can operate safely, efficiently, and in concert with nearby residential and open space uses, including parks and other recreational facilities. The proposed Project would be located in a densely-populated, urban environment surrounded by a variety of commercial, industrial, and residential development types. In this type of environment, it is common for public transportation, such as Metro’s light rail, to be located adjacent to residential uses and modern aerial transit systems in other cities, including Portland, Oregon and New York City, operate adjacent to residential uses. Nevertheless, as discussed in Topical Response J, Gondola Design and Operations and Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, cabin windows can be equipped with privacy glass that can become opaque while adjacent to sensitive views, and the proposed Project would work with stakeholders adjacent to the proposed Project alignment to identify locations where the use of privacy glass would be warranted. Considerations as to the locations along the proposed Project alignment where the privacy glass could be activated include the subject adjacent sensitive views and the vertical and horizontal distance between the proposed Project cabins and the adjacent sensitive views.

Comment PH9-4 I beg you not to approve this project which will be use our federal funds and our taxes. We oppose this gondola. Our communities have stated our opposition and now it corresponds to you to say no to the gondola.

Response PH9-4 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project’s capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project’s capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project.

Comment PH9-5 We do not want you to repeat the history that removed hundreds of Latino families from Chavez Ravine. Thank you very much.

Response PH9-5 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Section 5.0, Corrections and Additions, of this Final EIR for a discussion of Chavez Ravine.

Public Hearing Comment PH10 – Gloria Andrade

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH10

Comment PH10-1 Hello. My name is Gloria Andrade. I am 76 years old. I have lived in East LA here for 35 years and for me I would say stop the gondola forever.

Response PH10-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Comment PH10-2 Our taxes and federal funds should not be used to make rich people richer. At this time, there's a lot of problems in the streets and we should also focus on these homeless people who are human beings. And we should be watching out for them. That's all.

INTERPRETER: Interpreter correction. Where it said -- where I said there are a lot of problems in the streets, I should have translated as there are a lot of indigent people in the streets. Thank you.

Thank you very much for your time. So I already said part of it.

Response PH10-2 This comment is noted and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project.

Comment PH10-3 It is nothing but lies. Mr. McCourt only wants to fill up his pockets with more money from our taxes. We oppose this gondola. Our communities have already stated their opposition and now it corresponds to you to say no to the gondola.

Response PH10-3 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on

the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted. Refer to Response PH10-2 regarding the Project Sponsor and the proposed Project cost and financing.

Comment PH10-4 We do not want to repeat the history that pushed so many hundreds of Latina families out of Chavez Ravine. The gondola will not do anything to save the environment. Those are lies. Thank you very much for everything.

Response PH10-4 Refer to Section 5.0, Corrections and Additions, of this Final EIR for a discussion of Chavez Ravine. Refer to Section 3.03, Air Quality, Section 3.08, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 3.17, Transportation, Appendix D, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's ability to reduce vehicular travel, to improve air quality through reduced emissions, and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through reduced vehicular travel.

Public Hearing Comment PH11 – Renee Young

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH11

Comment PH11-1 My name is Renee Young and I am the president of NAWBO-LA, the National Association of Women Business Owners and we are the unifying voice for more than 750,000 local women business owners in the region and we are very excited about the LA ART project.

Response PH11-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment PH11-2 We believe very strongly that this will bring business to local, small businesses in particular, entrepreneurs. We, as women, are one of the fastest-growing groups of entrepreneurs in the country and anything that drives business into our community, into our stores, into our companies we support. So we're very, very excited about this.

Response PH11-2 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, discussing the proposed Project's potential partnerships with and benefits to local businesses and how the proposed Project would not displace businesses and represents an opportunity for additional visitors along the proposed Project alignment, creating economic opportunities for local businesses, including shops and restaurants, through potential partnerships that drive customers to businesses along the alignment, which, consequently, adds revenues to these small businesses in the communities the proposed Project hopes to serve. During construction, the Project Sponsor would create a Business and Community Support Program to assist local businesses affected by proposed Project construction activities. The proposed Project would provide numerous benefits to local businesses in El Pueblo, Chinatown, and other areas along the proposed Project alignment, including through potential partnerships with these businesses as well as by providing an accessible and affordable mobility option for employees and area residents.

Comment PH11-3 We are also very excited about the local business participation goal for 35 percent and we encourage the project as they move forward to make sure that we keep that as part of the goal and engagement because again the more we can drive business into our community, the more women business owners and all business owners can thrive and bring money back into our communities and this just goes to build back. Women who left the business world in droves during COVID, we want to be able to re-engage those women. We want to be able to offer them jobs and we believe that this project allows us to do that.

Response PH11-3 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of how the proposed Project has committed to a goal of 35 percent utilization of minority business enterprises (MBE), women business enterprises (WBE), disadvantaged business enterprises (DBE), small business enterprise (SBE), disabled veteran business enterprises (DVBE), and LGBTQ-owned businesses during the proposed Project's construction phase.

Comment PH11-4 So again, we encourage the Metro and the team to really move forward with this project and we're looking forward to seeing it soon. Thank you.

Response PH11-4 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Public Hearing Comment PH12 – Juniper Wong

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH12

Comment PH12-1 As a volunteer and worker in Chinatown who works with low income Chinese seniors, I do not support this project. Seniors with limited mobility do not want to be lifted into the sky. They want suspended buses and services in the area. They want reduced traffic on game days, not redirecting more traffic from the stadium to Chinatown where most people are projected to park with no accommodations.

Response PH12-1 Refer to Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, and Topical Response J, Gondola Design and Operations, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the safety features of the proposed Project and how the station boarding process and cabins would comply with all accessibility requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act (“ADA”). If needed, cabins could be either slowed or stopped in the station for boarding purposes. Station attendants would be located within each station to assure safe boarding and to execute stops for unloading or boarding purposes, if necessary. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at Los Angeles Union Station (LAUS), Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Traffic congestion is not required to be analyzed under CEQA in the Draft EIR following the implementation of Senate Bill 743, which designated “vehicle miles traveled” as the method for assessing transportation impacts on the environment for CEQA projects. Refer to the Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit Project Non-CEQA Transportation Assessment, which found that there could be localized increases in traffic at the intersections closest to the proposed Project’s Alameda Station and Chinatown/State Park Station due to some riders choosing to park and ride or take Uber/Lyft and recommended the proposed Project work with Metro to identify a transit partnership for the proposed Project riders to further encourage them to take transit, walk, or bike to the proposed Project’s stations. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the potential added benefits from the proposed Project, including potential partnerships with and benefits to local businesses in Chinatown. Refer to the Parking Study for a discussion of the proposed Project’s parking management plan.

Comment PH12-2 This past year, I've been canvassing for civic outreach in Chinatown. I've knocked on every door, met with nearly every resident asking what people wanted for the city. The answer was not a train in the sky to watch baseball games. The answer was affordable housing, a market, a grocery market in the neighborhood, a halt to the

rising cost of living which this gondola, as a tourist attraction, would only contribute to.

Response PH12-2 Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the proposed Project would not preclude development of uses including housing, grocery stores, and/or healthcare facilities in the surrounding communities, and would itself address a need for a permanent transit connection to one of the region's most visited venues, and would benefit the surrounding community by alleviating existing congestion on surrounding neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways, thereby reducing associated air pollution and improving safety. Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not exacerbate gentrification or result in displacement of residents in the surrounding neighborhoods and is consistent with Metro's considerations regarding gentrification and displacement.

Comment PH12-3 Where College Station was built, where one of the towers for this project is slated for, has already been developed into a Chinese center catering to well-off newcomers, not the long- time, low-income residents who they've already displaced and who continue to displace.

Response PH12-3 Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not displace housing or prevent planned housing.

Comment PH12-4 I believe LA Metro's priorities are skewed. There are other entryways to Dodger Stadium. Why choose to run this project through the second poorest neighborhood in LA? It says everything that you would spend time and money catering to a seasonal entertainment issue and not the truly urgent actually life-threatening issues of displacement that our most vulnerable Chinatown residents face which is becoming unhoused.

Response PH12-4 Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at LAUS, Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Refer to Section 5.0, Other CEQA Considerations, of the Draft EIR, for a discussion of why the proposed alignment and the proposed Project's Chinatown/State Park Station location was chosen. The proposed Project, in response to helping to promote and provide added connectivity to the Chinatown area, also located its Chinatown/State Park Station within a 3-minute walk to/from Metro's L Line (Gold) Chinatown station as a way to drive additional foot traffic to Chinatown and provide direct access to the Los Angeles State

Historic Park. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities, including but not limited to, sustainability features and open space enhancements, the Community Access Plan for fares, access to parks, mobility hubs, signage, utilization of local artists for site specific artwork at each station reflective of the unique neighborhood culture, design of each component of the proposed Project to complement and reflect the unique character of the surrounding neighborhood, the Business and Community Support Program during construction, and benefits to local businesses along the proposed Project alignment. The Project Sponsor would convene stakeholder groups to coordinate on issues related to proposed Project features. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the Draft EIR addresses environmental justice by considering the proposed Project's ability to reduce congestion and emissions from on-road vehicles in an area disproportionately burdened by pollution, and including an analysis of the proposed Project's potential impacts to the surrounding community, concluding that the proposed Project could result in air quality benefits for the surrounding communities. As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, and Topical Response C, Project Features, the proposed Project creates a first/last mile transit link for residents and businesses within Chinatown while unifying and connecting communities through transit mobility access. This new mode of transportation will expand rider access to the regional transit system by attracting new visitors including Dodgers fans, and represents an opportunity for additional visitors along the proposed Project alignment, creating economic opportunities for local businesses, including shops and restaurants, through potential partnerships that drive customers to Chinatown and other businesses along the alignment, which, consequently, adds revenues to these small businesses in the communities the proposed Project hopes to serve. Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not displace any housing, and how consistent with the proposed Project objectives, the proposed Project was designed in consideration of planned housing projects.

Comment PH12-5 And to that greater point, this whole process has been obfuscated and inaccessible for community input. Just today, I had tenants, Chinese seniors in attendance who wrote written comments. One of the interpreters read her comments in Chinese, came up to me and said her point of prioritizing affordable housing over the gondola was illegitimate. That is not his jurisdiction to say that to me. He cannot overrule a long time resident's personal point of view, that the land this is being built on should be used to better the most vulnerable in the neighborhood is absolutely a legitimate and glaringly urgent point of all of this.

Response PH12-5 In response to Comment Letter P133 regarding interpretation during the two public hearings held in December 2022, AECOM conducted an inquiry in conjunction with the consultant providing translation and interpretation services (LAT Multilingual) and summarized its results in a memorandum to Metro dated January 23, 2023, available on the proposed Project's SB 44 website.¹ As discussed therein, the LAT'S Multilingual interpreters stated that they did not take part in an interaction like the one described in the comment during the December 10, 2022, public hearing. The interpreters are certified and bound by a code of ethics that would prevent them from advocating a position in a setting such as this public hearing. The comment also describes the interpreter using male pronouns, but the Cantonese interpreters present at the December 10, 2022, public hearing were both female. Refer to Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, for transcripts of all verbal comments received on the Draft EIR during the two in-person public hearings. In addition, refer to Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's public outreach and opportunity for public testimony during the Draft EIR public review period. Eight public meetings were held immediately preceding, during, and immediately following the Draft EIR public review period, with four held in-person in the Project area at Los Angeles Union Station and Cathedral High School, and four held virtually via Zoom webinar. Project materials and information were provided at both the in-person meetings and on Metro's website in English, Spanish, Chinese (Traditional), and Chinese (Simplified). Interpretation was provided in English, Spanish, Mandarin, and Cantonese during the eight public meetings, with interpretation provided in Taishanese during the final two public meetings.

¹ Memo Documenting AECOM's Inquiry into Public Hearing Translator Comments (January 23, 2023).

Public Hearing Comment PH13 – Bill Chin

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH13

Comment PH13-1 Okay. My name is Bill Chin. B-I-L-L C-H-I-N. I've been looking at the boards that are on the easel. They tend to be very vague and I think they're very vague intentionally, so it's not within the capabilities of actually seeing towers when there are supposed to be towers very long and tall and they look very faint on purpose.

And there's also no scaling on there and the people from, I guess, MTA, who are running the show, they're kind of vague in terms of their language. They say it's a station as Bishop and Broadway. I said are you sure it's a station? Oh, no, it's a tower. No, it's a facility. I said what do you mean by facility? Well, it's like a tower, but it's bigger than a tower. I said well, what does it do? And he wasn't sure except that it has to be big, so they could turn.

Response PH13-1 Refer to Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the format of the in-person public meetings immediately preceding and during the Draft EIR public review period, which were in the format of an Open House, consistent with standard Metro practice, where attendees could learn more about the proposed Project and the key analyses and conclusions of the Draft EIR, and also a public comment opportunity. Twelve stations were set up throughout the venue, with ten stations focused on specific subject matter areas of the Draft EIR. Attendees could walk around to each station and ask questions to subject-matter experts about the proposed Project. Each station had large, printed boards, using the Key Observation Points (KOP) images (also known as key views) from the Draft EIR, summarizing the subject matter of that station, including: the Project Description, Aesthetics, Air Quality, GHG, and Energy, Cultural (Archaeology and Historical Resources), Parks and Recreation, Noise, Transportation, and Parking. Each station also included printed materials that attendees could review and/or take with them, including fact sheets in English, Spanish, and Chinese (Simplified) and printed copies of the presentation from the virtual public hearing in English, Spanish, Chinese (Simplified) and Chinese (Traditional). The meetings were staffed by Metro and AECOM staff, experts on subject matter areas including Transportation and Parking; Archaeology; Historical Resources; Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas, and Energy; Ropeway Engineering; Noise; and Aesthetics, and the Project team, who answered questions from attendees on the Draft EIR key analyses and conclusion. Refer to Section 3.01, Aesthetics, and Appendix C, Visual Impact Assessment, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the aesthetic impacts of the proposed Project, which would be less than significant. Refer to Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the stations, towers, and junction for the proposed Project.

Comment PH13-2 So at that point I thought even I speak very clearly, concisely, and correctly in English, and when somebody is trying to help me understand the project, it doesn't seem to work out very well. It's very frustrating to read and not read too much which is vague and then somebody not being very clear, it's even worse. So I don't know if reading and listening is going to do anything because I can't experience it or understand it without some kind of preliminary sources. That's all I want to say.

Response PH13-2 Refer to Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the translated materials and interpretation offered in several languages during the Draft EIR public review period. During the Draft EIR public review period, proposed Project materials and information were provided at both the in-person meetings and on Metro's website in English, Spanish, Chinese (Traditional), and Chinese (Simplified). Interpretation was provided in English, Spanish, Mandarin, and Cantonese during the eight public meetings, with interpretation provided in Taishanese during the final two public meetings.

Comment PH13-3 Okay, my name is Bill Chin, B-I-L-L C-H-I-N. I don't -- I'm against the gondola, but there are two things that I do like that I think can be done to improve the community where I live in Chinatown. One is to put more parkway that was proposed around the Chinatown station on the sidewalk, like trees and bathrooms and bicycle facilities that could be used for the Gold Line.

Response PH13-3 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Through collaboration with State Parks, the proposed Project has been designed to provide additional benefits to the Los Angeles State Historic Park, including pedestrian improvements between Metro's L Line (Gold) and the park, and integration of the Chinatown/State Park Station into the southern boundary of the park with hardscape and landscape enhancements, a mobility hub, and other park amenities including concessions, restrooms, and a breezeway connecting the concessions and restrooms.

Comment PH13-4 And the other things is the bridge, pedestrian bridge, they come from Broadway into the park could be very useful to cut down on traffic, so I don't have to take my car to the east side of the historical park in order to walk into the park. I can just walk while I'm shopping across Broadway into the park by way of a pedestrian bridge.

Response PH13-4 As discussed in Topical Response C, Project Features, while not proposed as part of the proposed Project, the Draft EIR includes an analysis of the State Park's proposed bike and pedestrian bridge as part of Design and Use Option E. The bridge would provide important connections for students at Cathedral High School, as well as between the Park and the Chinatown, Savoy, and Solano Canyon neighborhoods to support convenient access for the community. The analysis serves to provide environmental clearance for the bike and pedestrian bridge as a benefit to the Los Angeles State Historic Park, as the bike and pedestrian bridge was mentioned in the Los Angeles State Historic Park General Plan and studied in the State Park's Bridge

Feasibility Study, the bike and pedestrian bridge was never environmentally cleared. Support for the Los Angeles State Historic Park bike and pedestrian bridge would otherwise be provided as part of the proposed Project. Accordingly, the proposed Project is furthering the bike and pedestrian bridge by providing the necessary environmental clearance and support for the bridge.

Comment PH13-5 So I am officially against the gondola, but I do see these two things as beneficial. I also want to say that the gondola station and the Union Station gondola station seems to be repetitive of the Gold Line since we do have people coming from Union Station who would go to Chinatown by way of the Gold Line and there is a Gold Line station in Chinatown already.

Response PH13-5 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Metro engaged stakeholders in neighborhoods along the proposed Project alignment in decision making for the proposed Project beginning with the public scoping period for the Draft EIR in October 2020 to receive public comment on the proposed Project's scope of environmental review under CEQA. In June 2021, the Project Sponsor conducted two virtual public outreach meetings. The input from stakeholders in neighborhoods along the proposed Project, including Chinatown, during this period led directly to changes to the proposed Project, including selecting the proposed Project's alignment and the location of Chinatown / State Park Station, as discussed in Section 5.0, Other CEQA Considerations, of the Draft EIR. The proposed Project, in response to helping to promote and provide added connectivity to the Chinatown area, located its Chinatown/State Park Station within a 3-minute walk to/from Metro's L Line (Gold) Chinatown station as a way to drive additional foot traffic to Chinatown and provide direct access to the Los Angeles State Historic Park. Compared to the Metro L Line (Gold), accessible at the Chinatown Station, the proposed Project's Chinatown/State Park Station would be closer to the Los Angeles State Historic Park, the shorter headways would result in more frequent service, and the travel time would be less.

Comment PH13-6 So I think all that's needed is electric vehicles that would transport people from wherever that they need to come to Dodger Stadium either from Union Station or from Gene Autry Museum or from the airport or any other places, just like they do with the Hollywood Bowl. You can take a charter bus from Gene Autry to Hollywood Bowl. Thank you.

Response PH13-6 Refer to Topical Response H, The Draft EIR Considered an Appropriate Range of Alternatives and Design Options, for discussion of how electrification of the Dodger Stadium Express buses would not negate the operational issues associated with substantially expanding the Dodger Stadium Express. As discussed in Topical Response H, a system of buses from numerous remote locations throughout the Los Angeles region to and from Dodger Stadium events would require a substantial increase in the number of buses which, similar to expanding the fleet for an expanded

Dodger Stadium Express service, would result in a fleet of buses that would either be underutilized most of the time or regular Metro bus service that utilizes these vehicles would be disrupted every time a Dodger game or event at the stadium is held. Such a service would also incur substantial costs in paid time and mileage for driving empty buses out to the remote locations before a game and back from the remote locations after a game and paid idle time during the game. Buses from a variety of remote locations would also need to travel in rush hour congestion to get to Dodger Stadium. With limited regional facilities that provide bus only lanes that these services could utilize, they would not materially improve transit travel time compared with driving. For example, the current Dodger Stadium Express service from South Bay serves a broad area of southern Los Angeles County at stations spread across eight miles, is free, and travels on a priority lane within the I-110 freeway median for most of its trip, but the South Bay Dodger Stadium Express carried an average of only 415 passengers per game in 2019, which is substantially lower than the ridership of 1,895 riders per game on the LAUS Dodger Stadium Express.

Comment PH13-7 MR. CHIN: What do you need from me?

MS. KING: If you could just state and spell your name, please, and then you can begin your comment.

MR. CHIN: Bill Chin. B-I-L-L, C-H-I- N.

MS. KING: Great.

MR. CHIN: So this is being recorded and typed?

MS. KING: Recorded. The typing is just notes for now. It will later be transcribed I believe.

Response PH13-7 This comment is noted and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Comment PH13-8 MR. CHIN: Oh, okay. So I heard that there might -- I heard that the California State Park that runs the historical park has not given permission yet or they're thinking about the gondola being part of or on the State Park property. So I was wondering, why is that? Is that because they're not committed? Or they just want to see what the interest level is before the state decides, okay. We'll go with public interest and compromise the design and the plan of our state park. Period.

Response PH13-8 Refer to Topical Response D, Metro Is the Proper Lead Agency for the Proposed Project as the Region's Transportation Authority; Metro Named and Consulted with the Applicable Responsible Agencies, for discussion of how responsible agencies for the proposed Project include the California Department of Parks and Recreation. Refer to Section 3.11, Land Use and Planning, of the Draft EIR, for a discussion of the

proposed Project's consistency with the Los Angeles State Historic Park General Plan. As discussed therein, State Parks has determined that the proposed Project would be inconsistent with the Los Angeles State Historic Park General Plan because the identified land uses in the General Plan's Preferred Park Concept Elements did not contemplate a transit station like the proposed Project's Chinatown/State Park Station. State Parks considers this inconsistency a potentially significant impact. Therefore, Mitigation Measure LUP-A would be implemented to require the proposed Project to obtain an amendment to the Los Angeles State Historic Park General Plan. The General Plan Amendment is subject to the review and approval by the State Park Commission, which retains its independent authority related to the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response F, Los Angeles State Historic Park, for a discussion of the Los Angeles State Historic Park General Plan Amendment.

Comment PH13-9 My concern is, the state park has a goal in mind, and they've designed it well for the community. And I would not like to see their original plan compromised in any way by the gondola project, whether that means cutting trees or putting structure very close to the State Park where the State Park will feel like there is a compromise of the original design and landscaping or of cutting of trees because the cables are too low, or they need some height in the park to run their cars through the park. Period. Is that concise enough?

Response PH13-9 As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, Section 3.16, Parks and Recreational Facilities, and Section 5.0, Other CEQA Considerations, of the Draft EIR, the Chinatown/State Park Station would have a footprint of 2,195 square feet in the Los Angeles State Historic Park (~.1% of the total 32-acre park), and the station canopy would have an overhang of 9,320 square feet over the park. The proposed Project alignment crosses over the westernmost edge of the Los Angeles State Historic Park, adjacent to the existing Metro L Line (Gold) and the associated overhead catenary system. The proposed Project's required aerial clearance would be located above approximately 59,470 square feet of the total 32-acre park, plus an Additional Separation Buffer. With the required clearances and the height at which the cabins would cross over the Los Angeles State Historic Park, the ability to use the vast majority of the Park for kite flying, special events (e.g., concerts, craft fairs, partnership events, 5K/10K runs, workshops, cultural festivals, and the farmers' market), and other passive recreational opportunities (e.g., picnicking, jogging, walking, and informal play) would not be affected by the proposed Project. The proposed Project would implement BIO-PDF-F and adhere to ordinances and requirements applicable to tree replacement, based on the corresponding jurisdiction of the property where each tree is located. As discussed on page 3.4-23, in Section 3.04, Biological Resources, of the Draft EIR, and in Appendix K.1, Updated Tree Report, and in Appendix G, Supplemental Biological Resources Report, of this Final EIR, the removal of the 75 trees within Los Angeles State Historic Park would require a permit or approval from the California Department of Parks and Recreation, and all existing trees required to be removed on California Department of Parks and Recreation

property would be replaced at a minimum 1:1 ratio within the Park or as agreed to as part of the approvals required for implementation of the proposed Project from the Department. In addition, 6 trees within the public ROW located near the Los Angeles State Historic Park would be replaced at a ratio specified by the Urban Forestry Division, typically, at a 2:1 ratio.

Comment PH13-10 PARTICIPANT: That was perfect.

MR. CHIN: Oh, really?

PARTICIPANT: Yeah.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 10:24 a.m. and resumed at 10:32 a.m.)

MS. KING: All right. Your name again?

MR. CHIN: Bill Chin. B-I-L-L, C-H-I-N.

Response PH13-10 This comment is noted and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Comment PH13-11 I looked at the project and the environmental. I probably don't have any problems with the five or six towers in terms of the height.

Response PH13-11 This comment is noted and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the EIR, no further response is warranted.

Comment PH13-12 But LA and Los Angeles being so creative and also very close to the art industry and Hollywood, that there should be something done about concrete and more fashionable other than flat surface and square corners.

If you make it look like a tree or round off the corners like you see in modern apartments, where you take a piece of metal and nail it on the stud and then put sheet rock to it, then it softens the corner, just like in museums throughout the world. So that's not much to ask for because concrete can be molded into rounder corners. Make it look more organic. Period.

Response PH13-12 Refer to Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, for a discussion of the proposed Project design, which sought to minimize the perceived scale and mass of the stations and non-passenger junction, taking advantage of a simple barrel vault form to provide the minimum enclosure needed to protect the ropeway equipment and provide shade and weather protection to passengers on the boarding platform. This barrel form would utilize a hollow structural steel section structure and metal panel assembly to allow the introduction of custom perforation patterns that take

cues from the immediate neighborhood culture, while also providing a visual lightness to the form. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of how each component of the proposed Project would be designed to complement and reflect the unique character of the surrounding area, which would be discussed with identified stakeholder groups, and the Project Sponsor would utilize local artists for site specific artwork at each station reflective of the unique neighborhood culture. Refer to Appendix A, Scoping Report, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of outreach and community engagement during the Draft EIR scoping period. Metro sought to engage the community in each stage of the environmental review process. Metro engaged the public, including local community stakeholders, as well as from agencies, organizations, and interested parties, in decision making for the proposed Project beginning with the public scoping period for the Draft EIR in October 2020 to receive public comment on the proposed Project's scope of environmental review under CEQA. In June 2021, the Project Sponsor conducted two virtual public outreach meetings. The public input during this period led directly to changes to the proposed Project to incorporate public feedback, including changes to the proposed Project alignment to include the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station, redesign of the proposed Project stations and junction and additional pedestrian enhancements including hardscape and landscape improvements. Refer to Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, for discussion of outreach and community engagement during the Draft EIR public review period and community engagement efforts during the preparation of the Final EIR.

Comment PH13-13 MS. KING: Thank you.

MR. CHIN: I have something --

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 10:34 a.m. and resumed at 10:40 a.m.)

Response PH13-13 This comment is noted and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Comment PH13-14 MS. KING: Go right ahead.

MR. CHIN: My name is Bill Chin. B-I-L-L, C-H-I-N. I was at the booth for the aerospace. So the question was, will there be trees that will be cut? They said yes.

Response PH13-14 Refer to Section 3.04, Biological Resources, and Appendix E, Biological Resources Assessment, of the Draft EIR and Appendix G, Supplemental Biological Resources Report, of the Final EIR. The proposed Project would implement BIO-PDF-F and adhere to ordinances and requirements applicable to tree replacement, based on the corresponding jurisdiction of the property where each tree is located.

Comment PH13-15 And then I asked, why is it that all the maps in your EIR and on your project shows no scaling? Like no millimeter per foot or how many feet per millimeter on the two-dimensional maps? And he says, oh, we don't know. I said, it's not appropriate within your capabilities if you guys are all engineers.

But it's appropriate if somebody told all the engineers, don't put any scaling on it because we don't want the public to figure out how much distance or height is involved. And therefore there's not scale. Just a map and a legend. And I really, really oppose that. Why do you want people to review the information when they can't scale down any distances on every map on thousands of pages? PARTICIPANT: All done?

MR. CHIN: Thank you.

MS. KING: Thank you very much. Appreciate that.

Response PH13-15 Refer to Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR for Figure 2-3: Proposed Project Location, Figure 2-4: Proposed Project Alignment, Figure 2-10: Proposed Alameda Station Location, Figure 2-12: Proposed Alameda Tower Location, Figure 2-14: Proposed Alpine Tower Location, Figure 2-17: Proposed Chinatown/State Park Station Location, Figure 2-19: Proposed Broadway Junction Location, Figure 2-21: Proposed Stadium Tower Location, and Figure 2-24: Proposed Dodger Stadium Station Location, which show maps of the proposed Project with scaling. Refer to Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR for Figure 2-11: Alameda Station Cross Sections, Figure 2-13: Alameda Tower Elevations, Figure 2-15: Alpine Tower Elevations, Figure 2-18: Chinatown/State Park Station Cross Sections, Figure 2-20: Broadway Junction Cross Sections, Figure 2-22: Stadium Tower Elevations, and Figure 2-25: Dodger Stadium Station Cross Sections for cross sections and elevations of the proposed Project components and the respective dimensions of each. Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, refers to the proposed alignment profile provided in Proposed Alignment Plan and Profile (Appendix Q). Appendix Q, Proposed Project Alignment Plan and Profile, of the Draft EIR, includes the proposed alignment profile, which shows the heights of each proposed Project component in profile and the ropeway and provides a scale. Refer to Appendix H.1, Memo Regarding Preparation of View Simulations, of the Final EIR, for discussion of how the proposed Project renderings were rendered in perspective to match the pedestrian eye level vantage point.

Comment PH13-16 MS. KING: All right. Just state your name one more time for us, please.

MR. CHIN: My name is Bill Chin. And it's spelled C, B-I-L-L, C-H-I-N. As I demonstrated to the recorder here that the Cantonese speaker does not really speak Taishan, and there were four Taishan speakers that came in. But they chose not to come in because they saw the sign that says Cantonese and no Taishan.

And it makes a big difference because Taishan could be intimidated. They're not educated, they're barely skilled, and to come into a big, unfamiliar place like this, it's not comforting for them to know that people don't speak their dialect. And I hope that changes in the future because it's been a misleading thing to not bring enough people from the community already. Thank you.

MS. KING: Thank you.

Response PH13-16 Refer to Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the translated materials and interpretation offered in several languages during the Draft EIR public review period. During the Draft EIR public review period, proposed Project materials and information were provided at both the in-person meetings and on Metro's website in English, Spanish, Chinese (Traditional), and Chinese (Simplified). Interpretation was provided in English, Spanish, Mandarin, and Cantonese during the eight public meetings, with interpretation provided in Taishanese during the final two public meetings.

Comment PH13-17 MS. KING: And we're recording.

MR. CHIN: By name is Bill Chin. B-I-L-L, C-H-I-N. I've lived here for over 54 years in Chinatown. And I'm against the gondola because it seems like a repeat of the Gold Line with stations and Gold Line at Union Station and in Chinatown.

Response PH13-17 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Compared to the Metro L Line (Gold), accessible at the Chinatown Station, the proposed Project's Chinatown/State Park Station would be closer to the Los Angeles State Historic Park, the shorter headways would result in more frequent service, and the travel time would be less.

Comment PH13-18 But I do like to have a couple of the benefits, which is a pedestrian bridge from Broadway into the historical park and to maybe see more trees along where the Chinatown Gold Line is located.

Response PH13-18 This comment indicating support for certain aspects of the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefit to the surrounding community.

Comment PH13-19 But I wanted to say that, when I'm traveling on Alpine and going eastward toward the post office, I see that the Gold Line has three towers that are very thick. And it's daunting that there's no trees all around those towers, very grey, massive, concrete towers. And even though these towers may be just as thick and not as closely sequenced, they should also have very well-maintained vegetation, if not because there are towers. It is because those places where those towers are, they should be landscaped with even more vegetation and without the gondola. Thank you.

MS. KING: Thank you.

Response PH13-19 As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, and visually in Figure 2-14, of the Draft EIR, the Alpine Tower would be located on a City-owned parcel, currently being used as non-public parking storage for City vehicles, at the northeast corner of Alameda Street and Alpine Street, adjacent to the Metro L Line (Gold). The Alpine Tower would include the installation of landscaping and hardscaping near the base of the tower.

Comment PH13-20 MS. KING: Just go ahead and state your name one more time.

MR. CHIN: Yes. My name is Bill Chin.

MS. KING: Okay.

MR. CHIN: B-I-L-L, C-H-I-N.

MS. KING: And go right ahead, please.

MR. CHIN: I'm still I concerned that information on the board is so very vague. When I ask questions about the parking study, it wasn't articulated what day of the week and whether it was a weekend. It was just said that it was game day. And game day could fall on weekends as easy as it does on weekdays.

Especially on weekends, where Chinatown is highly, highly, highly tourist, and people from adjacent neighborhoods always come back to Chinatown to buy bags of rice or bring family members or even tourists. And they really occupy a lot of their private, as well as street parking, in the parking lot from very early morning all the way to the evening time on weekends throughout the year, especially during the summer months during game season as well.

So this is very vague because you don't read it on the board. You don't see it on the writing. You hear it only if you ask questions. But you don't get to experience it at a glance. And so you assume that the experts are telling the truth about how many parking spaces that are available.

But if you come on a weekend, it is not true. All the parking lots are filled, paid parking lots. And all the streets, you have to like double-park to wait for somebody to leave before you find parking. Thank you.

MS. KING: Okay. Thank you.

Response PH13-20 Parking is not required to be analyzed under CEQA or the Transportation Assessment Guidelines ("TAG"). Nevertheless, the Parking Study was prepared to provide additional information to the community and decision makers about existing parking conditions and the proposed Project's potential to effect parking conditions around the Alameda Station and Chinatown/State Park Station. As recommended in the Parking Study, the Project Sponsor will prepare, in collaboration with the City, and

with robust feedback from community stakeholders, a parking management plan. The City would implement any on-street parking management strategies identified.

Comment PH13-21 MS. KING: Ready when you are. Just state your name one more time.

MR. CHIN: My name is Bill Chin. B-I-L-L, C-H-I-N. I had a comment about LA Art, whether it's McCourt or whether it's a nonprofit. It seems the nonprofit, I have no confidence that they will be around after a gondola project like this is built, that they would be able to sustain the maintenance and the ongoing operating expenses for an endeavor like This throughout the year.

Whoever was chosen may be certified with nonprofit with the state, but I don't see that they have any resources that could manage with the operating expenses of a project like this and the amount of experience that they have. Thank you.

MS. KING: Thank you.

Response PH13-21 This comment is noted and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project.

Comment PH13-22 MS. KING: Recording.

MR. CHIN: My name is Bill Chin. B-I-L-L, C-H-I-N. I've seen and read parts of the EIR, so I understand the different heights of the tower, but they don't delineate where the heights are at every hundred feet or interval. It just is a very vague, saying that there's average height and maximum height. But they don't demarcate where they're located.

But being vague like that still doesn't stop me from asking if you are able to calculate the height of the towers and where the cables need to be.

Response PH13-22 As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, and depicted in Figure 2-4: Proposed Project Alignment, of the Draft EIR, the height of Alameda Tower is 195 feet, the height of Alpine Tower is 195 feet, and the height of Stadium Tower is 179 feet. Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, refers to the proposed alignment

profile provided in *Proposed Alignment Plan and Profile* (Appendix Q). Appendix Q, Proposed Alignment Plan and Profile, of the Draft EIR, provides an overview of the various heights along the proposed Project alignment and the locations of the Alameda Tower, the Alpine Tower, and the Stadium Tower, as well as the ropeway, stations, and junction.

Comment PH13-23 I would like to see statistics on how deep each of the seven towers are in terms of footing and how deep they go into the ground and whether there's been any preliminary soil report to determine at what height those footings should be. Thank you.

MS. KING: Thank you. Appreciate you.

Response PH13-23 The Draft EIR addressed construction details, including maximum depths for drilled piles to support the proposed Project's stations, junction, and towers in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR. As discussed on pages 2-50 and 2-51, the maximum depth of the drilled piles required for the proposed Project's Alameda, Alpine, and Stadium Towers would be 120 feet. The maximum depth of the drilled piles required for the proposed Project's stations would be 125 feet for Alameda Station, 80 feet for Chinatown/State Park Station, 120 feet for Broadway Junction, and 55 feet for Dodger Stadium Station. Regarding a preliminary soil report, refer to Section 3.07, Geology and Soils, and Appendix I, Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit Geotechnical Document in Support of the Environmental Impact Report, of the Draft EIR, for information regarding the geology and soils at the proposed Project.

Public Hearing Comment PH14 – Andrew Vought

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH14

Comment PH14-1 MS. KING: All right. Recording is going. If you please state your name and spell it for the record.

MR. VOUGHT: My name is Andrew Vought. V as in Victor, O-U-G-H-T.

MS. KING: Great.

Response PH14-1 This comment is noted and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Comment PH14-2 MR. VOUGHT: And I'm an Angeleno resident. I'm here today to voice my strong opposition to the proposed gondola. The only benefit from the gondola is that it allows a real estate developer to get richer developing the Dodgers parking lot. The rest of us all lose. Private gain equals public pain.

Response PH14-2 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities, including but not limited to, sustainability features and open space enhancements, the Community Access Plan for fares, access to parks, mobility hubs, signage, utilization of local artists for site specific artwork at each station reflective of the unique neighborhood culture, design of each component of the proposed Project to complement and reflect the unique character of the surrounding neighborhood, the Business and Community Support Program during construction, and benefits to local businesses along the proposed Project alignment. The Project Sponsor would convene stakeholder groups to coordinate on issues related to proposed Project features. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response G, No Improper Project Segmentation: The Proposed Project Is Intended to Create a Transit Connection from Metro's Union Station Transportation Hub via an Aerial Gondola System to the Dodger Stadium Property, for a discussion of how the proposed Project solely proposes an aerial gondola system. The proposed Project does not include other development, and neither the Project Sponsor nor any other applicant has applied for

other development unrelated to the existing stadium uses on the Dodger Stadium property.

Comment PH14-3 The Angelenos who use our beautiful state park lose. Two acres will be carved out of Los Angeles State Historic Park for a station, and gondolas will fly directly over the park. No more kite flying.

Response PH14-3 As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, Section 3.16, Parks and Recreational Facilities, and Section 5.0, Other CEQA Considerations, of the Draft EIR, the Chinatown/State Park Station would have a footprint of 2,195 square feet in the Los Angeles State Historic Park (~.1% of the total 32-acre park), and the station canopy would have an overhang of 9,320 square feet over the park. The proposed Project alignment crosses over the westernmost edge of the Los Angeles State Historic Park, adjacent to the existing Metro L Line (Gold) and the associated overhead catenary system. The proposed Project's required aerial clearance would be located above approximately 59,470 square feet of the total 32-acre park, plus an Additional Separation Buffer. With the required clearances and the height at which the cabins would cross over the Los Angeles State Historic Park, the ability to use the vast majority of the Park for kite flying, special events (e.g., concerts, craft fairs, partnership events, 5K/10K runs, workshops, cultural festivals, and the farmers' market), and other passive recreational opportunities (e.g., picnicking, jogging, walking, and informal play) would not be affected by the proposed Project. Refer to Response S2-4 for additional discussion regarding the ability of uses to continue at the Park. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of how the proposed Project would provide open space enhancements, including at the Alameda Triangle, the Los Angeles State Historic Park, and along the pedestrian pathway connecting Dodger Stadium Station and Dodger Stadium.

Comment PH14-4 Dodger fans lose because the arithmetic does not work for the thousands of rides promised. Fans will need to wait one or two hours after the game for a six-minute ride. Who wants that?

Response PH14-4 Refer to Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, and Topical Response J, Gondola Design and Operations, of the Final EIR, for discussion of how the proposed Project would carry up to approximately 5,000 passengers per hour per direction (pphpd). Refer to Topical Response B, Ridership Model; Queueing at Stations and Pre-game and Post-game Transportation, for discussion of how queues would be managed by efficient vertical circulation and by staff at the station and due to the nature of queue formation, the pre-game/event passenger queues at the Alameda Station in 2026 are estimated to be largely contained on the platform and only minimally extend out into the planned LAUS Forecourt. More active queue management would become more frequently needed at Alameda Station as ridership increases toward the 2042 ridership projection of 10,000 riders, but even with the maximum queue length, a person at the end of the line would wait for an estimated maximum of seven minutes before boarding the gondola cabin. Others would wait

shorter durations. Post-game queues at Dodger Stadium were estimated based on assumptions about the departure patterns and estimates of walk times from the various seating areas within the stadium. Those seated the furthest away from the Dodger Stadium Station would take more time to arrive at the Station, much like how it is currently for passengers riding the Dodger Stadium Express. In addition, passengers who would rather not join the line immediately to board the proposed Project in the post-game period could visit some of the entertainment amenities at the stadium, including at the Centerfield Plaza. The post-game/event queue for the proposed Project would be constantly moving as cabins would depart every 23 seconds.

Comment PH14-5 Taxpayers lose because the cost of operating the gondola will not be paid by the billionaire developer. These costs will be paid by tax-payers.

Response PH14-5 Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project.

Comment PH14-6 This park was won in 2000 in a fight with real estate developers who wanted to put in big box warehouses. The people wanted a park instead, and we got our State Park. Now the State Park is again threatened by a real estate developer. Please don't destroy our State Park. Thanks. I'm sorry, I tapped that –

Response PH14-6 Metro and the Project Sponsor acknowledge the more than 20 years of effort the community undertook to convert the closed rail yard at River Station to what is now the Los Angeles State Historic Park. Refer to Section 2.0, Project Description, Section 3.16, Parks and Recreational Facilities, and Section 5.0, Other CEQA Considerations, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the footprint of the proposed Project in the Los Angeles State Historic Park. With the small footprint of the proposed Project's Chinatown/State Park Station, and the required clearances and the height at which the cabins would cross over the Park, the ability to use the vast majority of the Park would not be affected by the proposed Project. Refer to Response S2-4 for additional discussion regarding the ability of uses to continue at the Park. Refer to Response PH14-5 for discussion of the Project Sponsor.

Public Hearing Comment PH15 – Marc Futernick

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH15

Comment PH15-1 MS. KING: -- minutes. Great, we're recording.

MR. FUTERNICK: Hi. My name is Marc Futernick. M-A-R-C. Last name F-U-T-E-R-N-I-C-K.

MS. KING: Please.

MR. FUTERNICK: I'm an emergency physician. I live in Pasadena, but I drive, every day that I come to work, through this area.

Response PH15-1 This comment is noted and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further responses is warranted.

Comment PH15-2 I'm really focused on the impact of climate change and air pollution on our health, and this gondola will improve both of those. It'll open the door to another mode of zero-emission transportation here in Los Angeles.

Response PH15-2 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Section 3.03, Air Quality, Section 3.08, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 3.17, Transportation, Appendix D, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's ability to reduce vehicular travel, to improve air quality through reduced emissions, and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through reduced vehicular travel.

Comment PH15-3 The gondola will serve as a first and last-mile connector from our main central transportation hub at LA Union Station to Dodger Stadium, the most-attended venue in major league baseball that lacks a permanent transit option, and not just for games but for many events. This also makes a key transit connection to Elysian Park, the city's oldest and second-largest park and, again, is not currently served by transit.

Response PH15-3 As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, and Topical Response C, Project Features, the proposed Project creates a first/last mile transit link for residents and businesses within Chinatown while unifying and connecting communities through transit mobility access. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit

system at LAUS, Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Dodger Stadium draws large regional crowds, with approximately 100 baseball games and other events each year, but there are no permanent transit connections to the venue. The vast majority of visitors drive their personal vehicles to access the venue. These vehicles create congestion on the surface streets leading up to and around Dodger Stadium, including Sunset Boulevard/Cesar E. Chavez from LAUS and throughout the surrounding communities. Given the capacity of the proposed Project's system, approximately 20 percent of the fans could take aerial transit connected to Metro's regional transit system. This would reduce vehicular congestion in and around Dodger Stadium, on neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways during game and special event days. In addition to providing service on game and special event days at Dodger Stadium and events at the Los Angeles State Historic Park, it is anticipated that the proposed Project would also provide daily service between 6:00am to 12:00am, for the surrounding communities, including Chinatown, Mission Junction, Elysian Park, Solano Canyon, and the Los Angeles State Historic Park. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game and the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the proposed Community Access Plan. As discussed in Section 5.0, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR, access to Elysian Park, the City's second largest park, comprising 575 acres, would be provided through a mobility hub at Dodger Stadium Station, where passengers would be able to access a suite of first/last mile multi-modal options, such as a bike share program. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of how the proposed Project would include several sustainability features and open space enhancements, including pedestrian enhancements and drought tolerant landscaping, open space enhancements, including at the Alameda Triangle, the Los Angeles State Historic Park, and along the pedestrian pathway connecting Dodger Stadium Station and Dodger Stadium, and improved access to Los Angeles State Historic Park and Elysian Park.

Comment PH15-4 And my main interest, personally, are the co-benefits of connectivity, active transport, reduced congestion, reduced greenhouse gas emissions, and decreased local air pollution in the surrounding communities of Solano Canyon, Victor Heights, and William Mead Homes. This will protect their health and improve people's daily lives in the area.

Response PH15-4 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the Draft EIR addresses environmental justice by considering the proposed Project's ability to reduce congestion and emissions from on-road vehicles in an area disproportionately burdened by pollution, and including an analysis of the proposed Project's potential impacts to the surrounding community, concluding that the proposed Project could

result in air quality benefits for the surrounding communities. In addition to providing service on game and special event days at Dodger Stadium and events at the Los Angeles State Historic Park, it is anticipated that the proposed Project would also provide daily service between 6:00am to 12:00am, for the surrounding communities, including Chinatown, Mission Junction, Elysian Park, Solano Canyon, and the Los Angeles State Historic Park. Refer to Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of how the proposed Project's intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station near the southernmost entrance to the Los Angeles State Historic Park would be located within a short walk to many Chinatown businesses and Metro's L Line (Gold), creating a stronger connection with the Metro L Line and enhancing transit access to the Los Angeles State Historic Park, Mission Junction, William Mead Homes, and the Los Angeles River. Compared to the Metro L Line (Gold), accessible at the Chinatown Station, the proposed Project's Chinatown/State Park Station would be closer to the Los Angeles State Historic Park, the shorter headways would result in more frequent service, and the travel time would be less.

Comment PH15-5 And lastly, zero-emission transit was formed to advance and accelerate zero-emission technology in the transportation sector, which is critical to a climate-resilient future for Los Angeles. And this project will demonstrate the value of this approach to the community and to our environment. Please approve this project.

MS. KING: Thank you.

Response PH15-5 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project.

Public Hearing Comment PH16 – Teri Vanderberg

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH16

Comment PH16-1 MS. KING: All right. We are recording.

MS. VANDERBERG: Hi. My name is Teri Vanderberg, and I am a resident of Chinatown. I've lived here over a year. And the whole idea of a gondola would upset the entire feeling of Chinatown and all the elderly Chinese people that live here. And this is their livelihood. This is where they work.

Response PH16-1 Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, discussing the proposed Project's potential partnerships with and benefits to local businesses in Chinatown. As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, and Topical Response C, Project Features, the proposed Project creates a first/last mile transit link for residents and businesses within Chinatown while unifying and connecting communities through transit mobility access. This new mode of transportation will expand rider access to the regional transit system by attracting new visitors including Dodgers fans, and represents an opportunity for additional visitors along the proposed Project alignment, creating economic opportunities for local businesses, including shops and restaurants, through potential partnerships that drive customers to Chinatown and other businesses along the proposed Project alignment, which, consequently, adds revenues to these small businesses in the communities the proposed Project hopes to serve.

Comment PH16-2 They created that park for a safe place for us to all go walk, and I use that park twice a day for peace and quiet and tranquility. And having a gondola placed over in the park where people are going to be, by the thousands, getting on a gondola that is going to be charging \$30 a person to go one mile, which is a free ride if you take it on the bus here at the train station, and which is what thousands of us do. And then they all park free on our little streets, and we all take a bus over there.

Response PH16-2 Refer to Section 2.0, Project Description, Section 3.16, Parks and Recreational Facilities, and Section 5.0, Other CEQA Considerations, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the footprint of the proposed Project in the Los Angeles State Historic Park. With the small footprint of the proposed Project's Chinatown/State Park Station, and the required clearances and the height at which the cabins would cross over the Park, the ability to use the vast majority of the Park would not be affected by the proposed Project. Refer to Response S2-4 for additional discussion regarding the ability of uses to continue at the Park. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of how the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan. The proposed Project would

provide active transportation connectivity along the proposed Project alignment through pedestrian access enhancements and first/last mile multi-modal options at the mobility hubs proposed for the Chinatown/State Park Station and the Dodger Stadium Station. Parking is not required to be analyzed under CEQA or the Transportation Assessment Guidelines (“TAG”). Nevertheless, the Parking Study was prepared to provide additional information to the community and decision makers about existing parking conditions and the proposed Project’s potential to effect parking conditions around the Alameda Station and Chinatown/State Park Station. As recommended in the Parking Study, the Project Sponsor will prepare, in collaboration with the City, and with robust feedback from community stakeholders, a parking management plan. The City would implement any on-street parking management strategies identified.

Comment PH16-3 There's no reason for a gondola. This is all about money. This is all about the gentleman who's proposing it because he wants to build beautiful buildings up there when the Dodgers aren't playing. So this has nothing to do with helping people, nothing for our community. It's all about money and wealth, and I'm very much against the gondola.

MS. KING: Thank you.

Response PH16-3 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project’s capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project’s capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response G, No Improper Project Segmentation: The Proposed Project Is Intended to Create a Transit Connection from Metro’s Union Station Transportation Hub via an Aerial Gondola System to the Dodger Stadium Property, for a discussion of how the proposed Project solely proposes an aerial gondola system. The proposed Project does not include other development, and neither the Project Sponsor nor any other applicant has applied for other development unrelated to the existing stadium uses on the Dodger Stadium property. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project’s features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities, including but not limited to, sustainability features and

open space enhancements, the Community Access Plan for fares, access to parks, mobility hubs, signage, utilization of local artists for site specific artwork at each station reflective of the unique neighborhood culture, design of each component of the proposed Project to complement and reflect the unique character of the surrounding neighborhood, the Business and Community Support Program during construction, and benefits to local businesses along the proposed Project alignment. The Project Sponsor would convene stakeholder groups to coordinate on issues related to proposed Project features. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the Draft EIR addresses environmental justice by considering the proposed Project's ability to reduce congestion and emissions from on-road vehicles in an area disproportionately burdened by pollution, and including an analysis of the proposed Project's potential impacts to the surrounding community, concluding that the proposed Project could result in air quality benefits for the surrounding communities.

Public Hearing Comment PH17 – Douglas Carstens, The California Endowment (TCE)

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH17

Comment PH17-1 MS. KING: All right. We are recording.

MR. CARSTENS: Hello. I am Douglas Carstens on behalf of the California Endowment. We've been reviewing the gondola EIR and have some initial comments with more to follow in writing. We oppose the gondola project. Metros should not be pursuing this private project at Frank McCourt's behest at all,...

Response PH17-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of this Final EIR, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project.

Comment PH17-2 ...and Metro should not be the lead agency because the city of Los Angeles is in a much better position and is more properly designated as the lead agency. These points will be expanded in our comment letter.

Response PH17-2 Refer to Topical Response D, Metro Is the Proper Lead Agency for the Proposed Project As the Region's Transportation Authority; Metro Named and Consulted With the Applicable Responsible Agencies, for discussion of why Metro is the proper lead agency for the proposed Project and the City's participation in the environmental review process as a CEQA responsible agency.

Comment PH17-3 First, regarding the EIR, the California Environmental Quality Act, it's a bill of rights for an environmental democracy. It ensures the twin goals of public participation and environmental protection are met, and EIR is the heart of CEQA. An EIR is not supposed to be a sales brochure or an infomercial for the project.

It's supposed to be a unbiased, full-disclosure document that advises the public and decision makers of the impacts of a project and how those impacts can and will be reduced. The draft EIR presented by ARTT and Metro falls woefully short of these legal requirements for full and accurate disclosure and is biased in favor of the project.

Response PH17-3 Consistent with CEQA's requirements, the Draft EIR provided sufficient information in order for the public and decision makers to meaningfully evaluate the proposed Project's potential environmental impacts. The Draft EIR includes 7,877 pages of detailed analysis from experts in their respective fields, intended to provide the public and decision makers the information that they need to meaningfully consider the proposed Project's potential environmental impacts, as well as a shorter executive

summary that explains the analysis and conclusions in clean and simple language. CEQA does not require extensive detail beyond that needed for evaluation and review of the proposed Project's environmental impact. (See, e.g., CEQA Guidelines § 15124.) In addition, consistent with the requirements of CEQA, Metro has and will independently review, evaluate, and exercise its judgment over the proposed Project's environmental review and EIR. The Draft EIR that was circulated reflects Metro's independent judgment. Accordingly, the Draft EIR more than adequately complies with CEQA's requirements for a Draft EIR. Refer to Responses PH17-4 through PH17-14 for further discussion regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR as an informational document. Refer to Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's opportunities for public testimony during the Draft EIR public review period. Refer to Appendix A, Scoping Report, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of outreach and community engagement during the Draft EIR scoping period.

Comment PH17-4 The aesthetic impact analysis is a good example of how, instead of meaningful and accurate depictions of what the gondola towers and stations will look like in context, the EIR preparers have chosen distortions and force perspective depictions that minimize the visual impact of the towers and stations in context. Instead of –

Response PH17-4 Refer to Section 3.01, Aesthetics, and Appendix C, Visual Impact Assessment, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the aesthetic impacts of the proposed Project, which would be less than significant. Key Observation Points (KOPs) critical or representative of the visual character of the area were identified within each Landscape Unit (LU) and utilized for before and after photorealistic and true to scale visual simulations and locations of sensitive viewers that potentially would be visually impacted by the proposed Project. KOPs within each LU were selected based on existing knowledge of important viewsheds and through consultation with responsible agencies. As discussed in Appendix H.1, Memo Regarding the Preparation of View Simulations, of the Final EIR, KOPs selected for simulation will appear larger and more distinct than visual elements further in the distance even though the foreground element may be of a smaller dimension, consistent with how pedestrians experience their surrounding environment. Further, visual simulations were created to reflect the proposed Project components within the existing landscape and, as such, include the existing landscape planting, buildings, and other visual elements such as open space resources, trees, and building frontages as they existed at the time the photos were taken. Refer to Appendix C, Visual Impact Assessment, for detailed discussion about the implementation and results of the visual simulation. Refer to Appendix H.1 for further discussion of how the view simulations were prepared in order to realistically illustrate what the proposed Project will look like in the surrounding context.

Comment PH17-5 MS. KING: It's been two minutes.

MR. CARSTENS: Okay. Thank you. Useful information, the EIR provides misleading depictions and half-truths. Information about whether the gondola cars will be used for advertising and billboards is not disclosed, though it's known advertising will be a major component of the project. The omission and misleading half-truths is a common theme of different types of analysis in the EIR. In fact, the gondola's entire financial plan, when -- is my time up?

Response PH17-5 Refer to Topical Response K, Signage and Lighting, for discussion of how the proposed Project's Sign Concept Plan, included in Appendix B of the Lighting Study, which is included in Appendix C, Visual Impact Assessment, of the Draft EIR, provides that across the entire proposed Project, including stations, the junction, towers, and cabins, the proposed Project is proposing static signage and digital signage. The digital signage would be limited to the Alameda Station and the Dodger Stadium Station. No digital signage is proposed on the exterior of the cabins. Signage proposed for the exterior of the cabins is static, non-illuminated naming rights signage. In addition to the naming rights signage, the proposed Project is proposing that two cabins be designated for the display of community programming graphics and that one cabin be designated for the display of artwork by local art collaborators. The proposed Project's proposed signage program will help to support wayfinding, transit connection, and funding for the proposed Project, and would reflect that the proposed Project provides access between the Dodger Stadium property, the surrounding communities, including Chinatown, Mission Junction, Elysian Park, and Solano Canyon, and the Los Angeles State Historic Park, to the regional transit system accessible at LAUS. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of this Final EIR, which provides detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project.

Comment PH17-6 It looks like you're --

MS. KING: Your time is up.

MR. CARSTENS: I just wonder, like can I make another set of comments or come back?

MS. KING: You can come back and restart your two minutes. Yeah.

MR. CARSTENS: Okay.

Response PH17-6 This comment is noted and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Comment PH17-7 MS. KING: And we are recording.

MR. CARSTENS: Hello. This is Douglas Carstens, and this is the second half of my testimony because it was apparently two minutes on the first half.

In fact, the gondola's entire financial plan, which the Metro board was promised would be made available before the end of September 2022, is missing altogether. The gondola's missing financing is critical to understanding how impacts identified in the EIR will be mitigated by the project proponent and how they will not be.

Since the proponent, Frank McCourt, and his company, McCourt Global, has only committed to funding about three percent of the entire project budget, the shortfalls in construction and operating revenues will need to be made up somewhere, and it is most likely that some, if not all, will come from public transit funding sources, better used for public projects. Mitigation of identified impacts will be expensive but will be critical to protect the neighborhoods and people living and working near the project route.

Response PH17-7 Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of this Final EIR, which provides detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response I, Use of Project Design Features and Plans in Mitigation Measures, for discussion of how CEQA does not require the proposed Project to provide a full accounting of how each mitigation measure will be funded.

Comment PH17-8 Traffic, air pollution, parking, noise, and recreation will all be impacted.

Response PH17-8 Traffic congestion is not required to be analyzed under CEQA in the Draft EIR following the implementation of Senate Bill 743, which designated "vehicle miles traveled" as the method for assessing transportation impacts on the environment for CEQA projects. Refer to Section 3.03, Air Quality, Section 3.08, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 3.17, Transportation, Appendix D, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the

proposed Project's ability to reduce vehicular travel, to improve air quality through reduced emissions, and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through reduced vehicular travel. Parking is not required to be analyzed under CEQA or the Transportation Assessment Guidelines ("TAG"). Nevertheless, the Parking Study was prepared to provide additional information to the community and decision makers about existing parking conditions and the proposed Project's potential to effect parking conditions around the Alameda Station and Chinatown/State Park Station. As recommended in the Parking Study, the Project Sponsor will prepare, in collaboration with the City, and with robust feedback from community stakeholders, a parking management plan. The City would implement any on-street parking management strategies identified. Refer to Section 3.13, Noise, and Appendix M, Noise and Vibration Technical Report, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the construction and operational noise impacts from the proposed Project. As detailed therein, construction related noise impacts would be significant and unavoidable even with implementation of mitigation. Operational noise impacts would be less than significant. Refer to Section 3.16, Parks and Recreational Facilities, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of how the proposed Project's impacts to parks and recreational facilities during construction and operation of the proposed Project would be less than significant.

Comment PH17-9 The noise section of the EIR identifies that there will be significant and so-called unavoidable impacts from construction equipment. This noise and vibration will affect the neighborhoods around El Pueblo and in Chinatown. The vibration will threaten the physical integrity of the El Grito Mural and the Avila Adobe.

Response PH17-9 Refer to Section 3.13, Noise, and Appendix M, Noise and Vibration Technical Report, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the construction noise impacts from the proposed Project. Construction noise impacts associated with the proposed Project were analyzed in the Draft EIR both for noise from on-site construction activities, meaning the noise from construction activities at each station, tower, and junction, and for off-site construction noise. Tables 3.13-17 and 3.13-18 on pages 3.13-35 to 3.13-45 of Section 3.13, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, show the locations where on-site construction noise impacts would occur during each phase of construction of the proposed Project, based on the L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide and FTA analysis methods. As detailed therein, on-site construction related noise impacts would be significant and unavoidable even with implementation of mitigation. Mitigation Measure NOI-A would be implemented during construction of the proposed Project, requiring a Construction Noise Management Plan to minimize construction-related noise impacts to off-site noise-sensitive receptors, which would include the construction noise barriers. As demonstrated on Table 3.13-21 and explained on pages 3.13-51 to 3.13-52 of Section 3.13, Noise and Vibration, of the Draft EIR, off-site construction traffic noise impacts would be less than significant during all phase of construction of the proposed Project.

Refer to Section 3.13 and Appendix M for discussion of the vibration impacts from construction of the proposed Project. Vibration impacts associated with the proposed Project were analyzed in the Draft EIR both for building damage and human annoyance. Table 3.13-28 on page 3.13-62 of the Draft EIR, show the location where on-site construction vibration impacts would occur during each phase of the construction of the proposed Project based on the FTA. As shown in Table 3.13-28 on page 3.13-62 of the Draft EIR, construction vibration velocities will not exceed applicable FTA structural damage criteria with implementation of mitigation at *El Grito* Mural or Avila Adobe. In addition, Mitigation Measures VIB-A (Vibration Monitoring) and VIB-B (Force-Adjustable Ground Compaction Devices) are designed to address potential building damage. As concluded in Table 3.13-28 on page 3.13-62 of the Draft EIR, with implementation of Mitigation Measures VIB-A and VIB-B during construction of the Alameda Station, vibration impacts related to building damage at the Avila Adobe, the Old Winery, and *El Grito* Mural, would be less than significant. Further, as demonstrated in Table 3.13-28 on page 3.13-62 of the Draft EIR, the proposed Project would result in significant and unavoidable vibration (human annoyance) impacts during construction of the proposed Project. In addition, as detailed on page 3.13-72 of the Draft EIR, relevant protective measures are also included in Section 3.05, Cultural Resources, with CUL-PDF-A through CUL-PDF-E, which require pre-construction surveys to document existing conditions at The Winery and *El Grito* Mural, post-construction inspections to document any construction-related damage, and retention of an experienced professional or professionals qualified to carry out the repairs within 12 months of completion of the proposed Project.

Comment PH17-10 These impacts can be avoided by denying the project altogether or choosing the environmentally-superior alternative which, in the EIR is called transportation systems management, what comes down to enhancement of the Dodger express buses system.

Response PH17-10 Refer to Topical Response H, The Draft EIR Considered an Appropriate Range of Alternatives and Design Options, for discussion of how the Transportation Systems Management Alternative for an enhanced Dodger Stadium Express is unlikely to achieve the same level of ridership as the proposed Project, and otherwise fails to meet most of the Project Objectives, which seek to achieve the proposed Project's underlying purpose of providing a permanent direct transit connection between LAUS and the Dodger Stadium property and improving connectivity for surrounding communities, including Chinatown, Mission Junction, Elysian Park, Solano Canyon, and the Los Angeles State Historic Park. Further, improving the connection between LAUS and Dodger Stadium via the proposed Project would provide the quickest, most frequent, and highest capacity transit connection for the greatest number of riders traveling to Dodger Stadium to have the most travel time competitive transit trips from more locations in the region.

Comment PH17-11 The California Endowment opposes Frank McCourt's gondola and the potential waste and gifting of tax-payer resources that it represents, including public land, such as allowing Alameda Street and at the State Historic Park. The implications of which –

Response PH17-11 Refer to Topical Response L for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of this Final EIR, which provides detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project.

Refer to Section 2.5, Proposed Project Alignment and Components, with supporting data provided in Appendix Q, Proposed Alignment Plan and Profile, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of how the proposed Project maximizes alignment along the public ROW and publicly owned property and minimizes aerial rights over private properties. As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, Section 3.16, Parks and Recreational Facilities, and Section 5.0, Other CEQA Considerations, of the Draft EIR, the Chinatown/State Park Station would have a footprint of 2,195 square feet in the Los Angeles State Historic Park (~.1% of the total 32-acre park), and the station canopy would have an overhang of 9,320 square feet over the park. The proposed Project alignment crosses over the westernmost edge of the Los Angeles State Historic Park, adjacent to the existing Metro L Line (Gold) and the associated overhead catenary system. The proposed Project's required aerial clearance would be located above approximately 59,470 square feet of the total -32-acre park, plus an Additional Separation Buffer. With the required clearances and the height at which the cabins would cross over the Los Angeles State Historic Park, the ability to use the vast majority of the Park for kite flying, special events (e.g., concerts, craft fairs, partnership events, 5K/10K runs, workshops, cultural festivals, and the farmers' market), and other passive recreational opportunities (e.g., picnicking, jogging, walking, and informal play) would not be affected by the proposed Project. Refer to Response S2-4 for additional discussion regarding the ability of uses to continue at the park. Refer to Topical Response M, Comparable Urban Aerial Transit Systems, discussing how, like the proposed Project, comparable aerial transit systems in cities around the world are integrated with their surrounding urban environments. In particular, comparable aerial transit systems in other locations demonstrate that such systems can operate safely, efficiently, and in concert with nearby residential and open space uses, including parks and other recreational facilities.

Comment PH17-12 MS. KING: Thank you.

MR. CARSTENS: Oh, is that time?

MS. KING: That's time.

MR. CARSTENS: Okay. And let me see --

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 10:54 a.m. and resumed at 10:55 a.m.)

MS. KING: And just your name again.

MR. CARSTENS: Okay. My name is Douglas Carstens, and I'm here on behalf of the California Endowment.

Response PH17-12 This comment is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Comment PH17-13 So the California Endowment opposes Frank McCourt's gondola and the potential waste and gifting of tax-payer resources that it represents, including public land such as allowing Alameda Street and at the State Historic Park, the implications of which the Environment Impact Report only partially discloses in more incomplete and misleading half-truths.

Response PH17-13 This comment is noted and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted. Refer to Response PH17-11 for a discussion of the Project Sponsor, funding and financing for the proposed Project, and how the proposed Project maximizes alignment along the public ROW and publicly owned property and minimizes aerial rights over private properties.

Comment PH17-14 Instead of promoting a private gondola to a private sport stadium, more like an amusement park ride than actual public transit, Metro should focus on enhancing actual public transit options with its limited resources and staff and board time.

Response PH17-14 Refer to Topical Response A, SB 44, for discussion of how the proposed Project is public transportation because it will be open to the general public for service at regular, scheduled operating times, operating daily to serve existing residents, workers, park users, and visitors to Los Angeles.

Refer to Topical Response H, The Draft EIR Considered an Appropriate Range of Alternatives and Design Options, for discussion of how improving the connection between LAUS and Dodger Stadium via the proposed Project would provide the quickest, most frequent, and highest capacity transit connection for the greatest number of riders traveling to Dodger Stadium to have the most travel time competitive transit trips from more locations in the region.

Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at LAUS, Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Dodger Stadium draws large regional crowds, with approximately 100 baseball games and other events each year, but there are no permanent transit connections to the venue. The vast majority of visitors drive their personal vehicles to access the venue. These vehicles create congestion on the surface streets leading up to and around Dodger Stadium, including Sunset Boulevard/Cesar E. Chavez from LAUS and throughout the surrounding communities. Given the capacity of the proposed Project's system, approximately 20 percent of the fans could take aerial transit connected to Metro's regional transit system. This would reduce vehicular congestion in and around Dodger Stadium, on neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways during game and special event days. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan.

Refer to Topical Response M, Comparable Urban Aerial Transit Systems, discussing how, like the proposed Project, comparable aerial transit systems in cities around the world are integrated with their surrounding urban environments. In particular, comparable aerial transit systems in other locations demonstrate that such systems can operate safely, efficiently, and in concert with nearby residential and open space uses, including parks and other recreational facilities.

Refer to Response PH17-11 for a discussion of how no public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project.

Comment PH17-15 We ask that you terminate the project review process immediately. If you do not terminate the project immediately, you, Metro, should transfer lead agency status to the city of Los Angeles to complete review and processing of the gondola project. Metro should not let itself be co-opted to serve the private interests of a billionaire, especially one who has bankrupted such a revered organization as the Los Angeles Dodgers. Stop the gondola now. Thank you.

MS. KING: Thank you very much.

Response PH17-15 This comment indicating opposition to the Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response D, Metro Is the Proper Lead Agency for the Proposed Project As the Region's Transportation Authority; Metro Named and Consulted With the Applicable Responsible Agencies, for discussion of why Metro is the proper lead agency for the proposed Project and the City's participation in the environmental review process as

a CEQA responsible agency. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project.

Public Hearing Comment PH18 – Kenneth Chan

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH18

Comment PH18-1 MS. KING: We're recording. If you could just state your name and spell it before you begin.

MR. CHAN: Yeah. Kenneth Chan. K-E-N-N-E-T-H. Last name, C-H-A-N.

MS. KING: Thanks. Go ahead.

MR. CHAN: Yeah. Coming out. I think I'm against this project. There's not enough analysis on housing and gentrification from what we've seen. Every time Metro comes in here and builds one of these projects, it encourages market-rate development and displaces longtime tenants.

Response PH18-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not exacerbate gentrification or result in displacement of residents in the surrounding neighborhoods and is consistent with Metro's considerations regarding gentrification and displacement.

Comment PH18-2 In addition, this is really treating our neighborhood like a playground. It is not a good use of funds. You know, we still have some of the worst-maintained sidewalks, streets in our neighborhood. We have a huge demand and need for affordable housing in our neighborhood. This will not resolve Chinatown's transportation issues. It should not take me two buses to get to downtown.

Response PH18-2 Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing, and Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not displace housing, prevent planned housing, or preclude development of uses including housing, grocery stores, and/or healthcare facilities in the surrounding communities. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of how the proposed Project would include several sustainability features and open space enhancements, including pedestrian enhancements and drought tolerant landscaping, open space

enhancements, including at the Alameda Triangle, the Los Angeles State Historic Park, and along the pedestrian pathway connecting Dodger Stadium Station and Dodger Stadium, and improved access to Los Angeles State Historic Park and Elysian Park. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at LAUS, Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Dodger Stadium draws large regional crowds, with approximately 100 baseball games and other events each year, but there are no permanent transit connections to the venue. The vast majority of visitors drive their personal vehicles to access the venue. These vehicles create congestion on the surface streets leading up to and around Dodger Stadium, including Sunset Boulevard/Cesar E. Chavez from LAUS and throughout the surrounding communities. Given the capacity of the proposed Project's system, approximately 20 percent of the fans could take aerial transit connected to Metro's regional transit system. This would reduce vehicular congestion in and around Dodger Stadium, on neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways during game and special event days. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan.

Comment PH18-3 Overall, I think this project is a waste of funds, and the show that's been put on today completely ignores the community. And yeah. I think that building this project would be a huge waste of funds and a huge mistake, and if folks continue to proceed with this and ignore the voices of the community, they're going to meet some real resistance. And I think it'll be a waste of time for everybody.

So again, you know, we have a real need for affordable housing and a real need for real transit solutions, not some playground BS that's being funded by Frank McCourt.

MS. KING: Thank you very much.

PARTICIPANT: All right. Thank you.

Response PH18-3 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, Appendix A, Public

Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, Appendix A, Scoping Report, of the Draft EIR, and Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project team's outreach efforts to neighborhoods along the proposed Project alignment and the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefit to the surrounding community. Metro sought to engage the community in each stage of the environmental review process. Input from the public, including local community stakeholders, led directly to the selection of the proposed Project alignment, including an intermediate station in Chinatown (the Chinatown/State Park Station), as well as to the redesign of the proposed Project stations and junction and additional pedestrian enhancements including hardscape and landscape improvements. Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing, and Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not displace housing, prevent planned housing, or preclude development of uses including housing, grocery stores, and/or healthcare facilities in the surrounding communities. Refer to Topical Response A, SB 44, for discussion of how the proposed Project is public transportation because it will be open to the general public for service at regular, scheduled operating times, operating daily to serve existing residents, workers, park users, and visitors to Los Angeles. Refer to Section 2.1, Overview of the Project, of the Draft EIR, discussing how the proposed Project would operate daily to serve existing residents, workers, park users, and visitors to Los Angeles. As discussed on page 2-42, in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the proposed Project would provide service to all pre-season, regular season, and post-season Los Angeles Dodger games and any special events (e.g., concerts, the Los Angeles Marathon) at the Dodger Stadium property. The proposed Project would also provide service to events at the Los Angeles State Historic Park. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project.

Public Hearing Comment PH19 – Jonathan Berman

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH19

Comment PH19-1 PARTICIPANT: State and spell your name

MS. KING: All right.

MR. BERMAN: Does the two minutes include my name-spelling?

PARTICIPANT: No. I'm going to start it right after you finish.

MS. KING: We're recording now, so.

MR. BERMAN: I have a very long name. Ready?

MS. KING: Yes.

MR. BERMAN: Jonathan Berman. J-O-N-A-T-H-A-N, B-E-R-M-A-N.

Response PH19-1 This comment is noted and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Comment PH19-2 MR. BERMAN: Now? I am currently against this project for a number of reasons. First of all, it feels like a massive boondoggle of the ownership of the area of Dodger Stadium. My understanding of it is Frank McCourt and related people, who's already bankrupted the Dodgers and other professional teams, and that the end game of all of this is the development of those parking areas in Dodger Stadium as some kind of mall or LA live type of situation. So not being transparent about what that is. Furthermore -- let me know if I'm going too fast.

MS. KING: Okay.

Response PH19-2 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response G, No Improper Project Segmentation: The Proposed Project Is Intended to Create a Transit Connection from Metro's Union Station Transportation Hub via an Aerial Gondola System to the Dodger Stadium Property, for a discussion of how the proposed Project solely proposes an aerial gondola system. The proposed Project does not include other development, and neither the Project Sponsor nor any other

applicant has applied for other development unrelated to the existing stadium uses on the Dodger Stadium property.

Comment PH19-3 MR. BERMAN: Furthermore, this particular event here is incredible biased. You have 20 booths manned by people, persons, by people who are in the employ of the people who want to move this forward. And the results seem pretty ordain. It's always no significant impact.

Response PH19-3 Refer to Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's public outreach and opportunity for public testimony during the Draft EIR public review period. Refer to Appendix A, Scoping Report, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of outreach and community engagement during the Draft EIR scoping period. Eight public meetings were held immediately preceding, during, and immediately following, the Draft EIR public review period, with four held in-person in the Project area at Los Angeles Union Station and Cathedral High School, and four held virtually via Zoom webinar. The format of the in-person public meetings immediately preceding and during the Draft EIR public review period was an Open House, consistent with standard Metro practice, where attendees could learn more about the proposed Project and the key analyses and conclusions of the Draft EIR, and also a public comment opportunity. Twelve stations were set up throughout the venue, with ten stations focused on specific subject matter areas of the Draft EIR. Attendees could walk around to each station and ask questions to subject-matter experts about the proposed Project. Each station had large, printed boards summarizing the subject matter of that station, including: the Project Description, Aesthetics, Air Quality, GHG, and Energy, Cultural (Archaeology and Historical Resources), Parks and Recreation, Noise, Transportation, and Parking. Each station also included printed materials that attendees could review and/or take with them, including fact sheets in English, Spanish, and Chinese (Simplified) and printed copies of the presentation from the virtual public hearing in English, Spanish, Chinese (Simplified) and Chinese (Traditional). A hard copy of the Draft EIR was also available at the Summary of Impacts station for attendees to review. The meeting was staffed by Metro and AECOM staff, experts on subject matter areas including Transportation and Parking; Archaeology; Historical Resources; Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas, and Energy; Ropeway Engineering; Noise; and Aesthetics, and the Project team, who answered questions from attendees on the Draft EIR key analyses and conclusion. During the two in-person public meetings that were public hearings, comments could be submitted either in writing on forms provided by Metro, or verbally to the court reporters who had set up at a "comment station" in the venue. Written comment forms provided instructions on how to comment on the Draft EIR in English, Spanish, and Chinese (Simplified). Interpretation was provided in English, Spanish, Mandarin, and Cantonese during the eight public meetings, with interpretation provided in Taishanese during the final two public meetings.

Comment PH19-4 Crowd control. You're going to have, for the games, 10 -- are we out of time? Are we going to have like 10,000 more people getting out of the stadium at the same time getting into these gondolas? That's going to be a special show of consternation. So yeah.

Response PH19-4 Refer to Topical Response B, Ridership Model; Queueing at Stations and Pre-game and Post-game Transportation, for discussion of how post-game queues at Dodger Stadium were estimated based on assumptions about the departure patterns and estimates of walk times from the various seating areas within the stadium. Those seated the furthest away from the Dodger Stadium Station would take more time to arrive at the Station, much like how it is currently for passengers riding the Dodger Stadium Express. In addition, passengers who would rather not join the line immediately to board the proposed Project in the post-game period could visit some of the entertainment amenities at the stadium, including at the Centerfield Plaza. The post-game/event queue for the proposed Project would be constantly moving as cabins would depart every 23 seconds, in contrast to the existing Dodger Stadium Express, which has much longer gaps in bus departures (from 3 to 19 minutes spacing between bus departures based on 2023 season observations further described below). The comment incorrectly uses “queue” to refer to the total service time needed to transport riders from Dodger Stadium post-game. Actual riders would be waiting in the queue for shorter time periods. In order to quantify the existing service time needed to transport Dodger Stadium Express riders, four post-game time periods were observed during the 2023 season. These games were selected to reflect the mix of game times, days and opponents. As noted below, the service time from the first bus departure to the last bus departure was nearly 2 hours, with the last bus departing up to 90 minutes after the end of the game. The amount of time between the end of each game and the departure of the last bus varied, with the June 15th and June 16th games both going into extra innings. Additionally, the June 16 game had a post-game drone show. While the Dodger Stadium Express has the capacity to carry approximately 1/5th of the riders of the proposed Project, its service time needed to load all riders is equivalent to that of the proposed Project in 2042, and longer than the needed service time for the proposed Project’s 2026 opening year ridership estimate.

- Sunday, June 4, 2023 (Yankees)—1 hour 50-minute service time; 1 hour 30 minutes post-game
- Thursday June 15, 2023 (White Sox) —1 hour 54-minute service time; 49 minutes post-game (game ended in 11th inning)
- Friday, June 16, 2023 (Giants) —2-hour 27-minute service time; 52 minutes post-game (game ended in 11th inning)
- Saturday, June 24, 2023 (Astros) —1 hour 15 minutes service time; 1 hour 15 minutes post-game

Comment PH19-5 My main -- also the environmental review. The idea that there are 10,000 parking spots in Chinatown is laughable at best given that most of these, many of these properties are being redeveloped as commercial or residential properties, some of the lots close at night.

Response PH19-5 Parking is not required to be analyzed under CEQA or the Transportation Assessment Guidelines (“TAG”). Nevertheless, the Parking Study was prepared to provide additional information to the community and decision makers about existing parking conditions and the proposed Project’s potential to effect parking conditions around the Alameda Station and Chinatown/State Park Station. As recommended in the Parking Study, the Project Sponsor will prepare, in collaboration with the City, and with robust feedback from community stakeholders, a parking management plan. The City would implement any on-street parking management strategies identified.

Comment PH19-6 So I just think it's not that well thought out. I mean the ultimate thing is that this funding that will ultimately come out of taxpayers' dollars should go towards homeless, helping get people off the streets, mentally-ill people and other people who are living on the streets, rather than putting billions towards a project that's not going to happen in the four --that this will come out in four years is insane. That's not going to happen.

PARTICIPANT: Thank you.

MS. KING: Thank you.

Response PH19-6 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project’s capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project’s capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing, and Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not displace housing, prevent planned housing, or preclude development of uses including housing, grocery stores, and/or healthcare facilities in the surrounding communities.

Public Hearing Comment PH20 – Baldomero Capiz

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH20

Comment PH20-1 MS. KING: So we're recording now, and you can just start by stating his name and spelling.

MR. CAPIZ (Speaking through translator): My name is Baldomero Capiz. B-A-L-D-O-M-E-R-O. I am the president of the organization National Union of Ex Berceros. As a community leader, it is our responsibility to ensure that our taxes are not used for the benefit of third parties.

Response PH20-1 This comment is noted and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project.

Comment PH20-2 The gondola project is nothing more than an attraction, which has nothing to do with the protection of the environment. Metro already has a bus system which takes fans to the Dodger Stadium, and it is free. This project will only take advantage of our taxes for the benefit of a person who wants to make him or herself more rich.

Response PH20-2 Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at LAUS, Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Dodger Stadium draws large regional crowds, with approximately 100 baseball games and other events each year, but there are no permanent transit connections to the venue. The vast majority of visitors drive their personal vehicles to access the venue. These vehicles create congestion on the surface streets leading up to and around Dodger Stadium, including Sunset Boulevard/Cesar E. Chavez from LAUS and throughout the surrounding communities. Given the capacity of the proposed Project's system, approximately 20 percent of the fans could take aerial transit connected to Metro's regional transit system. This would reduce vehicular congestion in and around Dodger Stadium, on neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways during game and special event days. The proposed

Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan. Refer to Topical Response H, The Draft EIR Considered an Appropriate Range of Alternatives and Design Options and Section 4.0, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR, for a discussion of how the Transportation Systems Management Alternative for an enhanced Dodger Stadium Express is unlikely to achieve the same level of ridership as the proposed Project, and otherwise fails to meet most of the Project Objectives which seek to achieve the proposed Project's underlying purpose of providing a permanent direct transit connection between LAUS and the Dodger Stadium property and improving connectivity for surrounding communities, including Chinatown, Mission Junction, Elysian Park, Solano Canyon, and the Los Angeles State Historic Park. Improving the connection between LAUS and Dodger Stadium via the proposed Project would provide the quickest, most frequent, and highest capacity transit connection for the greatest number of riders traveling to Dodger Stadium to have the most travel time competitive transit trips from more locations in the region. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project.

Comment PH20-3 The gondola will only displace many residents in Chinatown, just as Latino residents were displaced from the lands where they now are living in Dodger Stadium -- where Dodger Stadium is now located, rather. Correction.

We oppose the gondola in honor of people who are known as landless, including the Ex Barceros. We robustly oppose that anyone with personal interests would construct an aerial transport.

MR. CAPIZ: That's it.

MS. KING: Great. Thank you.

Response PH20-3 Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not displace any housing. Refer to Section 5.0, Corrections and Additions, of this Final EIR for a discussion of Chavez Ravine. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the proposed Project would not displace businesses and represents

an opportunity for additional visitors along the proposed Project alignment, creating economic opportunities for local businesses, including shops and restaurants, through potential partnerships that drive customers to businesses along the alignment, which, consequently, adds revenues to these small businesses in the communities the proposed Project hopes to serve. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of how during construction, the Project Sponsor would create a Business and Community Support Program to assist local businesses affected by proposed Project construction activities. The proposed Project would provide numerous benefits to local businesses in El Pueblo, Chinatown, and other areas along the proposed Project alignment, including through potential partnerships with these businesses as well as by providing an accessible and affordable mobility option for employees and area residents. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project.

Public Hearing Comment PH21 – Maria Elena Padino

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH21

Comment PH21-1 MS. KING: Okay. Name and spelling, please.

MS. PADINO (Speaking through translator): My name is Maria Elena Padino. M --or sorry. Correction. M-A-R-I-A, E-L-E-N-A, P-A-D-I-N-O.

MS. KING: She can begin.

MS. PADINO: I am a member of the organization Anahuak. Our organization has fought to be able to have more green spaces and parks so that our children are able to play. For many years, we have fought for our well-being, the well-being of our families, rather, and for better recreational opportunities for our community.

Response PH21-1 This comment is noted and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Comment PH21-2 We do not want people with money, with personal interests to build an air highway above our State Park because it is abusing the privacy of people by having a gondola that would go over the homes of these people. Doesn't the privacy of these people count?

Response PH21-2 Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project. As discussed in Sections 3.01, Aesthetics, 3.04, Biological Resources, 3.05, Cultural Resources, 3.06, Energy, 3.07, Geology and Soils, 3.09, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, 3.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, 3.11, Land Use and Planning, 3.13, Noise, 3.15, Public Services, 3.16, Parks and Recreational Facilities, 3.17, Transportation, 3.18, Tribal Cultural Resources, 3.19, Utilities and Service Systems, 3.20, Wildfire, and 5.0, Other CEQA Considerations, the proposed Project would have less than significant operational impacts, including to Los Angeles State Historic Park. Refer to Topical Response M, Comparable Urban Aerial Transit Systems, discussing how, like the proposed Project, comparable aerial transit systems in cities around the world are integrated with their surrounding urban environments. In particular, comparable aerial transit systems in other locations demonstrate that such systems can operate safely, efficiently, and in concert with nearby residential and open space uses, including parks and other recreational facilities. The proposed Project would be located in a densely populated, urban environment surrounded by a variety of

commercial, industrial, and residential development types. In this type of environment, it is common for public transportation, such as Metro’s light rail, to be located adjacent to residential uses and modern aerial transit systems in other cities, including Portland, Oregon and New York City, operate adjacent to residential uses. Nevertheless, as discussed in Topical Response J, Gondola Design and Operations and Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, cabin windows can be equipped with privacy glass that can become opaque while adjacent to sensitive views, and the proposed Project would work with stakeholders adjacent to the proposed Project alignment to identify locations where the use of privacy glass would be warranted. Considerations as to the locations along the proposed Project alignment where the privacy glass could be activated include the subject adjacent sensitive views and the vertical and horizontal distance between the proposed Project cabins and the adjacent sensitive views.

Comment PH21-3 We ask for you to listen to us and for you to reject this project which will use our federal funds and our taxes. We oppose this gondola. Our communities have already demonstrated our opposition, and now it corresponds to you all to say no to this gondola. Thank you so much.

Response PH21-3 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project’s capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project’s capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, Appendix A, Scoping Report, of the Draft EIR, and Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project team’s outreach efforts to neighborhoods along the proposed Project alignment and the proposed Project’s features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities. Metro sought to engage with stakeholders in neighborhoods along the proposed Project alignment in each stage of the environmental review process. Input from the public, including local community stakeholders, led directly to the selection of the proposed Project alignment, including an intermediate station in Chinatown (the Chinatown/State Park Station), as well as the redesign of the proposed Project stations and junction and additional pedestrian enhancements including hardscape and landscape improvements.

Public Hearing Comment PH22 – Disraely Butler

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH22

Comment PH22-1 MS. KING: We are recording. If you could please state and spell your name.

MR. BUTLER: My name is Disraely Butler. D as in David, I-S-R-A-E-L-Y. Butler the way it sounds.

MS. KING: Got you. And you can begin.

MR. BUTLER: All right. And do I need to state my case, honey?

MS. KING: Yes, please.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. Wonderful project. Of course, our Founding Fathers would be so proud of what we're doing here and what you guys are doing. And, of course, the great Nubian Pharaohs.

Response PH22-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment PH22-2 My only concern is the noise factor. LAPD needs to relocate their heliports. They're flying too low, it's too noisy, and because of the Kobe Bryant incident, there is a situation that could be very dangerous, you know, with some mechanical failures.

Response PH22-2 The Draft EIR addresses potential airport hazards in Section 3.09, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, with supporting data provided in Appendix O, Airspace Analysis Technical Memo. The Draft EIR concludes that the proposed Project alignment is not within two miles of a “public use airport” as that term is defined under CEQA. Refer to Draft EIR Appendix O, Airspace Analysis Technical Memo. That analysis, based on FAA analysis standards, concludes with substantial evidence that construction and operation of the proposed Project is clear of the airspace associated with the existing heliports in the proposed Project's vicinity. In addition, refer to Appendix I, Firefighting Helicopter Response Memo, of this Final EIR, for discussion of how helicopter flight paths would not be impeded as a result of the proposed Project. Refer to Section 3.13, Noise, and Appendix M, Noise and Vibration Technical Report, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the operational noise impacts from the proposed Project, which would be less than significant.

Comment PH22-3 The other situation, there needs to be more regulation of the actual train horn industry. You can't always have everything on 16 when you can turn it down to 8 and 7 and still have the same results. What's happening in our communities? People are getting vertical, the rooms are spinning around, blood pressure levels are going up, and all the other complicates related to frequencies. So those can be taken care of, I think everything else will take care of itself.

MS. KING: Great.

MR. BUTLER: See? I made it short.

MS. KING: Look at that. Thank you very much. Appreciate you.

Response PH22-3 Refer to Response PH22-2 for a discussion of how the proposed Project's operational noise impacts would be less than significant.

Public Hearing Comment PH23 – Tany Ling

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH23

Comment PH23-1 MS. KING: All right. So just your name and the spelling, first, please?

MS. T. LING: My name's Tany Ling. T-A-N-Y, L-I-N-G.

MS. KING: Perfect. And you can begin.

MS. T. LING: Okay. I'm a resident of Chinatown. I am against this project. I think it's a giveaway to a billionaire, and I think Metro should listen very closely to the people who are raising alarms about this. Why are we constantly giving away the city to billionaires? Who are they really serving because it's not really the people? It's usually -- and the bottom line is, it's all about money, okay?

So I think the project is masquerading as a, it's masquerading as a public transit project for the greater good, but it's really a means for a billionaire to use public money to take a step forward towards achieving his planned huge development project at Dodger Stadium and all the while promising that it won't cost taxpayers money.

Response PH23-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project. Refer to Appendix A, Scoping Report, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of outreach and community engagement during the Draft EIR scoping period. Metro sought to engage the community in each stage of the environmental review process. Metro engaged the public, including local community stakeholders, as well as from agencies, organizations, and interested parties, in decision making for the proposed Project beginning with the public scoping period for the Draft EIR in October 2020 to receive public comment on the proposed Project's scope of environmental review under CEQA. In June 2021, the Project Sponsor conducted two virtual public outreach meetings. The public input during this period led directly to changes to the proposed Project to incorporate public feedback, including changes to the proposed Project alignment to include the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station, redesign of the proposed Project stations and junction and additional pedestrian enhancements including hardscape and landscape improvements. Refer to Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, for discussion of outreach and community engagement during the Draft EIR public review period and community engagement efforts during the preparation of the Final EIR. Refer to Topical Response L, Project

Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of this Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. Operation and maintenance costs are proposed to be fully funded out of Project revenues. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response G, No Improper Project Segmentation: The Proposed Project Is Intended to Create a Transit Connection from Metro's Union Station Transportation Hub via an Aerial Gondola System to the Dodger Stadium Property for a discussion of how the proposed Project solely proposes an aerial gondola system. The proposed Project does not include other development, and neither the Project Sponsor nor any other applicant has applied for other development unrelated to the existing stadium uses on the Dodger Stadium property.

Comment PH23-2 But he has already transferred the operation of this project to a nonprofit. And guess what? Nonprofits can apply for federal and state funding, which is paid for by taxpayers.

Response PH23-2 This comment is noted and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted. Refer to Response PH23-1 for detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding.

Comment PH23-3 There's been studies done to show that this will not improve traffic in the area. It will not improve air quality. It will actually, could possibly bring more cars into the area.

Response PH23-3 The commenter may be referring to the UCLA Mobility Lab Study. Refer to Topical Response O, Response to UCLA Mobility Lab Study, for detailed responses to the items in the Mobility Lab Study. The Mobility Lab Study was not submitted by its authors at the Mobility Lab as a comment on the proposed Project's Draft EIR, and does not appear to have been prepared for that purpose. Refer to Section 3.03, Air Quality, Section 3.08, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 3.17, Transportation, Appendix D, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's ability to reduce vehicular travel, to improve air quality through reduced emissions, and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through reduced vehicular travel.

Comment PH23-4 It's going to be traveling not near people's homes but over people's homes and not 400 feet in the air but possibly as low as 40 feet in the air above people's heads, above people's roofs.

Response PH23-4 As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the proposed Project alignment was chosen as it maximizes alignment over the public ROW and publicly

owned property and minimizes aerial rights over private properties, taking into account existing and future adjacent land uses. As discussed in Appendix Q, Proposed Alignment Plan and Profile, of the Draft EIR, the proposed Project requires certain aerial rights over private property located at 455 Savoy Street and 451 Savoy Street. The proposed Project's approximate cable height over the 455 Savoy Street property and the 451 Savoy Street property is approximately 70 feet and the bottom of the cabin height over the 455 Savoy Street and the 451 Savoy Street property is approximately 49 feet.

Comment PH23-5 I am against this project also because it's going to completely change the character of the State Park. Cutting down trees, putting these tall imposing towers and stations in the State Park that the community worked so hard to bring to life and to have this beautiful, open space for everybody to enjoy. It can't happen. Let's not let it happen.

Response PH23-5 As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, Section 3.16, Parks and Recreational Facilities, and Section 5.0, Other CEQA Considerations, of the Draft EIR, the Chinatown/State Park Station would have a footprint of 2,195 square feet in the Los Angeles State Historic Park (~.1% of the total 32-acre park), and the station canopy would have an overhang of 9,320 square feet over the park. The proposed Project alignment crosses over the westernmost edge of the Los Angeles State Historic Park, adjacent to the existing Metro L Line (Gold) and the associated overhead catenary system. The proposed Project's required aerial clearance would be located above approximately 59,470 square feet of the total 32-acre park, plus an Additional Separation Buffer. With the required clearances and the height at which the cabins would cross over the Los Angeles State Historic Park, the ability to use the vast majority of the Park for kite flying, special events (e.g., concerts, craft fairs, partnership events, 5K/10K runs, workshops, cultural festivals, and the farmers' market), and other passive recreational opportunities (e.g., picnicking, jogging, walking, and informal play) would not be affected by the proposed Project. Refer to Response S2-4 for additional discussion regarding the ability of uses to continue at the park. The proposed Project would implement BIO-PDF-F and adhere to ordinances and requirements applicable to tree replacement, based on the corresponding jurisdiction of the property where each tree is located. As discussed on page 3.4-23, in Section 3.04, Biological Resources, of the Draft EIR, and in Appendix K.1, Updated Tree Report, and in Appendix G, Supplemental Biological Resources Report, of this Final EIR, the removal of the 75 trees within Los Angeles State Historic Park would require a permit or approval from the California Department of Parks and Recreation, and all existing trees required to be removed on California Department of Parks and Recreation property would be replaced at a minimum 1:1 ratio within the Park or as agreed to as part of the approvals required for implementation of the proposed Project from the Department. In addition, 6 trees within the public ROW located near the Los Angeles State Historic Park would be replaced at a ratio specified by the Urban Forestry Division, typically, at a 2:1 ratio.

Public Hearing Comment PH24 - Phyllis Ling

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH24

Comment PH24-1 MS. KING: All right. And your name?

MS. P. LING: Phyllis Ling.

MS. KING: And could you spell that please?

MS. P. LING: P-H-Y-L-L-I-S, L-I-N-G.

MS. KING: Great. And please.

Ms. P. LING: Yeah. I think with this draft Environmental Impact Report, I think something that needs to be said is that there's still no funding plan and that all of these impacts and mitigations proposed are meaningless if there isn't sufficient finding for this project.

The fact that Metro is doing this draft EIR before there is any funding plan is a huge disrespect to our communities. It's wasting our time. It's putting residents like me in the position of having to spend thousands of dollars on consultants and thousands of hours reading an 8,000 plus page draft Environmental Impact Report,

Response PH24-1 Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of this Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response I, Use of Project Design Features and Plans in Mitigation Measures, for discussion of how CEQA does not require the proposed Project to provide a full accounting of how each mitigation measure will be funded. The Draft EIR provided sufficient information in order for the public and decision makers to meaningfully evaluate the proposed Project's potential environmental impacts.

Comment PH24-2 It costs a lot of money to operate and maintain systems like this, and it would run over our homes and public spaces. A system that isn't even properly maintained will be noisy and unsafe and fall into despair, be gratified over, and be a visual blight.

Response PH24-2 As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the proposed Project would require routine maintenance that would be performed by the system operator. The overall system would be observed on a daily basis as part of the startup routine. As discussed in Section 3.13, Noise, and Appendix M, Noise and Vibration Technical Report, of the Draft EIR, the proposed Project technology is quiet, and noise impacts from operation of the proposed Project would be less than significant. Refer to Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR and Topical Response J, Gondola

Design and Operations, of the Final EIR for discussion of the safety features of the proposed Project and how aerial transit systems such as the proposed Project represent one of the safest modes of transportation relative to other forms of transit. Refer also to Response P702-36 regarding vandalism. Refer to Topical Response M, Comparable Urban Aerial Transit Systems, discussing how, like the proposed Project, comparable aerial transit systems in cities around the world are integrated with their surrounding urban environments. In particular, comparable aerial transit systems in other locations demonstrate that such systems can operate safely, efficiently, and in concert with nearby residential and open space uses, including parks and other recreational facilities.

Comment PH24-3 Crowd control is a huge control. It's largely ignored or dismissed in this draft EIR. People can die from crushing injuries and stampedes. It's a huge issue. You're trying to squeeze 40 people into each cabin. After events, a lot of people will be drunk. There's very little consideration for the impacts that will have, the liabilities that will impose on the city if it takes responsibility for this system.

I think you have to consider what happened after the Elton John concert in the parking lot. People bumping into each other in crowded spaces, bumping into cars, bumping. That's a huge issue. A lot of fights start that way, especially at Dodger Stadium.

Response PH24-3 Refer to Topical Response B, Ridership Model; Queueing at Stations and Pre-game and Post-game Transportation, for discussion of the proposed Project's ridership model which is based on extensive data sources and assumptions validated by data, and the management of queueing at stations, and pre-game and post-game transportation. Refer to Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, for a discussion of the proposed Project's queueing and ticketing/fare checking, including how ticketing for the proposed Project would use either a chip-based card system or electronic ticketing, where riders would pre-purchase their ticket prior to entering the boarding platform and fares would be checked using a card reader/scanner.

Comment PH24-4 And crowd control at the stations is a big issue also. There's very little explanation for how the lines will be spread out. We can't expect a magical ticketing system, reservation system to spread people out evenly over a two-hour period before and after games. And how are people going to arrive on time for a gondola reservation if they're supposedly taking transit to the gondola stations? And who will be able to reserve these tickets anyway? Is this going to be equitable or will VIPs and certain members of clubs have early access to reserve tickets? I think I've used up my time, but can I keep going?

PARTICIPANT: Go ahead.

Response PH24-4 Refer to Response PH24-3 for discussion of the proposed Project’s queueing and ticketing/fare checking. Refer to Response P702-6 for discussion of the proposed Project’s time ticket reservation system, the purpose of which would be to reduce queue lengths and waiting times for riders waiting to board the proposed Project at the Alameda Station or the Chinatown/State Park Station before a large game or event at Dodger Stadium by managing arrival times. Potential elements of such a system could include: the timed arrival reservations would be free; the reservation system would be online; for those without online access, kiosks could be provided at LAUS, the Chinatown/State Park Station, and/or at Dodger Stadium; reservations would be issued for 30-minute arrival periods and the user would pick a time and the boarding station; the timed ticket reservations would be transferable similar to how game and event tickets themselves are transferable; the timed tickets would be checked by proposed Project staff at the entrance to the line; those who arrive earlier than their arrival window would be fed into the boarding line when possible in advance of their arrival window or wait until their arrival window; those who arrive later than their arrival window would be held and fed into the boarding line when possible; incentives could potentially be offered to encourage choice of earlier windows; and there would be no exclusive access to preferred arrival windows to particular groups of people. The timed ticket reservation system would likely not be used post-game. The system will be more fully developed prior to proposed Project operations.

Comment PH24-5 MS P. LING: I think visual impacts are a big issue as well. You have these leaning towers that don’t look very stable or balanced. They don’t have the sense of goof Fung Shui. I don’t know if that’s going to be addressed in the final EIR. Seems that it would be important to consider Fung Shui in Chinatown.

Response PH24-5 Refer to Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the location and design of the Alameda Tower, Alpine Tower, and Stadium Tower. Refer to Appendix F, Memo on Structural Engineering, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the structural design of the proposed Project’s towers. As discussed therein, the towers would “meet the rigorous safety standards of applicable standards, requirements, and building codes, including all mandated standards addressing environmental factors such as wind and seismic effects and gravity forces, including all impacts from the height and tilt of the structures, to ensure structural integrity and safety.” Refer to Section 3.01, Aesthetics, and Appendix C, Visual Impact Assessment, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the aesthetic impacts of the proposed Project’s towers, which would be less than significant, and for visual simulations of the proposed Project’s towers. The Alameda Tower’s modern architectural style is evident and would complement the buildings within The California Endowment. The neutral light-tone gray color scheme of Alameda Tower was designed for consistency with the surrounding urban environment, and to not distract from visually distinct structures such as the United States Post Office Terminal Annex building. Alpine Tower would consist of a neutral light-tone gray color scheme that would provide visual lightness

to the form and their design would complement the existing buildings in this area, as well as not distract from the visually distinct Chinese architecture within this area. Stadium Tower would consist of an architectural design that provides visual lightness to the form to complement the existing buildings in this area. In addition, the neutral light-tone gray colors and material finishes of the Stadium Tower were selected to complement the surrounding urban environment, and to not distract from existing visually distinct structures, such as Dodger Stadium. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, discussing how the proposed Project's design takes cues from the immediate neighborhood culture, including how each component of the proposed Project would be designed to complement and reflect the unique character of the surrounding area.

Comment PH24-6 And then visual blight of advertising all over the gondola cabins, stations, and towers. This is going to be owned by a private company. Are there any limits to what they can advertise? Personally, I wouldn't want to see advertisements for liquor, alcohol, online gambling, cannabis, campaign and political ads, ads for authoritarian governments' propaganda, PR during the Olympics constantly streaming over my neighborhood. Those are just a few things.

And would we have any say as a community as to what messages are constantly being streamed over our neighborhood? The visual impact is that this would turn our neighborhood into an advertising district and Disneyland type of amusement park. It would cause destructive driving, it would hurt seniors, pedestrians, and cyclists. All right. Thank you.

MS. KING: Thank you. Appreciate it.

Response PH24-6 Refer to Topical Response K, Signage and Lighting, for discussion of the proposed Project's signage and lighting, with additional technical detail and information provided in the Lighting Study, which is included in Appendix C, Visual Impact Assessment, of the Draft EIR. The proposed Project's Sign Concept Plan included in Appendix B of the Lighting Study, which is included in Appendix C, Visual Impact Assessment, of the Draft EIR, provides that across the entire proposed Project, including stations, the junction, towers, and cabins, the proposed Project is proposing static signage and digital signage. The digital signage would be limited to the Alameda Station and the Dodger Stadium Station. No digital signage is proposed on the exterior of the cabins. Signage proposed for the exterior of the cabins is static non-illuminated naming rights signage. In addition to the naming rights signage, the proposed Project is proposing that two cabins be designated for the display of community programming graphics and that one cabin be designated for the display of artwork by local art collaborators. Further, there is existing signage in the proposed Project area, and the proposed Project signage would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views. Instead, the proposed Project's design ensures that signage would enhance the public realm. Specifically, signage for the proposed Project would be architecturally integrated into the design of the ART

system, including its stations, the junction, towers, and cabins, and would be designed consistent with applicable Metro, City, and State approval requirements. Regarding sign content, the Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 14.4.4 prohibits signs that contain obscene matters, as defined in Section 311 of the Penal Code of the State of California. Outside of the prohibition on obscene matters, signs have free speech protections under the First Amendment of the United States Constitution and accordingly sign regulations are generally content-neutral and instead focus on time, place, and manner regulations. Nevertheless, the proposed Project's signage would be designed to be consistent with Metro requirements, including Metro's Advertising Content Guidelines as applicable, which are updated from time to time. Metro's Advertising Content Guidelines include a number of restrictions on advertising, including prohibiting the advertising of all alcohol, tobacco, and cannabis products, services, and events. Metro's Advertising Content Guidelines also provide that advertising may not be displayed if its content involves: illegal activity; violence; demeaning or disparaging matter; vulgarity; obscene matter; adult entertainment and content; political endorsements; religion, negative connotations of public transit; unsafe transit behavior; content injurious to Metro's interests; or content harmful or disruptive to the transit system. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefit to the surrounding community, including but not limited to, sustainability features and open space enhancements, the Community Access Plan for fares, access to parks, mobility hubs, signage, utilization of local artists for site specific artwork at each station reflective of the unique neighborhood culture, design of each component of the proposed Project to complement and reflect the unique character of the surrounding neighborhood, the Business and Community Support Program during construction, and benefits to local businesses along the proposed Project alignment. The Project Sponsor would convene stakeholder groups to coordinate on issues related to proposed Project features. Refer to Topical Response M, Comparable Urban Aerial Transit Systems, discussing how, like the proposed Project, comparable aerial transit systems in cities around the world are integrated with their surrounding urban environments. In particular, comparable aerial transit systems in other locations demonstrate that such systems can operate safely, efficiently, and in concert with nearby residential and open space uses, including parks and other recreational facilities.

Comment PH24-7 MS. KING: All right. Go right ahead.

MS P. LING: Phyllis Ling. P-H-Y-L-L-I-S, L-I-N-G.

MS. KING: Oh, go right ahead.

MS: P. LING: Okay. So my comment is that the parking study, I think we were told it was not part of the Environmental Impact Report. But it is being presented here on a board, and so it's a little big confusing. Personally, I do think it should part of the Environmental Impact Report because it would – people driving to the gondola

stations and parking in our neighborhoods will have an impact on traffic flow in our neighborhoods.

And the fact that it's being presented here but then not a part of the Environmental Impact Report, to me, that's just very confusing. And it seems like it sets it up as where it's, the parking study doesn't need to be as thorough or doesn't need to meet a certain standard as a separate study outside of the Environmental Impact Report.

It's just very confusing as to the status of that. And I think it should be officially included in the final report.

Response PH24-7 Parking is not required to be analyzed under CEQA or the Transportation Assessment Guidelines ("TAG"). Nevertheless, the Parking Study was prepared to provide additional information to the community and decision makers about existing parking conditions and the proposed Project's potential to affect parking conditions around the Alameda Station and Chinatown/State Park Station. As recommended in the Parking Study, the Project Sponsor will prepare, the Project Sponsor will prepare, in collaboration with the City, and with robust feedback from community stakeholders, a parking management plan. The City would implement any on-street parking management strategies identified.

Comment PH24-8 And I think there should be additional public review and extended review time when the final EIR is released. Thank you.

MS. KING: Thank you.

Response PH24-8 This comment is noted and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Public Hearing Comment PH25 – Eric Smith

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH25

Comment PH25-1 Wonderful idea. Good for transportation, good for environment. Do it!

Response PH25-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment PH25-2 At Dodger Stadium – make walkways either under roads or build bridge over roads to alleviate any foot congestion slowing traffic.

Response PH25-2 This comment is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Public Hearing Comment PH26 – Maria Salnejon

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH26

Comment PH26-1 It will be fabulous to have this type of transportation for the tourists and for all type of people.

Response PH26-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Public Hearing Comment PH27 – Renee Young

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH27

Comment PH27-1 As the premier women business owners organization in the region (NAWBO – LA) supports the LA ART project. We are excited to have this project in our community to bring business to those who are part of this community.

Response PH27-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment PH27-2 NAWBO LA encourages the LA ART project to contract with local and small businesses with a 35% participation.

Response PH27-2 Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the potential added benefits from the proposed Project, including potential partnerships with and benefits to local businesses. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of how the proposed Project has committed to a goal of 35 percent utilization of minority business enterprises (MBE), women business enterprises (WBE), disadvantaged business enterprises (DBE), small business enterprise (SBE), disabled veteran business enterprises (DVBE), and LGBTQ-owned businesses during the proposed Project's construction phase.

Public Hearing Comment PH28 – Guan Bao

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH28

Comment PH28-1 Strongly support. Lichang Fang.

Response PH28-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Public Hearing Comment PH29 – Andrea Lacaza

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH29

Comment PH29-1 Construct the gondola now!

Response PH29-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Public Hearing Comment PH30 – Maribel

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH30

Comment PH30-1 The information we have heard today about the Gondola Project is extensive and understandable to people because the information is in different languages, so I like the information given today, and the Gondola Project is going to bring benefits to the area.

Response PH30-1 Refer to Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project’s public outreach during the Draft EIR public review period. The format of the in-person public meetings immediately preceding, during, and immediately following the Draft EIR public review period was an Open House, consistent with standard Metro practice, where attendees could learn more about the proposed Project and the key analyses and conclusions of the Draft EIR, and also a public comment opportunity. During the two in-person public meetings that were public hearings, comments could be submitted either in writing on forms provided by Metro, or verbally to the court reporters who were set up at a “comment station” in the venue. Written comment forms provided instructions on how to comment on the Draft EIR in English, Spanish, and Chinese (Simplified). Interpretation was provided in English, Spanish, Mandarin, and Cantonese during the eight public meetings, with interpretation provided in Taishanese during the final two public meetings.

Comment PH30-2 People will be able to look at the project, which is very fast, comfortable and accessible to all the people. It is something we can all experience.

Response PH30-2 Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of how the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan. The proposed Project would provide active transportation connectivity along the proposed Project alignment through pedestrian access enhancements and first- and last-mile multi-modal options at the mobility hubs proposed for the Chinatown/State Park Station and the Dodger Stadium Station.

Public Hearing Comment PH31 – Fernando Quesada

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH31

Comment PH31-1 Build The Gondola

Response PH31-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Public Hearing Comment PH32 – Simon Fraga

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH32

Comment PH32-1 I support the gondola.

Response PH32-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Public Hearing Comment PH33 – Abram Illescas

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH33

Comment PH33-1 I love the gondola and all benefits it would bring.

Response PH33-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Public Hearing Comment PH34 – Amparo Cabrera

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH34

Comment PH34-1 Great project to reduce pollution, it is faster than the bus, it will reduce traffic in my community and there will be more parking for us and our neighborhood.

Response PH34-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Public Hearing Comment PH35 – Socorro Lugo

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH35

Comment PH35-1 I support the gondola because it will reduce traffic, make the city more beautiful, it will be very complete for tourists, free for neighboring communities and a better future for transportation.

Response PH35-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Public Hearing Comment PH36 – Fang Li Chan

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH36

Comment PH36-1 Fully support.

Response PH36-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Public Hearing Comment PH37 – Juniper Wong

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH37

Comment PH37-1 As a volunteer and worker in Chinatown who works with low income Chinese seniors, I do not support this project. This gondola has been ushered through by Frank McCourt to cater to Dodgers fans and not the actual residents. This entire process has left out the most vulnerable in the community and will further displace people by raising the cost of living.

Response PH37-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, and Appendix A, Scoping Report, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project team's outreach efforts to neighborhoods along the proposed Project alignment and the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities. Metro sought to engage with stakeholders in neighborhoods along the proposed Project alignment in each stage of the environmental review process. Metro engaged stakeholders in neighborhoods along the proposed Project alignment in decision making for the proposed Project beginning with the public scoping period for the Draft EIR in October 2020 to receive public comment on the proposed Project's scope of environmental review under CEQA. In June 2021, the Project Sponsor conducted two virtual public outreach meetings. The input from stakeholders in neighborhoods along the proposed Project, including Chinatown, during this period led directly to changes to the proposed Project, including selecting the proposed Project alignment and the location of Chinatown/State Park Station, as discussed in Section 5.0, Other CEQA Considerations, of the Draft EIR. Eight public meetings were held immediately preceding, during, and immediately following the Draft EIR public review period, with four held in-person in the Project area at Los Angeles Union Station and Cathedral High School, and four held virtually via Zoom webinar. Project materials and information were provided at both the in-person meetings and on Metro's website in English, Spanish, Chinese (Traditional), and Chinese (Simplified). Interpretation was provided in English, Spanish, Mandarin, and Cantonese during the eight public meetings, with interpretation provided in Taishanese during the final two public meetings. Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not displace housing or prevent planned housing.

Comment PH37-2 Just today, I invited tenant seniors who submitted written comment. One of the interpreters read her comment in Chinese, came up to me, and said her point of prioritizing affordable housing over the gondola – was illegitimate. This is grossly inappropriate for him to do. That the land this is built on should be used for public good over private interest is within a resident’s right to say. It is the most urgent point in all of this. This project is full of misconduct, from the funding, to the botched public process.

Response PH37-2 Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project’s capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project’s capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project. Refer to Response PH37-1 for discussion of how Metro sought to engage the community in each stage of the environmental review process and the Draft EIR public review period.

Public Hearing Comment PH38 – Karina Ramos

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH38

Comment PH38-1 How secure is the ride?

What are some safety concerns and what are some safety measures.

Response PH38-1 Refer to Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR and Topical Response J, Gondola Design and Operations, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's design and operations, including discussion of the safety, privacy, and operations features of the proposed Project, and how aerial transit systems such as the proposed Project represent one of the safest modes of transportation relative to other forms of transit. Maintenance would be performed by the operator and would include daily observation of the overall system as part of the startup routine. Further, system components would be equipped with security features for system safety. The gates and entrances to the stations would be locked at night and would be equipped with security features to prevent entrance by unauthorized personnel. The towers would have no publicly accessible gates or entrances and would be inaccessible to unauthorized personnel. Maintenance doors at the base of the towers would be secured at all times and only accessible by authorized personnel. The system components would be equipped with security cameras to monitor activity at stations, the junction, the towers, and in each cabin. Moreover, attendants would be present at each station, and a separate operator would be stationed in a control room to monitor activity throughout the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response M, Comparable Urban Aerial Transit Systems, for discussion of comparable aerial transit systems in cities around the world that operate safely, efficiently, and in concert with nearby residential and open space uses.

Public Hearing Comment PH39 – Gustavo Gonzales

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH39

Comment PH39-1 Good for pollution and taking cars off the road.

Like that good for environment!

Response PH39-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Public Hearing Comment PH40 – Maria L.

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH40

Comment PH40-1 I am in favor of this project since it can make commuting to the stadium easier, attract more tourism and result in less traffic, and it does not pollute so much.

Response PH40-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Public Hearing Comment PH41 – Lucrecia Vargas D.

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH41

Comment PH41-1 It will be a great and fabulous project, because I think that this aerial transportation will be very helpful to the community of Los Angeles. More tourists would come here.

Response PH41-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Public Hearing Comment PH42 – Claudia Vasquez

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH42

Comment PH42-1 It would be fabulous to have that form of transportation, a great improvement for the community.

It would improve the [illegible].

Response PH42-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Public Hearing Comment PH43 – Tany Ling

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH43

Comment PH43-1 I am against this gondola project. This is masquerading as a public transit project for the greater good, but it is really a means for a billionaire to use public money to take a step forward achieving a huge development project at Dodger Stadium – all while costing taxpayers millions of dollars,

Response PH43-1 Refer to Topical Response A, SB 44, for discussion of how the proposed Project is public transportation because it will be open to the general public for service at regular, scheduled operating times, operating daily to serve existing residents, workers, park users, and visitors to Los Angeles. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response G, No Improper Project Segmentation: The Proposed Project Is Intended to Create a Transit Connection from Metro's Union Station Transportation Hub via an Aerial Gondola System to the Dodger Stadium Property for a discussion of how the proposed Project solely proposes an aerial gondola system. The proposed Project does not include other development, and neither the Project Sponsor nor any other applicant has applied for other development unrelated to the existing stadium uses on the Dodger Stadium property.

Comment PH43-2 making traffic worse, and destroying the LASHP and the surrounding neighborhood.

Response PH43-2 Refer to Section 3.03, Air Quality, Section 3.08, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 3.17, Transportation, Appendix D, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's ability to reduce vehicular travel, to improve air quality through reduced emissions, and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through reduced vehicular travel. As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, Section 3.16, Parks and Recreational Facilities, and Section 5.0, Other CEQA Considerations, of the Draft EIR, the Chinatown/State Park Station would have a footprint of 2,195 square feet in the Los Angeles State Historic Park (~.1% of the total 32-acre park), and the station canopy

would have an overhang of 9,320 square feet over the park. The proposed Project alignment crosses over the westernmost edge of the Los Angeles State Historic Park, adjacent to the existing Metro L Line (Gold) and the associated overhead catenary system. The proposed Project's required aerial clearance would be located above approximately 59,470 square feet of the total 32-acre park, plus an Additional Separation Buffer. With the required clearances and the height at which the cabins would cross over the Los Angeles State Historic Park, the ability to use the vast majority of the Park for kite flying, special events (e.g., concerts, craft fairs, partnership events, 5K/10K runs, workshops, cultural festivals, and the farmers' market), and other passive recreational opportunities (e.g., picnicking, jogging, walking, and informal play) would not be affected by the proposed Project. Refer to Response S2-4 for additional discussion regarding the ability of uses to continue at the park. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities including but not limited to sustainability features and open space enhancements, the Community Access Plan for fares, access to parks, mobility hubs, signage, utilization of local artists for site specific artwork at each station reflective of the unique neighborhood culture, design of each component of the proposed Project to complement and reflect the unique character of the surrounding neighborhood, the Business and Community Support Program during construction, and benefits to local businesses along the proposed Project alignment. The Project Sponsor would convene stakeholder groups to coordinate on issues related to proposed Project features. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan.

Comment PH43-3 Chinatown residents didn't ask for this and have no practical use for this. There are less expensive actions that can be taken to truly alleviate the traffic issue at a lesser cost. Expand and streamline access for Dodger Stadium Express buses -- this requires no permanent damage to the community with intrusive infrastructure or noise/visual blight. Chinatown is not for sale to this billionaire.

Response PH43-3 Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, Appendix A, Scoping Report, of the Draft EIR, and Topical C, Project Commitment to Community Benefits, for discussion of the proposed Project team's outreach efforts to neighborhoods along the proposed Project alignment and the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities. Metro sought to engage with stakeholders in neighborhoods along the proposed Project alignment in each stage of the environmental review process. Input from the public, including local community stakeholders, led directly to the selection of the proposed Project alignment, including an intermediate station in Chinatown (the Chinatown/State Park Station), as well as to the redesign of the proposed Project stations and junction and additional

pedestrian enhancements including hardscape and landscape improvements. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities including but not limited to sustainability features and open space enhancements, the Community Access Plan for fares, access to parks, mobility hubs, signage, utilization of local artists for site specific artwork at each station reflective of the unique neighborhood culture, design of each component of the proposed Project to complement and reflect the unique character of the surrounding neighborhood, the Business and Community Support Program during construction, and benefits to local businesses along the proposed Project alignment. The Project Sponsor would convene stakeholder groups to coordinate on issues related to proposed Project features. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the potential added benefits from the proposed Project, including potential partnerships with and benefits to local businesses in Chinatown.

Refer to Topical Response H, The Draft EIR Considered an Appropriate Range of Alternatives and Design Options, for discussion of how the Transportation Systems Management Alternative for an enhanced Dodger Stadium Express is unlikely to achieve the same level of ridership as the proposed Project, and otherwise fails to meet most of the Project Objectives which seek to achieve the proposed Project's underlying purpose of providing a permanent direct transit connection between LAUS and the Dodger Stadium property and improving connectivity for surrounding communities. Electrification of the Dodger Stadium Express buses would not negate the operational issues associated with substantially expanding the Dodger Stadium Express. Improving the connection between LAUS and Dodger Stadium via the proposed Project would provide the quickest, most frequent, and highest capacity transit connection for the greatest number of riders traveling to Dodger Stadium to have the most travel time competitive transit trips from more locations in the region. Refer to Section 3.03, Air Quality, Section 3.08, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 3.17, Transportation, Appendix D, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's ability to reduce vehicular travel, to improve air quality through reduced emissions, and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through reduced vehicular travel. As discussed in Sections 3.01, Aesthetics, 3.04, Biological Resources, 3.05, Cultural Resources, 3.06, Energy, 3.07, Geology and Soils, 3.09, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, 3.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, 3.11, Land Use and Planning, 3.13, Noise, 3.15, Public Services, 3.16, Parks and Recreational Facilities, 3.17, Transportation, 3.18, Tribal Cultural Resources, 3.19, Utilities and Service Systems,

3.20, Wildfire, and 5.0, Other CEQA Considerations, the proposed Project would have less than significant operational impacts. Refer to Section 3.01, Aesthetics, and Appendix C, Visual Impact Assessment, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the aesthetic impacts of the proposed Project, which would be less than significant, including to scenic or panoramic views. Refer to Section 3.13, Noise, and Appendix M, Noise and Vibration Technical Report, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the construction and operational noise impacts from the proposed Project. As detailed therein, construction related noise impacts would be significant and unavoidable even with implementation of mitigation. Operational noise impacts would be less than significant. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project.

Public Hearing Comment PH44 – Luis Ramos

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH44

Comment PH44-1 I like the idea for the project to reduce traffic congestion, & less pollution in the air. Also free to dodger fans & easier access to dodger stadium.

Response PH44-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan.

Public Hearing Comment PH45 – Maria Gutierrez

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH45

Comment PH45-1 I strongly support Aerial project for many reasons, one of them being less traffic and faster transportation to stadium, secondly it being free with purchase of ticket to game, and last but not least less pollution for the environment.

Response PH45-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Public Hearing Comment PH46 – Drew Miller

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH46

Comment PH46-1 The Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit project is an important opportunity to solve advance zero emissions transportation to build a healthier and more environmentally responsible Los Angeles. LA ART would be the first permanent rapid transit connection from the region’s transportation hub, Union Station, to Dodger Stadium and Elysian Park.

Response PH46-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment PH46-2 This would remove thousands of vehicles from the road, thus reducing congestion and pollution while providing a unique and safe experience for the community. As rising temperatures from human caused greenhouse gases threaten Los Angeles and civilization as we know it – the time to act is now.

Response PH46-2 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Public Hearing Comment PH47 – Disraeli Butler

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH47

Comment PH47-1 Great project that would make our founding fathers proud that is bringing innovation, peace, and harmony to our nation and people during these challenging apocalyptic times...

Response PH47-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment PH47-2 Because this region is being impacted by multiple noise factors that are the underlying causes of vertigo, stress, and blood pressure levels... LAPD heliports need to be relocated, and train horns regulated

Response PH47-2 The Draft EIR addresses potential airport hazards in Section 3.09, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, with supporting data provided in Appendix O, Airspace Analysis Technical Memo. The Draft EIR concludes that the proposed Project alignment is not within two miles of a “public use airport” as that term is defined under CEQA. Refer to Draft EIR Appendix O, Airspace Analysis Technical Memo. That analysis, based on FAA analysis standards, concludes with substantial evidence that construction and operation of the proposed Project is clear of the airspace associated with the existing heliports in the proposed Project’s vicinity. In addition, refer to Appendix I, Firefighting Helicopter Response Memo, of this Final EIR, for discussion of how helicopter flight paths would not be impeded as a result of the proposed Project. Refer to Section 3.13, Noise and Vibration, and Appendix M, Noise and Vibration Technical Report, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the noise impacts from the proposed Project. As detailed therein, operational noise impacts would be less than significant.

Public Hearing Comment PH48 – Dong Lee

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH48

Comment PH48-1 I live in William Mead.

I support the Gondola Project.

It will be good for our community

Response PH48-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Public Hearing Comment PH49 – Moon Smeyev

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH49

Comment PH49-1 I live in William Mead.

I support the Gondola project.

Response PH49-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Public Hearing Comment PH50 – Jose Roberto Garela

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH50

Comment PH50-1 I support the project. It is something really great for the community because it will help people to commute.

Please approve the gondola.

Response PH50-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Public Hearing Comment PH51 – Juana Noriega

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH51

Comment PH51-1 We support it because it is good for the community. If it was bad, we would not support it, but it is beneficial to the community.

I support the gondola.

Response PH51-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Public Hearing Comment PH52 – Wences Sanchez

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH52

Comment PH52-1 I support it is good for community because when they have games you cannot park on the street it is good for us since it will bring us more together with our childred.

Response PH52-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Public Hearing Comment PH53 – Irine Andalon R.

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH53

Comment PH53-1 My name is Irinea and my comment is about this project, which would damage our area's [illegible]. The traffic issue would persist and the children's playground parks would be over.

Response PH53-1 Refer to Section 3.03, Air Quality, Section 3.08, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 3.17, Transportation, Appendix D, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's ability to reduce vehicular travel, to improve air quality through reduced emissions, and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through reduced vehicular travel. Refer to Section 2.0, Project Description, Section 3.16, Parks and Recreational Facilities, and Section 5.0, Other CEQA Considerations, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the footprint of the proposed Project in the Los Angeles State Historic Park. With the small footprint of the proposed Project's Chinatown/State Park Station, and the required clearances and the height at which the cabins would cross over the Park, the ability to use the vast majority of the Park would not be affected by the proposed Project. Refer to Response S2-4 for additional discussion regarding the ability of uses to continue at the Park.

Comment PH53-2 We would not like this to happen in a place where we have lived for 50 years at the same address.

Response PH53-2 This comment is noted and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Public Hearing Comment PH54 – Jeremiah Arriaga

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH54

Comment PH54-1 I support the gondola and think it's a good idea to help clear the traffic up in the city. I think it would also be very nice to see the city while on it, and is eco friendly.

Response PH54-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Public Hearing Comment PH55 – Jonathan Berman

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH55

Comment PH55-1 Crowd control 10k plus people getting in + out

Response PH55-1 This comment is noted and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Comment PH55-2 Private public who is the private co?

Frank McCourt who bankrupt Dodgers

Eventually to be paid for by taxes

Beginning of development of stadium as ‘Doger Mall’

Response PH55-2 Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project’s capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project’s capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response G, No Improper Project Segmentation: The Proposed Project Is Intended to Create a Transit Connection from Metro’s Union Station Transportation Hub via an Aerial Gondola System to the Dodger Stadium Property for a discussion of how the proposed Project solely proposes an aerial gondola system and was not improperly segmented or “piecemealed” from a larger development project at the Dodger Stadium property.

Comment PH55-3 Environmental review

Response PH55-3 This comment is noted and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Public Hearing Comment PH56 – Bryn Lindblad

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH56

Comment PH56-1 Very excited about this project!

I hope the elected officials / Metro Board do everything in their power to help this project along. The sooner it's in operation, the better.

Response PH56-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment PH56-2 The project team has already done extensive community engagement and adjusted the scope of the project according to what they heard (e.g. extra station in Chinatown).

Now it's time to cheer this project along and get it done! I wholeheartedly support this project.

Response PH56-2 Refer to Appendix A, Scoping Report, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of outreach and community engagement during the Draft EIR scoping period. Metro sought to engage the community in each stage of the environmental review process. Metro engaged the public in decision making for the proposed Project beginning with the public scoping period for the Draft EIR in October 2020 to receive public comment on the proposed Project's scope of environmental review under CEQA. In June 2021, the Project Sponsor conducted two virtual public outreach meetings. The input from the public, including local community stakeholders, as well as from agencies, organizations, and interested parties, during this period led directly to changes to the proposed Project to incorporate public feedback. For example, after initially offering two options for the proposed Project alignment in the Notice of Preparation, responding to stakeholder input, the Project Sponsor announced it would proceed with the proposed Project alignment studied in the Draft EIR, including the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station near the southernmost entrance to the Los Angeles State Historic Park. This decision was in direct response to both State Park and Chinatown stakeholders. Located within a short walk to many Chinatown businesses and Metro's L Line (Gold), this station also addresses the goal of creating a stronger connection with the Metro L line and would also enhance transit access to the Los Angeles State Historic Park, Mission Junction, William Mead Homes, and the Los Angeles River. In addition to this significant modification in response to public input, the proposed Project stations were also redesigned to address public response to the initial design vision for the proposed Project, by reducing the size by 26 percent and updating the architecture to better reflect the neighboring communities.

Public Hearing Comment PH57 – Alma R. Melgoza

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH57

Comment PH57-1 I think it would bring many benefits, like:

1. It would create jobs.
2. It would reduce traffic a little bit (Dodgers).
3. It would be a tourist attraction.

Response PH57-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at LAUS, Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Dodger Stadium draws large regional crowds, with approximately 100 baseball games and other events each year, but there are no permanent transit connections to the venue. The vast majority of visitors drive their personal vehicles to access the venue. These vehicles create congestion on the surface streets leading up to and around Dodger Stadium, including Sunset Boulevard/Cesar E. Chavez from LAUS and throughout the surrounding communities. Given the capacity of the proposed Project's system, approximately 20 percent of the fans could take aerial transit connected to Metro's regional transit system. This would reduce vehicular congestion in and around Dodger Stadium, on neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways during game and special event days. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan.

Public Hearing Comment PH58 – Lynn Chen

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH58

Comment PH58-1 Great project to promote Local Business grow,
and provide visitors far and near.

Improve families connection, Brig people together in positive synergy.

I, We support this project.

Response PH58-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Public Hearing Comment PH59 – Patrick Paul Gallego II

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH59

Comment PH59-1 Would love to support out community by garunteeing a well designed stadium so that not only the fans get excited.

Response PH59-1 This comment is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Comment PH59-2 But, add another NFL team to Dodgers Stadium. Thanks in advance for your support.

Response PH59-2 This comment is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Public Hearing Comment PH60 – Lynn Chen

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH60

Comment PH60-1 I support this project.! We support this project.

Great project to promote Local Business grow and bring visitors, far and near.

Response PH60-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment PH60-2 Improve families connection, Bring people together In positive synergy.

Response PH60-2 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Public Hearing Comment PH61 – Esperanza Andrade

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH61

Comment PH61-1 The Gondola Project does not bring benefits to our people and communities.

Response PH61-1 Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities, including but not limited to sustainability features and open space enhancements, the Community Access Plan for fares, access to parks, mobility hubs, signage, utilization of local artists for site specific artwork at each station reflective of the unique neighborhood culture, design of each component of the proposed Project to complement and reflect the unique character of the surrounding neighborhood, the Business and Community Support Program during construction, and benefits to local businesses along the proposed Project alignment. The Project Sponsor would convene stakeholder groups to coordinate on issues related to proposed Project features.

Comment PH61-2 These are lies, that it will replace more vehicles going to the Dodger Stadium. The Gondola Project will impact our community.

Response PH61-2 Refer to Section 3.03, Air Quality, Section 3.08, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 3.17, Transportation, Appendix D, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's ability to reduce vehicular travel, to improve air quality through reduced emissions, and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through reduced vehicular travel. Refer to Topical Response A, SB 44, for discussion of how the proposed Project is consistent with RTP/SCS, as the proposed Project would provide improved mobility, accessibility, reliability and travel choices for people traveling in Los Angeles to a major event destination (Dodger Stadium), as well as provide improved transit service to adjacent communities, and would otherwise reduce greenhouse gas emissions by reducing VMT.

Comment PH61-3 I do not agree with this project because they do not think about our people, but their own benefit. Let's fight so it is not made.

Response PH61-3 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Response PH61-1 for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities.

Public Hearing Comment PH62 – Sophat Phea

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH62

Comment PH62-1 Hi, I grew up in Chinatown since I was 2 years old and I still live in Chinatown today. As there's been a rise of development and gentrification in Chinatown, I fear this Aerial Rapid Transit will contribute to it and my home won't be the same anymore.

Response PH62-1 Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not exacerbate gentrification or result in displacement of residents in the surrounding neighborhoods and is consistent with Metro's considerations regarding gentrification and displacement.

Comment PH62-2 I personally don't see myself using it and would love the money and effort to go toward more to what the community would use instead such as our public transportation.

Response PH62-2 Refer to Topical Response A, SB 44, for discussion of how the proposed Project is public transportation because it will be open to the general public for service at regular, scheduled operating times, operating daily to serve existing residents, workers, park users, and visitors to Los Angeles. Refer to Section 2.1, Overview of the Project, of the Draft EIR, discussing how the proposed Project would operate daily to serve existing residents, workers, park users, and visitors to Los Angeles. As discussed on page 2-42, in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the proposed Project would provide service to all pre-season, regular season, and post-season Los Angeles Dodger games and any special events (e.g., concerts, the Los Angeles Marathon) at the Dodger Stadium property. The proposed Project would also provide service to events at the Los Angeles State Historic Park. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities including but not limited to sustainability features and open space enhancements, the Community Access Plan for fares, access to parks, mobility hubs, signage, utilization of local artists for site specific artwork at each station reflective of the unique neighborhood culture, design of each component of the proposed Project to complement and reflect the unique character of the surrounding neighborhood, the Business and Community Support Program during construction, and benefits to local businesses along the proposed Project alignment. The Project Sponsor would convene stakeholder groups to coordinate on issues related to proposed Project features. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor

and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project.

Comment PH62-3 It also looks like it'll take up a lot of parking in Chinatown where ppl already having trouble finding. It's been a huge barrier to the small businesses in Chinatown. Money and effort could've been put into improving the parking situation instead.

Response PH62-3 Parking is not required to be analyzed under CEQA or the Transportation Assessment Guidelines ("TAG"). Nevertheless, the Parking Study was prepared to provide additional information to the community and decision makers about existing parking conditions and the proposed Project's potential to effect parking conditions around the Alameda Station and Chinatown/State Park Station. As recommended in the Parking Study, the Project Sponsor will prepare, in collaboration with the City, and with robust feedback from community stakeholders, a parking management plan. The City would implement any on-street parking management strategies identified. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, discussing the proposed Project's potential partnerships with and benefits to local businesses in Chinatown. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the potential added benefits from the proposed Project, including potential partnerships with and benefits to local businesses in Chinatown.

Comment PH62-4 At the end of the day, who does it really benefit and who is being harm??

Response PH62-4 Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at LAUS, Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities including but not limited to sustainability features and open space enhancements, the Community Access Plan for fares, access to parks, mobility hubs, signage, utilization of local artists for site specific artwork at each station reflective of the unique neighborhood culture, design of each component of the proposed Project to complement and reflect the unique character of the surrounding neighborhood, the Business and Community Support Program during construction, and benefits to local businesses along the proposed Project alignment. The Project Sponsor would convene stakeholder groups to coordinate on issues related to proposed Project features. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close

to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the Draft EIR addresses environmental justice by considering the proposed Project's ability to reduce congestion and emissions from on-road vehicles in an area disproportionately burdened by pollution, and including an analysis of the proposed Project's potential impacts to the surrounding community, concluding that the proposed Project could result in air quality benefits for the surrounding communities.

Public Hearing Comment PH63 – Teri Vanderberg

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH63

Comment PH63-1 There is transportation to the Dodger game its FREE and it's a bus here at the train station.

Response PH63-1 Refer to Topical Response O, Response to the UCLA Mobility Lab Study, for a discussion of how the Dodger Stadium Express would not be precluded from operating by the proposed Project. While existing riders of the Dodger Stadium Express may choose to switch to the proposed Project to take advantage of its substantial travel time savings, some riders may prefer to ride the Union Station Dodger Stadium Express for other reasons. The opportunities for more mobility choices through improved connections to additional public transit options created by the proposed Project are projected to increase the number of attendees of games or events at Dodger Stadium to ride public transportation.

Comment PH63-2 I live here in Chinatown we don't want our parks peace disturbed by loops of people getting on a gondola.

Response PH63-2 Refer to Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of how the proposed Project's intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station near the southernmost entrance to the Los Angeles State Historic Park would be located within a short walk to many Chinatown businesses and Metro's L Line (Gold), creating a stronger connection with the Metro L Line and enhancing transit access to the Los Angeles State Historic Park, Mission Junction, William Mead Homes, and the Los Angeles River. Compared to the Metro L Line (Gold), accessible at the Chinatown Station, the proposed Project's Chinatown/State Park Station would be closer to the Los Angeles State Historic Park, the shorter headways would result in more frequent service, and the travel time would be less. Refer to Topical Response B, Ridership Model; Queueing at Stations and Pre-game and Post-game Transportation, for discussion of how approximately 15 percent of proposed Project riders to Dodger Stadium (900 passengers in 2026 and 1,500 passengers in 2042) are expected to board the system before a game or event at the Stadium at the Chinatown/State Park Station, and queues would therefore be accommodated within the Station, given this lesser boarding demand and the larger queuing capacity at the Station.

Comment PH63-3 The pollution traffic and commercial circus of this will change Chinatown

Response PH63-3 Traffic congestion is not required to be analyzed under CEQA in the Draft EIR following the implementation of Senate Bill 743, which designated "vehicle miles traveled" as the method for assessing transportation impacts on the environment for CEQA projects. Refer to the *Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit Project Non-CEQA Transportation Assessment*, which found that there could be localized increases in

traffic at the intersections closest to the proposed Project's Alameda Station and Chinatown/State Park Station due to some riders choosing to park and ride or take Uber/Lyft and recommended the proposed Project work with Metro to identify a transit partnership for the proposed Project riders to further encourage them to take transit, walk, or bike to the proposed Project's stations. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the potential added benefits from the proposed Project, including potential partnerships with and benefits to local businesses in Chinatown.

Public Hearing Comment PH64 – Rebeca Ocegueda

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH64

Comment PH64-1 As a resident of North East Los Angeles, I oppose the Gondola, since it will affect our community, our historical park and Chinatown’s community.

Response PH64-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. This comment provides a general summary of the comments raised in this letter. Responses to the comments contained in this letter are provided below in Responses PH64-2 through PH64-3.

Comment PH64-2 It will impact rent increases and evictions, because many of us cannot pay, and it will increase the number of homeless people due to the increases that we will have.

Response PH64-2 Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not exacerbate gentrification or result in displacement of residents in the surrounding neighborhoods and is consistent with Metro’s considerations regarding gentrification and displacement.

Comment PH64-3 This project would only fill up the pockets of Mr. McCourt, who is the most interested in it. But he does not think about us, the people who will be affected. This gondola will increase air pollution because of vehicle emissions in an area [cont.] that is already overloaded with air emissions.

Response PH64-3 Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project. The proposed Project’s ability to reduce vehicular travel, to improve air quality through reduced emissions, and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through reduced vehicular travel are discussed in Section 3.03, Air Quality, Section 3.08, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 3.17, Transportation, Appendix D, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by connecting LAUS to Dodger Stadium via an aerial gondola system, including an intermediate station at the southernmost entrance of the Los Angeles State Historic Park. Dodger Stadium draws large regional crowds, with approximately 100 baseball games and other events each year, but there are no permanent transit connections to the venue. Given the capacity of this system, approximately 20 percent of the fans could take aerial transit connected to Metro’s regional transit system. This would reduce vehicular congestion

in and around Dodger Stadium, on neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways during game and special event days, thereby reducing VMT and GHG emissions. Accordingly, the proposed Project would result in air quality benefits to the surrounding communities. The lifetime emissions of the proposed Project over its useful life would be a reduction of 166,653 MT CO₂e. The lifetime VMT reduction of the proposed Project would be a reduction of 129,629,500 VMT. Emissions are decreased through reducing vehicle miles traveled. The proposed Project would result in a net reduction in criteria pollutant emissions by reducing vehicle miles traveled. Refer to Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of how the proposed Project would operate at zero emissions, with the electrical power for the proposed Project supplied by the City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) through the utility's Green Power Program, pursuant to GHG-PDF-A. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the Draft EIR addresses environmental justice by considering the proposed Project's ability to reduce congestion and emissions from on-road vehicles in an area disproportionately burdened by pollution, and including an analysis of the proposed Project's potential impacts to the surrounding community, concluding that the proposed Project could result in air quality benefits for the surrounding communities.

Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities including but not limited to sustainability features and open space enhancements, the Community Access Plan for fares, access to parks, mobility hubs, signage, utilization of local artists for site specific artwork at each station reflective of the unique neighborhood culture, design of each component of the proposed Project to complement and reflect the unique character of the surrounding neighborhood, the Business and Community Support Program during construction, and benefits to local businesses along the proposed Project alignment. The Project Sponsor would convene stakeholder groups to coordinate on issues related to proposed Project features. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan.

Comment PH64-4 This project is all lies, let's not be deceived.

Let's say NO to the Gondola.

Response PH64-4 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Public Hearing Comment PH65 – Julie Rico

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH65

Comment PH65-1 As a taxpayer and resident in Chinatown I am opposed to the Gondola project.

Response PH65-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Comment PH65-2 Displacing the parking lot at dodger Stadium to send the CARS DOWN TO Chinatown and the Historic State Park will be ruined. Seniors will be run over by cars –

Response PH65-2 Traffic congestion is not required to be analyzed under CEQA in the Draft EIR following the implementation of Senate Bill 743, which designated “vehicle miles traveled” as the method for assessing transportation impacts on the environment for CEQA projects. Refer to the *Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit Project Non-CEQA Transportation Assessment*, which found that there could be localized increases in traffic at the intersections closest to the proposed Project’s Alameda Station and Chinatown/State Park Station due to some riders choosing to park and ride or take Uber/Lyft and recommended the proposed Project work with Metro to identify a transit partnership for the proposed Project riders to further encourage them to take transit, walk, or bike to the proposed Project’s stations. Refer to Section 3.03, Air Quality, Section 3.08, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 3.17, Transportation, Appendix D, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project’s ability to reduce vehicular travel, to improve air quality through reduced emissions, and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through reduced vehicular travel. As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, Section 3.16, Parks and Recreational Facilities, and Section 5.0, Other CEQA Considerations, of the Draft EIR, the Chinatown/State Park Station would have a footprint of 2,195 square feet in the Los Angeles State Historic Park (~.1% of the total 32-acre park), and the station canopy would have an overhang of 9,320 square feet over the park. The proposed Project alignment crosses over the westernmost edge of the Los Angeles State Historic Park, adjacent to the existing Metro L Line (Gold) and the associated overhead catenary system. The proposed Project’s required aerial clearance would be located above approximately 59,470 square feet of the total 32-acre park, plus an Additional Separation Buffer. With the required clearances and the height at which the cabins would cross over the Los Angeles State Historic Park, the ability to use the vast majority of the Park for kite flying, special events (e.g., concerts, craft fairs, partnership events, 5K/10K runs, workshops, cultural festivals, and the farmers’ market), and other passive

recreational opportunities (e.g., picnicking, jogging, walking, and informal play) would not be affected by the proposed Project. Refer to Response S2-4 for additional discussion regarding the ability of uses to continue at the Park. Through collaboration with State Parks, the proposed Project has been designed to provide additional benefits to the Los Angeles State Historic Park, including pedestrian improvements between Metro's L Line (Gold) and the park, and integration of the Chinatown/State Park Station into the southern boundary of the park with hardscape and landscape enhancements, a mobility hub, and other park amenities including concessions, restrooms, and a breezeway connecting the concessions and restrooms.

Comment PH65-3 Disease will be spread.

Response PH65-3 This comment is noted and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Comment PH65-4 All for Frank McCourt to have recurring income.

Response PH65-4 This comment is noted and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project.

Public Hearing Comment PH66 – Jose Estrada

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH66

Comment PH66-1 My comment is that any natural alteration has consequences on the environment. Therefore, I am against the project, because we will have consequences in terms of air and soil pollution, and pollution affecting birds and people.

Response PH66-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Section 3.3, Air Quality, Section 3.8, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 3.17, Transportation, Appendix D, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's ability to reduce vehicular travel, to improve air quality through reduced emissions, and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through reduced vehicular travel. Refer to Section 3.07, Geology and Soils, and Appendix I, Geotechnical Document in Support of the Environmental Impact Report, of the Draft EIR for discussion of how the proposed Project would meet applicable standards, requirements, and building codes and would have less than significant impacts related to geology and soils with implementation of Mitigation Measures GEO-A and GEO-B. Refer to Section 3.04, Biological Resources, and Appendix E, Biological Resources Assessment, of the Draft EIR and Appendix G, Supplemental Biological Resources Report, of the Final EIR for discussion of how impacts to biological resources from construction and operations of the proposed Project would be less than significant.

Public Hearing Comment PH67 – Maria Lemus

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH67

Comment PH67-1 I support the Gondola Project.

I am a William Mead Homes Resident & having air transportation will significantly decrease traffic. It will also decrease the traffic and parking issues that we are currently experiencing with the events hosted at the state historic park.

Response PH67-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at LAUS, Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Dodger Stadium draws large regional crowds, with approximately 100 baseball games and other events each year, but there are no permanent transit connections to the venue. The vast majority of visitors drive their personal vehicles to access the venue. These vehicles create congestion on the surface streets leading up to and around Dodger Stadium, including Sunset Boulevard/Cesar E. Chavez from LAUS and throughout the surrounding communities. Given the capacity of the proposed Project's system, approximately 20 percent of the fans could take aerial transit connected to Metro's regional transit system. This would reduce vehicular congestion in and around Dodger Stadium, on neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways during game and special event days. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. The proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan.

Public Hearing Comment PH68 – Monica Vazquez

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH68

Comment PH68-1 Hi my name is Monica Vazquez and I would love for you to pass this project. Aside from creating jobs, it will have a good impact on the community. There will be less pollution, traffic jams. And it's a faster and safer way to get to the stadium. We all know how the stadium gets when there's a game with the Gondola Project it will minimize that problem.

Response PH68-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Public Hearing Comment PH69 – Joshua Neal

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH69

Comment PH69-1 I support the building of the LA ART project. As someone who frequently travels to LA to meet family as well as for work, taking cars off the street to reduce traffic, especially during high traffic periods such as game days is a very appealing prospect.

Response PH69-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Public Hearing Comment PH70 – Kevin Ho

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH70

Comment PH70-1 I believe the gondola is an excellent idea given that it will be properly maintained. Anything to reduce LA traffic is a great project.

Response PH70-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Public Hearing Comment PH71 – Maria Avila

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH71

Comment PH71-1 This project looks very good for the environment and all the community will benefit from this service. Thank you for thinking about the community.

Response PH71-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Public Hearing Comment PH72 – Andy

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH72

Comment PH72-1 I was born and raised in LA and am a long time community member of Chinatown. I. my family, my neighbors and the people of LA do not need the gondola project.

Response PH72-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at LAUS, Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Dodger Stadium draws large regional crowds, with approximately 100 baseball games and other events each year, but there are no permanent transit connections to the venue. The vast majority of visitors drive their personal vehicles to access the venue. These vehicles create congestion on the surface streets leading up to and around Dodger Stadium, including Sunset Boulevard/Cesar E. Chavez from LAUS and throughout the surrounding communities. Given the capacity of the proposed Project's system, approximately 20 percent of the fans could take aerial transit connected to Metro's regional transit system. This would reduce vehicular congestion in and around Dodger Stadium, on neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways during game and special event days. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access.

Comment PH72-2 dodger stadium itself was an overinvestment that bulldozed over people's homes and the communities of La Loma, Bishop, and Palo Verde to exist. This project is yet another misuse of the people's collective time, funds, and energy.

Response PH72-2 Refer to Section 5.0, Corrections and Additions, of this Final EIR for a discussion of Chavez Ravine. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project. Refer to Response PH72-1 for an overview of the need for the proposed Project.

Comment PH72-3 no one asked for or wants this project. There's already public transportation and shuttles that bring people specifically to Dodgers stadium. \$25 million dollars for a limited worth and limited use project is an irresponsible use of funds when what we desperately need is better public transportation infrastructure.

Response PH72-3 Refer to Response PH72-1 for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, Appendix A, Scoping Report, of the Draft EIR, and Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project team's outreach efforts to neighborhoods along the proposed Project alignment and the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding community. Metro sought to engage with stakeholders in neighborhoods along the proposed Project alignment in each stage of the environmental review process. Input from the public, including local community stakeholders, led directly to the selection of the proposed Project alignment, including an intermediate station in Chinatown (the Chinatown/State Park Station), as well as to the redesign of the proposed Project stations and junction and additional pedestrian enhancements including hardscape and landscape improvements.

Refer to Topical Response H, The Draft EIR Considered an Appropriate Range of Alternatives and Design Options, for discussion of how the Transportation Systems Management Alternative for an enhanced Dodger Stadium Express is unlikely to achieve the same level of ridership as the proposed Project, and otherwise fails to meet most of the Project Objectives which seek to achieve the proposed Project's underlying purpose of providing a permanent direct transit connection between LAUS and the Dodger Stadium property and improving connectivity for surrounding communities. Electrification of the Dodger Stadium Express buses would not negate the operational issues associated with substantially expanding the Dodger Stadium Express. Improving the connection between LAUS and Dodger Stadium via the proposed Project would provide the quickest, most frequent, and highest capacity transit connection for the greatest number of riders traveling to Dodger Stadium to have the most travel time competitive transit trips from more locations in the region.

Refer to Topical Response A, SB 44, for discussion of how the proposed Project is public transportation because it will be open to the general public for service at regular, scheduled operating times, operating daily to serve existing residents, workers, park users, and visitors to Los Angeles. Refer to Section 2.1, Overview of the Project, of the Draft EIR, discussing how the proposed Project would operate daily to serve existing residents, workers, park users, and visitors to Los Angeles. As discussed on page 2-42, in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the proposed Project would provide service to all pre-season, regular season, and post-season Los Angeles Dodger games and any special events (e.g., concerts, the Los Angeles Marathon) at the Dodger Stadium property. The proposed Project would also provide service to events at the Los Angeles State Historic Park.

Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project.

Comment PH72-4 i and all my elderly and working neighbors should not have to wait one, two hours for the bus to get home, or anywhere. There is no hospital in Chinatown, because of gentrification many residents have to go to the USC hospital. The quickest route from Chinatown is 28 minutes by bus. 19 of those minutes is walking. People are elderly, disabled, living on \$1000/month w/ a limited support network.

Response PH72-4 Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at LAUS, Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Refer to Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of how the proposed Project's intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station near the southernmost entrance to the Los Angeles State Historic Park would be located within a short walk to many Chinatown businesses and Metro's L Line (Gold), creating a stronger connection with the Metro L Line and enhancing transit access to the Los Angeles State Historic Park, Mission Junction, William Mead Homes, and the Los Angeles River. Compared to the Metro L Line (Gold), accessible at the Chinatown Station, the proposed Project's Chinatown/State Park Station would be closer to the Los Angeles State Historic Park, the shorter headways would result in more frequent service, and the travel time would be less. As discussed in Section 2.1, Overview of the Project, of the Draft EIR, the proposed Project would operate daily to serve existing residents, workers, park users, and visitors to Los Angeles. In addition to providing service on game and special event days at Dodger Stadium and events at the Los Angeles State Historic Park, it is anticipated that the proposed Project would also provide daily service between 6:00am to 12:00am, for the surrounding communities, including Chinatown, Mission Junction, Elysian Park, Solano Canyon, and the Los Angeles State Historic Park. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan.

Comment PH72-5 put \$125 mil more to eliminating transit fare, faster public transit, station hygiene, to bus shelters and real benches to affordable and free housing. I've noticed some bus shelters removed over the year, why, did installing hostile architecture to keep

unhoused people from laying down get too expensive? LA has seen too many harmful, displacing and gentrifying developments – it's insulting that the people behind LA ART try to mislead people into thinking this is a community good, to fool people into thinking this is good for us. We know better than that.

Response PH72-5 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. This comment provides a general summary of the comments raised in this letter. Responses to the comments contained in this letter are provided above in Responses PH72-1 through PH72-4.

Public Hearing Comment PH73 – Samuel Maury-Holmes

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH73

Comment PH73-1 I am very excited by this project. I have lived in NELA for ~8 years and have attended 10-20 Dodger games/year during that span. This will make my trips faster, cheaper, and produce less emissions. I will also start eating in Chinatown at local businesses instead of the Taco Bell Drive Thru on the way to the stadium.

Response PH73-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the potential added benefits from the proposed Project, including potential partnerships with and benefits to local businesses in Chinatown.

Comment PH73-2 This project is a huge net positive for Angelenos, including myself, my friends, and my neighbors. Cheaper, faster, and safer. Anyone familiar with gondolas knows that they are quieter, more fun, and pollute less than cars or buses.

Response PH73-2 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment PH73-3 I am happy that the draft EIR found no significant operating impacts, and that the project will remove thousands of cars per game – that means less pollution (aerial, noise) and safer walking for the nearby residents.

Go Dodgers!

Response PH73-3 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Public Hearing Comment PH74 – Mark Edwards

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH74

Comment PH74-1 Good idea to generate employment / income for Angelenos

Response PH74-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment PH74-2 This is a terroristic age (the many thought up ways to terrorize from ground to air)

Response PH74-2 This comment is noted and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Comment PH74-3 Initials to benefit attendance and revenue for dodgers stadium

Fair and reasonable fare for non-stadium riders

Response PH74-3 Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of how the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan. The proposed Project would provide active transportation connectivity along the proposed Project alignment through pedestrian access enhancements and first- and last-mile multi-modal options at the mobility hubs proposed for the Chinatown/State Park Station and the Dodger Stadium Station.

Comment PH74-4 Is the pandemic expected to cease. Those aerial carts will carry more than one person.

Response PH74-4 This comment is noted and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Comment PH74-5 If you are willing to do this for the L.A. Dodgers

What are you willing to do for God our creator (Jesus)

Response PH74-5 This comment is noted and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Public Hearing Comment PH75 – Julie Chow

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH75

Comment PH75-1 I don't want the Gondola in Chinatown. It affects all residents. What can we do if we want to build houses? It's better to build a subway than a gondola. Don't build a gondola in Chinatown. I'm opposed to it. I strongly oppose this approach. Please respect Chinatown residents. Stop the project. You can build subway, bus projects instead.

Response PH75-1 Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not displace housing or prevent planned housing. Refer to Topical Response H, The Draft EIR Considered an Appropriate Range of Alternatives and Design Options, for discussion of how the proposed Project's objectives broadly contemplate improving neighborhood connectivity and the Dodger Stadium visitor experience, reducing vehicle congestion and associated emissions in and around Dodger Stadium, on neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways during game and special event days, improving access to Elysian Park and the Los Angeles State Historic Park, and providing a sustainable form of transit. Aerial rapid transit technology has the ability to overcome grade and elevation issues between LAUS and Dodger Stadium in order to provide a direct transit connection between the two locations, and provide safe, zero emission, environmentally friendly, and high-capacity transit connectivity in the Project area that would reduce GHG emissions as a result of reduced vehicular congestion in and around Dodger Stadium and on neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways.

Public Hearing Comment PH76 – Hugo Garcia

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH76

Comment PH76-1 I oppose the Gondola Project that is truly intended to create revenue for a private wealthy developer.

Response PH76-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project.

Comment PH76-2 It will not improve mobility at all and is not the identified preferred alternative contained in the DEIR.

Response PH76-2 Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at LAUS, Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Dodger Stadium draws large regional crowds, with approximately 100 baseball games and other events each year, but there are no permanent transit connections to the venue. The vast majority of visitors drive their personal vehicles to access the venue. These vehicles create congestion on the surface streets leading up to and around Dodger Stadium, including Sunset Boulevard/Cesar E. Chavez from LAUS and throughout the surrounding communities. Given the capacity of the proposed Project's system, approximately 20 percent of the fans could take aerial transit connected to Metro's regional transit system. This would reduce vehicular congestion in and around Dodger Stadium, on neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways during game and special event days. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan. The opportunities for more mobility choices through improved connections to additional public transit options created by the proposed Project are projected to increase the number of attendees of games or events at Dodger Stadium to ride public transportation. Refer to Topical Response H, The Draft EIR Considered an Appropriate Range of Alternatives and Design Options and Section 4.0, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR, for a discussion of the

Draft EIR's consideration of a range of reasonable alternatives, properly identifying an "environmentally superior" alternative and analyzing a "No Project" alternative, pursuant to CEQA. The Transportation Systems Management Alternative for an enhanced Dodger Stadium Express is unlikely to achieve the same level of ridership as the proposed Project, and otherwise fails to meet most of the Project Objectives which seek to achieve the proposed Project's underlying purpose of providing a permanent direct transit connection between LAUS and the Dodger Stadium property and improving connectivity for surrounding communities. Electrification of the Dodger Stadium Express buses would not negate the operational issues associated with substantially expanding the Dodger Stadium Express. Improving the connection between LAUS and Dodger Stadium via the proposed Project would provide the quickest, most frequent, and highest capacity transit connection for the greatest number of riders traveling to Dodger Stadium to have the most travel time competitive transit trips from more locations in the region.

Comment PH76-3 A gondola will ruin the open space aesthetic and not allow for users to relax and escape the urban/environment. It's a CEQA violation.

Response PH76-3 Refer to Section 3.01, Aesthetics, and Appendix C, Visual Impact Assessment, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the aesthetic impacts of the proposed Project, which would be less than significant. To the extent this comment raises concerns about impacts to the Los Angeles State Historic Park, refer to Section 2.0, Project Description, Section 3.16, Parks and Recreational Facilities, and Section 5.0, Other CEQA Considerations, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the footprint of the proposed Project in the Los Angeles State Historic Park. With the small footprint of the proposed Project's Chinatown/State Park Station, and the required clearances and the height at which the cabins would cross over the Park, the ability to use the vast majority of the Park would not be affected by the proposed Project. Refer to Response S2-4 for additional discussion regarding the ability of uses to continue at the park. Additionally, refer to Topical Response M, Comparable Urban Aerial Transit Systems, discussing how, like the proposed Project, comparable aerial transit systems in cities around the world are integrated with their surrounding urban environments. In particular, comparable aerial transit systems in other locations demonstrate that such systems can operate safely, efficiently, and in concert with nearby residential and open space uses, including parks and other recreational facilities.

Comment PH76-4 It won't benefit the community. The DEIR calls for using/upgrading the rapid bus system.

Response PH76-4 Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities, including but not limited to sustainability features and open space enhancements, the Community Access Plan for fares, access to parks, mobility hubs, signage, utilization of local artists for site specific artwork at each station reflective of the unique neighborhood culture, design of each component of the proposed Project to

complement and reflect the unique character of the surrounding neighborhood, the Business and Community Support Program during construction, and benefits to local businesses along the proposed Project alignment. The Project Sponsor would convene stakeholder groups to coordinate on issues related to proposed Project features. Refer to Response PH76-2 for discussion of how the Transportation Systems Management Alternative for an enhanced Dodger Stadium Express is unlikely to achieve the same level of ridership as the proposed Project, and otherwise fails to meet most of the Project Objectives.

Comment PH76-5 We don't want to see a commercial retail/mall project – expansion of LA Live.

Response PH76-5 Refer to Topical Response G, No Improper Project Segmentation: The Proposed Project Is Intended to Create a Transit Connection from Metro's Union Station Transportation Hub via an Aerial Gondola System to the Dodger Stadium Property, for discussion of how the proposed Project solely proposes an aerial gondola system. The proposed Project does not include other development, and neither the Project Sponsor nor any other applicant has applied for other development unrelated to the existing stadium uses on the Dodger Stadium property.

Public Hearing Comment PH77 – L. Spangler

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH77

Comment PH77-1 I looked at considered the exhibits pro Angola. I am convinced this a McCourt/Dodgers Stadium private thing not public transportation. It is a tourist attraction sitting on our neighborhood and over our pants. It should not be built

Response PH77-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response A, SB 44, for discussion of how the proposed Project is public transportation because it will be open to the general public for service at regular, scheduled operating hours, operating daily to serve existing residents, workers, park users and visitors to Los Angeles.

Public Hearing Comment PH78 - Zhao Can Guan

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH78

Comment PH78-1 I'm strongly opposed to the gondola project in Chinatown. The gondola route will affect Chinatown's future development. Therefore, I'm strongly opposed to the gondola project in Chinatown.

Response PH78-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the proposed Project would not preclude development of uses including housing, grocery stores, and/or healthcare facilities in the surrounding communities, and would itself address a need for a permanent transit connection to one of the region's most visited venues, and would benefit the surrounding community by alleviating existing congestion on surrounding neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways, thereby reducing associated air pollution and improving safety. Refer also to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the potential added benefits from the proposed Project, including potential partnerships with and benefits to local businesses in Chinatown.

Public Hearing Comment PH79 – Matt Hebermehl

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH79

Comment PH79-1 I am opposed to the gondola project. I think that it will negatively impact the neighborhood and California State Historic Park. I also think that it is a waste of public fund, especially since metro already provides a shuttle service from Union Station.

Response PH79-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. As discussed in Sections 3.01, Aesthetics, 3.04, Biological Resources, 3.05, Cultural Resources, 3.06, Energy, 3.07, Geology and Soils, 3.09, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, 3.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, 3.11, Land Use and Planning, 3.13, Noise, 3.15, Public Services, 3.16, Parks and Recreational Facilities, 3.17, Transportation, 3.18, Tribal Cultural Resources, 3.19, Utilities and Service Systems, 3.20, Wildfire, and 5.0, Other CEQA Considerations, the proposed Project would have less than significant operational impacts, including to Los Angeles State Historic Park. Refer to Responses to S2 regarding the Los Angeles State Historic Park. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at Los Angeles Union Station (LAUS), Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Dodger Stadium draws large regional crowds, with approximately 100 baseball games and other events each year, but there are no permanent transit connections to the venue. The vast majority of visitors drive their personal vehicles to access the venue. These vehicles create congestion on the surface streets leading up to and around Dodger Stadium, including Sunset Boulevard/Cesar E. Chavez from LAUS and throughout the surrounding communities. Given the capacity of the proposed Project's system, approximately 20 percent of the fans could take aerial transit connected to Metro's regional transit system. This would reduce vehicular congestion in and around Dodger Stadium, on neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways during game and special event days. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents,

employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan.

Public Hearing Comment PH80 – L Meza

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH80

Comment PH80-1 I don't support the gondola. It's a waste of public money, public space and the public's will. It's wrong. It's a sin. Think about that.

Response PH80-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project.

Public Hearing Comment PH81 – Gigi Droesch

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH81

Comment PH81-1 We do not need a new tourist trap in Los Angeles! We need to prioritize working class angelenos and projects that will benefit them and not wealthy developers.

Response PH81-1 Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities. The proposed Project would provide numerous benefits to local businesses in El Pueblo, Chinatown, and other areas along the proposed Project alignment, including through potential partnerships with these businesses as well as by providing an accessible and affordable mobility option for employees and area residents. The proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan.

Public Hearing Comment PH82 – Philip Murphy

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH82

Comment PH82-1 From what I've read and understand LA Arts claims that the Gondola is going greatly decrease traffic in and out of Dodgers Stadium as well as reduce air pollution is greatly exaggerated! The Gondola + McCourt's plans to put a shopping mall at Dodgers Stadium will increase traffic 365 days a year!

Response PH82-1 Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at LAUS, Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Dodger Stadium draws large regional crowds, with approximately 100 baseball games and other events each year, but there are no permanent transit connections to the venue. The vast majority of visitors drive their personal vehicles to access the venue. These vehicles create congestion on the surface streets leading up to and around Dodger Stadium, including Sunset Boulevard/Cesar E. Chavez from LAUS and throughout the surrounding communities. Given the capacity of the proposed Project's system, approximately 20 percent of the fans could take aerial transit connected to Metro's regional transit system. This would reduce vehicular congestion in and around Dodger Stadium, on neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways during game and special event days. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition to providing service on game and special event days at Dodger Stadium and events at the Los Angeles State Historic Park, it is anticipated that the proposed Project would also provide daily service between 6:00am to 12:00am, for the surrounding communities, including Chinatown, Mission Junction, Elysian Park, Solano Canyon, and the Los Angeles State Historic Park. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game and the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the proposed Community Access. Refer to Topical Response G, No Improper Project Segmentation: The Proposed Project Is Intended to Create a Transit Connection from Metro's Union Station Transportation Hub via an Aerial Gondola System to the Dodger Stadium Property for a discussion of how the proposed Project solely proposes an aerial gondola system. The proposed Project does not include other development, and neither the Project Sponsor nor any other applicant has applied for other development unrelated to the existing stadium uses on the Dodger Stadium property. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit,

a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project.

Comment PH82-2 Why not increase E-buses from Union Station to Dodgers Stadium, which will be less expensive and more efficient? The Gondola is going negatively impact the LA Historic Park and the neighborhood.

Response PH82-2 Refer to Topical Response H, The Draft EIR Considered an Appropriate Range of Alternatives and Design Options, for discussion of how the Transportation Systems Management Alternative for an enhanced Dodger Stadium Express is unlikely to achieve the same level of ridership as the proposed Project, and otherwise fails to meet most of the Project Objectives which seek to achieve the proposed Project's underlying purpose of providing a permanent direct transit connection between LAUS and the Dodger Stadium property and improving connectivity for surrounding communities, including Chinatown, Mission Junction, Elysian Park, Solano Canyon, and the Los Angeles State Historic Park. Electrification of the Dodger Stadium Express buses would not negate the operational issues associated with substantially expanding the Dodger Stadium Express. Improving the connection between LAUS and Dodger Stadium via the proposed Project would provide the quickest, most frequent, and highest capacity transit connection for the greatest number of riders traveling to Dodger Stadium to have the most travel time competitive transit trips from more locations in the region. As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, Section 3.16, Parks and Recreational Facilities, and Section 5.0, Other CEQA Considerations, of the Draft EIR, the Chinatown/State Park Station would have a footprint of 2,195 square feet in the Los Angeles State Historic Park (~.1% of the total 32-acre park), and the station canopy would have an overhang of 9,320 square feet over the park. The proposed Project alignment crosses over the westernmost edge of the Los Angeles State Historic Park, adjacent to the existing Metro L Line (Gold) and the associated overhead catenary system. The proposed Project's required aerial clearance would be located above approximately 59,470 square feet of the total 32-acre park, plus an Additional Separation Buffer. With the required clearances and the height at which the cabins would cross over the Los Angeles State Historic Park, the ability to use the vast majority of the Park for kite flying, special events (e.g., concerts, craft fairs, partnership events, 5K/10K runs, workshops, cultural festivals, and the farmers' market), and other passive recreational opportunities (e.g., picnicking, jogging, walking, and informal play) would not be affected by the proposed Project. Refer to Response S2-4 for additional discussion regarding the ability of uses to continue at the park. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities.

Comment PH82-3 It is more of a tourist attraction than anything else to help promote McCourt's proposed shopping mall at Dodger Stadium.

Response PH82-3 Refer to Response PH82-1 for an overview of the need for the proposed Project and how the proposed Project solely proposes an aerial gondola system. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project.

Public Hearing Comment PH83 – Mark McRae

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH83

Comment PH83-1 1) You don't own the sky. You cannot overpass people's property.

2) Security. People fight after every Dodgers game, remember Brian Stow. What kind of altercations could occur in every gondola.

3) If people are not driving, they are more likely to get more drunk – and become more aggressive fighting inside Gondola.

4) So much easier to have more shuttle buses to stadium.

Response PH83-1 Refer to Section 2.5, Proposed Project Alignment and Components, with supporting data provided in Appendix Q, Proposed Alignment Plan and Profile, of the Draft EIR for discussion of how the proposed Project maximizes alignment along the public ROW and publicly owned property and minimizes aerial rights over private properties. Refer to Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR and Topical Response J, Gondola Design and Operations, of the Final EIR for discussion of how the proposed Project is equipped with security features. For example, to provide added security to system passengers, each gondola cabin would have a security camera on board with a feed to the control room, as well as a “push to talk” button, which would open two-way communications with the control room. The control room would be able to address all cabins at once, or an individually selected cabin. Control room operators would have the ability to contact local security, law enforcement or other emergency response agencies as needed. The Emergency Operations Plan for the proposed Project would also include emergency response protocols and safety procedures developed in conjunction with the operator, system provider, and local authorities, and would address operational changes and communication protocols required in response to a range of potential emergencies such as a medical emergency in a cabin or in a station or a fire near the alignment. The plan would consider a wide range of scenarios for which default operational responses would be determined. In addition, the plan would include communication protocols with local authorities for further instruction and coordination. Refer also to Topical Response M, Comparable Urban Aerial Transit Systems, for discussion of how comparable urban aerial transit systems have been shown to reduce violent crime in nearby areas. In addition to statistical studies, residents of cities with aerial transit systems have reported a greater sense of security when riding aerial transit relative to other modes of public transportation. Refer to Topical Response H, The Draft EIR Considered an Appropriate Range of Alternatives and Design Options, for discussion of how the Transportation Systems Management Alternative for an enhanced Dodger Stadium Express is unlikely to achieve the same level of ridership as the proposed Project, and otherwise fails to

meet most of the Project Objectives which seek to achieve the proposed Project's underlying purpose of providing a permanent direct transit connection between LAUS and the Dodger Stadium property and improving connectivity for surrounding communities, including Chinatown, Mission Junction, Elysian Park, Solano Canyon, and the Los Angeles State Historic Park.

Public Hearing Comment PH84 - Margaret Fong

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH84**Comment PH84-1** Opposing gondola

I'm a resident near Broadway proposed gondola junction

There are no benefits for our community. Basically it is for McCourt financial gain only!

Response PH84-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the Draft EIR addresses environmental justice by considering the proposed Project's ability to reduce congestion and emissions from on-road vehicles in an area disproportionately burdened by pollution, and including an analysis of the proposed Project's potential impacts to the surrounding community, concluding that the proposed Project could result in air quality benefits for the surrounding communities. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities, including but not limited to sustainability features and open space enhancements, the Community Access Plan for fares, access to parks, mobility hubs, signage, utilization of local artists for site specific artwork at each station reflective of the unique neighborhood culture, design of each component of the proposed Project to complement and reflect the unique character of the surrounding neighborhood, the Business and Community Support Program during construction, and benefits to local businesses along the proposed Project alignment. The Project Sponsor would convene stakeholder groups to coordinate on issues related to proposed Project features.

Public Hearing Comment PH85 – Olali Perez

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH85

Comment PH85-1 Dislike – placement of gondola, would be better in Playa del Rey.

Response PH85-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at LAUS, Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Dodger Stadium draws large regional crowds, with approximately 100 baseball games and other events each year, but there are no permanent transit connections to the venue. The vast majority of visitors drive their personal vehicles to access the venue. These vehicles create congestion on the surface streets leading up to and around Dodger Stadium, including Sunset Boulevard/Cesar E. Chavez from LAUS and throughout the surrounding communities. Given the capacity of the proposed Project's system, approximately 20 percent of the fans could take aerial transit connected to Metro's regional transit system. This would reduce vehicular congestion in and around Dodger Stadium, on neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways during game and special event days. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan.

Comment PH85-2 Dislike – parking analysis – only 2 lots, that may not last at all. They are already occupied

Response PH85-2 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Parking is not required to be analyzed under CEQA or the Transportation Assessment Guidelines ("TAG"). Nevertheless, the Parking Study was prepared to provide additional information to the community and decision makers about existing parking conditions and the proposed Project's potential to effect parking conditions around the Alameda Station and Chinatown/State Park Station. As recommended in the Parking Study, the Project Sponsor will prepare, in collaboration with the City, and with robust feedback from community stakeholders, a parking management plan. The City would implement any on-street parking management strategies identified.

Comment PH85-3 Dislike – Esthetics, ugly, non-complimentary

Dislike – Cultural trauma of the proposed location

Dislike - \$30 ride ticket

Response PH85-3 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Section 3.01, Aesthetics, and Appendix C, Visual Impact Assessment, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the aesthetic impacts of the proposed Project, which would be less than significant. Refer to Section 5.0, Corrections and Additions, of this Final EIR for a discussion of Chavez Ravine. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the proposed Project is designed to extend affordable, regional access and mobility options to the communities adjacent to the proposed Project alignment, providing connections to Metro’s growing regional public transit system. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan.

Public Hearing Comment PH86 – Sakae Koyama

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH86

Comment PH86-1 ELYSIAN PARK AS THE OLDEST AND SECOND LARGEST CITY PARK IN LOS ANGELES HAS HISTOICALLY BEEN TARGETED BY DEVELOPERS WHO SEE OPEN PARK SPACE W/ DOLLAR SIGNS IN THEIR EYES. ELYSIAN PARK WAS TARGETED FOR A CONVENTION CENTER, A SMALL AIRPORT, AND HOUSING AMONG OTHER THINGS. KEEP GREEN SPACE OPEN. NO GONDOLA. NO TO FRANK MCCOURT. NO TO DODGER DEVELOPMENT.

Response PH86-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response G, No Improper Project Segmentation: The Proposed Project Is Intended to Create a Transit Connection from Metro’s Union Station Transportation Hub via an Aerial Gondola System to the Dodger Stadium Property, for discussion of how the proposed Project solely proposes an aerial gondola system. The proposed Project does not include other development, and neither the Project Sponsor nor any other applicant has applied for other development unrelated to the existing stadium uses on the Dodger Stadium property.

Public Hearing Comment PH87 – Norvan Gorgi

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH87

Comment PH87-1 The gondola is a stupid, stupid idea. It's obvious that this is not an EIR, it is an advertisement. Just build some damn stairs and sidewalk.

Response PH87-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The Draft EIR complied with CEQA's requirements, providing the necessary analysis to adequately inform the public and decision makers regarding the proposed Project and its potential environmental impacts. Refer to Section 5.0, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR, for discussion of a Pedestrian Enhancement Alternative to the proposed Project in which the proposed Project would not be constructed, and instead an enhanced pedestrian walkway and vertical circulation elements would be constructed to improve the safety, comfort, and accessibility of walking between the Metro L Line (Gold) Station and Dodger Stadium. This alternative was considered but dismissed from further detailed analysis because it did not meet most of the basic objectives of the proposed Project.

Comment PH87-2 Can there be a guarantee that LA ART won't institute a "fast-pass" system where you won't be able to pay to jump the queue?

Can there be a guarantee that LA ART give all riders equal service for one flat rate, as in just one standard fare for one type of service (similar to public transit)?

Response PH87-2 Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of how the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. Refer to Topical Response B, Ridership Model; Queueing at Stations and Pre-game and Post-game Transportation, for discussion of the proposed Project's ridership model which is based on extensive data sources and assumptions validated by data, and the management of queueing at stations, and pre-game and post-game transportation.

Public Hearing Comment PH88 – Guilmar Perdorno

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH88

Comment PH88-1 The gondola is so ugly. The wires, the towers and the disturbance to the sky makes this project a FLOP

Stop the Gondola project because it does not need to exist. Use current infrastructure.

Response PH88-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Section 3.01, Aesthetics, and Appendix C, Visual Impact Assessment, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the aesthetic impacts of the proposed Project, which would be less than significant. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project.

Public Hearing Comment PH89 – Elizabeth

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH89

Comment PH89-1 I’m concerned with where people who are riding the Gondola will park. Where will the gondola riders park? You are removing, or planning to remove a parking lot at Union Station.

Response PH89-1 Parking is not required to be analyzed under CEQA or the Transportation Assessment Guidelines (“TAG”). Nevertheless, the Parking Study was prepared to provide additional information to the community and decision makers about existing parking conditions and the proposed Project’s potential to effect parking conditions around the Alameda Station and Chinatown/State Park Station. As recommended in the Parking Study, the Project Sponsor will prepare, in collaboration with the City, and with robust feedback from community stakeholders, a parking management plan. The City would implement any on-street parking management strategies identified. Refer to Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of Metro’s LAUS Forecourt and Esplanade Improvements Project, which is not part of the proposed Project. Metro’s planned Forecourt would include repurposing the existing northwestern parking lot at LAUS into a pedestrian forecourt and gathering space.

Comment PH89-2 Also, please address the Writ of Mandate from the California Endowment. Please address Metro using the office of Extraordinary Innovation to get around publicly sharing information.

Response PH89-2 This comment raises issues that were litigated and decided in *The California Endowment v. Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority*, Case No. 22STCP01030 (Jan. 9, 2023, Order Denying Petition for Writ of Mandate). There, the Los Angeles Superior Court upheld Metro’s sole source determination for the proposed Project. Refer to Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project’s public outreach and opportunity for public testimony during the Draft EIR public review period. Refer to Appendix A, Scoping Report, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of outreach and community engagement during the Draft EIR scoping period. Metro sought to engage the community in each stage of the environmental review process. Metro engaged the public in decision making for the proposed Project beginning with the public scoping period for the Draft EIR in October 2020 to receive public comment on the proposed Project’s scope of environmental review under CEQA. In June 2021, the Project Sponsor conducted two virtual public outreach meetings. The input from the public, including local community stakeholders, as well as from agencies, organizations, and interested parties, during this period led directly to changes to the proposed Project to incorporate public feedback. The Draft EIR was released on October 17, 2022, for a 60-day public review period, which Metro extended an additional 30 days for a 90-

day public review period ending on January 17, 2023. Eight public meetings were held immediately preceding, during, and immediately after the Draft EIR public review period, with four held in-person in the Project area at Los Angeles Union Station and Cathedral High School, and four held virtually via Zoom webinar. Project materials and information were provided at both the in-person meetings and on Metro's website in English, Spanish, Chinese (Traditional), and Chinese (Simplified). Interpretation was provided in English, Spanish, Mandarin, and Cantonese during the eight public meetings, with interpretation provided in Taishanese during the final two public meetings.

Comment PH89-3 Finally, how will this be funded?

Response PH89-3 This comment is noted and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project.

Public Hearing Comment PH90 - Robert Villagomez

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH90

Comment PH90-1 No Gondola! Chinatown for the people. This will displace more people and is a big waste of space, energy, and money.

How can development into a natural park be good for the environment by disrupting animal migration and their peace, damaging our biodiversity that is losing here and more space.

Response PH90-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not displace housing or prevent planned housing. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. As discussed in Sections 3.01, Aesthetics, 3.04, Biological Resources, 3.05, Cultural Resources, 3.06, Energy, 3.07, Geology and Soils, 3.09, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, 3.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, 3.11, Land Use and Planning, 3.13, Noise, 3.15, Public Services, 3.16, Parks and Recreational Facilities, 3.17, Transportation, 3.18, Tribal Cultural Resources, 3.19, Utilities and Service Systems, 3.20, Wildfire, and 5.0, Other CEQA Considerations, the proposed Project would have less than significant operational impacts, including to Los Angeles State Historic Park. Additionally, refer to Topical Response M, Comparable Urban Aerial Transit Systems, discussing how, like the proposed Project, comparable aerial transit systems in cities around the world are integrated with their surrounding urban environments. In particular, comparable aerial transit systems in other locations demonstrate that such systems can operate safely, efficiently, and in concert with nearby residential and open space uses, including parks and other recreational facilities.

Comment PH90-2 Displacement is death. City should protect people.

Response PH90-2 Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not exacerbate gentrification or result in displacement of residents in the surrounding neighborhoods and is consistent with Metro's considerations regarding gentrification and displacement.

Public Hearing Comment PH91 – Aaron Thomas

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH91

Comment PH91-1 AS A RESIDENT WHO LIVES ON NORTH BROADWAY (IN THE PROJECT AREA) I HAVE CONCERNS ON THE FOLLOWING TOPICS:

Response PH91-1 This comment provides a general introduction to the comments raised in this letter. Responses to the comments contained in this letter are provided below in Responses PH91-2 through PH91-11.

Comment PH91-2 AESTHETICS – WILL HAVE A NEGATIVE IMPACT ON THE VIEWSCAPE OF THE AREA

Response PH91-2 Refer to Section 3.01, Aesthetics, and Appendix C, Visual Impact Assessment, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the aesthetic impacts of the proposed Project, including impacts to the viewshed, which would be less than significant. Regarding scenic vistas specific to the North Broadway area identified by this commenter, as analyzed in the Draft EIR, there are no designated scenic vistas present in the area of potential impact. However, the Project area provides views that are considered scenic by certain viewers, including views of the downtown Los Angeles skyline, LAUS, El Pueblo, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Arroyo Seco Parkway, Dodger Stadium, and the mountains that make up the Transverse Ranges, including the San Gabriel and San Bernardino Mountains. As discussed in Section 3.01, Aesthetics, and Appendix C, Visual Impact Assessment, views considered to be scenic locally would not be substantially impacted. Therefore, the proposed Project would not block any designated scenic views, alter a designated scenic area, or block panoramic views, and impacts to scenic or panoramic views would be less than significant.

Comment PH91-3 AIR QUALITY – CONSTRUCTION OF THE PROJECT WILL WORSEN THE ALREADY POOR AIR QUALITY BY INCREASING TRUCK/VEHICLE IDLING

Response PH91-3 The Draft EIR addressed air quality in Section 3.03 Air Quality with supporting data provided in Appendix D, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, of the Draft EIR. As discussed on page 3.03-21 through 3.03-22 and page 3.03-24, construction activities would not exceed applicable mass emissions or localized thresholds on worst-case construction days and air quality impacts would be less than significant.

Comment PH91-4 BIOLOGICAL – PROJECT WILL IMPACT WILDLIFE THAT USE ADJACENT NATURAL OPEN SPACE, INCLUDING THE L.A. RIVER

Response PH91-4 As discussed in Section 3.04, Biological Resources, of the Draft EIR, under CEQA, a project would have a substantial impact on biological resources if it would have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species. Further, as

discussed in Section 3.04, with supporting evidence provided in Appendix E, Biological Resources Assessment, of the Draft EIR, and as confirmed in Appendix G, Supplemental Biological Resources Report, of this Final EIR, construction of the proposed Project would result in less than significant impacts to special-status species with mitigation, and operation of the proposed Project would result in less than significant impacts to special-status species. The proposed Project BSA has been completely disturbed during urban development and consists of roadways, sidewalks, buildings, and rail tracks. Therefore, habitats preferred by special-status wildlife species are not present within the BSA. The Los Angeles River, which is contained in a concrete channel through the downtown Los Angeles area, is approximately 0.4 to 0.6 mile east of the BSA, and serves as a wildlife movement corridor through the heavily urbanized downtown area; however, it occurs outside the BSA. Additionally, there are no wildlife movement corridors between the BSA and the river that could promote movement between areas. As such, the proposed Project would not impact the Los Angeles River, and would not impact any special-status species that may utilize the Los Angeles River.

Comment PH91-5 CULTURAL – PROJECT WILL DISTURB HISTORIC AND CULTURAL ELEMENTS SUCH AS THE ZANJA MADRE AND NATIVE SITES

Response PH91-5 The Draft EIR fully analyzed and addressed the proposed Project’s potential impacts to cultural resources in Section 3.05, Cultural Resources, with supporting data provided in Appendix F, Archaeological and Paleontological Resources Assessment for the Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit Project, and Appendix G, Historical Resource Technical Report for the Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit Project (HRTR). As discussed in Section 3.05, the Draft EIR’s analysis concludes that all potential impacts related to historical resources would be less than significant, and all potential impacts related to archaeological resources would be either less than significant or reduced to less than significant with mitigation, including impacts to the Zanja Madre.

Comment PH91-6 NOISE – PROJECT CONSTRUCTION WILL CREATE MORE NOISE IN SURROUNDING NEIGHBORHOODS INCLUDING THE STATE PARK

Response PH91-6 Refer to Section 3.13, Noise, and Appendix M, Noise and Vibration Technical Report, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the construction noise impacts from the proposed Project. Construction noise impacts associated with the proposed Project were analyzed in the Draft EIR both for noise from on-site construction activities, meaning the noise from construction activities at each station, tower, and junction, and for off-site construction noise. Tables 3.13-17 and 3.13-18 on pages 3.13-35 to 3.13-45 of Section 3.13, Noise, of the Draft EIR, show the locations where on-site construction noise impacts would occur during each phase of construction of the proposed Project, based on the L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide and FTA analysis methods. As detailed therein, on-site construction related noise impacts would be significant and unavoidable even with implementation of mitigation. Mitigation Measure NOI-A would be implemented during construction of the proposed Project, requiring a

Construction Noise Management Plan to minimize construction-related noise impacts to off-site noise-sensitive receptors, which would include the construction noise barriers. As demonstrated on Table 3.13-21 and explained on pages 3.13-51 to 3.13-52 of Section 3.13, Noise, of the Draft EIR, off-site construction traffic noise impacts would be less than significant during all phase of construction of the proposed Project. Refer to Section 2.08, Construction, in Section 2.0, Project Description, and Appendix B, Construction Assumptions, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the duration of construction for each component of the proposed Project.

Comment PH91-7 PARKS – PROJECT WILL IMPACT THE USE OF AND AESTHETICS OF THE LA STATE HISTORIC PARK (WHICH WAS CREATED BY AND FOR THE COMMUNITY)

Response PH91-7 Metro and the Project Sponsor acknowledge the more than 20 years of effort the community undertook to convert the closed rail yard at River Station to what is now the Los Angeles State Historic Park. Refer to Section 3.01, Aesthetics, and Appendix C, Visual Impact Assessment, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the aesthetic impacts of the proposed Project, which would be less than significant. As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, Section 3.16, Parks and Recreational Facilities, and Section 5.0, Other CEQA Considerations, of the Draft EIR, the Chinatown/State Park Station would have a footprint of 2,195 square feet in the Los Angeles State Historic Park (~.1% of the total 32-acre park), and the station canopy would have an overhang of 9,320 square feet over the park. The proposed Project alignment crosses over the westernmost edge of the Los Angeles State Historic Park, adjacent to the existing Metro L Line (Gold) and the associated overhead catenary system. The proposed Project's required aerial clearance would be located above approximately 59,470 square feet of the total 32-acre park, plus an Additional Separation Buffer. With the required clearances and the height at which the cabins would cross over the Los Angeles State Historic Park, the ability to use the vast majority of the Park for kite flying, special events (e.g., concerts, craft fairs, partnership events, 5K/10K runs, workshops, cultural festivals, and the farmers' market), and other passive recreational opportunities (e.g., picnicking, jogging, walking, and informal play) would not be affected by the proposed Project. Refer to Response S2-4 for additional discussion regarding the ability of uses to continue at the Park.

Comment PH91-8 POPULATION/HOUSING – THIS PROJECT MAY BE INTENDED TO FACILITATE THE FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF THE PARKING LOTS AT DODGER STADIUM, WHICH ARE OWNED BY FRANK MCCOURT.

Response PH91-8 Refer to Topical Response G, No Improper Project Segmentation: The Proposed Project Is Intended to Create a Transit Connection from Metro's Union Station Transportation Hub via an Aerial Gondola System to the Dodger Stadium Property for a discussion of how the proposed Project solely proposes an aerial gondola system. The proposed Project does not include other development, and neither the Project Sponsor nor any other applicant has applied for other development unrelated to the existing stadium uses on the Dodger Stadium property. Refer to Topical Response L,

Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project.

Comment PH91-9 THIS USE OF PUBLIC FUNDS TO SUPPORT A PRIVATE INTEREST AT THE EXPENSE OF THE LONG TERM SUSTAINABILITY OF THE EXISTING LOCAL COMMUNITY IS UNACCEPTABLE.

Response PH91-9 Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities, including but not limited to sustainability features and open space enhancements, the Community Access Plan for fares, access to parks, mobility hubs, signage, utilization of local artists for site specific artwork at each station reflective of the unique neighborhood culture, design of each component of the proposed Project to complement and reflect the unique character of the surrounding neighborhood, the Business and Community Support Program during construction, and benefits to local businesses along the proposed Project alignment. The Project Sponsor would convene stakeholder groups to coordinate on issues related to proposed Project features.

Comment PH91-10 THE MARKET RATE HOUSING AND COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT INTENDED FOR THE DODGER STADIUM PARKING LOTS WOULD CERTAINLY LEAD TO THE DISPLACEMENT OF THOUSANDS OF LOCAL RESIDENTS DUE TO INCREASE RENT AND PROPERTY VALUES. IT WOULD EFFECTIVELY BE A REPEAT OF THE CHAVEZ RAVINE TRAGEDY THAT PRECEDED THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE STADIUM.

Response PH91-10 Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not exacerbate gentrification or result in displacement of residents in the surrounding neighborhoods and is consistent with Metro's considerations regarding gentrification and displacement. Refer to Refer to Topical Response G, No Improper Project Segmentation: The Proposed Project Is Intended to Create a Transit Connection from Metro's Union Station Transportation Hub via an Aerial Gondola System to the Dodger Stadium Property, for discussion of how the proposed Project solely proposes

an aerial gondola system. The proposed Project does not include other development, and neither the Project Sponsor nor any other applicant has applied for other development unrelated to the existing stadium uses on the Dodger Stadium property. Further, the Dodger Stadium property is approved only for Dodger Stadium and ancillary uses and structures as set forth in the Conditional Use Permit for the Dodger Stadium property, with restrictive designations and zoning not consistent with the uses speculated by commenters. Refer to Section 5.0, Corrections and Additions, of this Final EIR for a discussion of Chavez Ravine.

Comment PH91-11 THAT THE INTENTIONS OF THE DEVELOPERS ARE NOT BEING CONSIDERED IN THIS EIR SHOWS THE DISHONEST AND MALICIOUS NATURE OF THIS PROCESS AND IT SHOULD BE DISCREDITED. I DEMAND THAT THE FUTURE USE AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE DODGER STADIUM PARKING LOT PROPERTIES (THE REAL OBJECTIVE OF THE GONDOLA) BE STUDIED AND CHALLENGED IN THIS EIR.

Response PH91-11 Refer to Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, for a description of the proposed Project, an aerial gondola system intended to be the first permanent transit connection to one of the region's most visited venues. Refer to Response PH91-10 for discussion of how the proposed Project solely proposes an aerial gondola system.

Public Hearing Comment PH92 – Darlene Escobedo

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH92

Comment PH92-1 I am writing the comment to oppose the construction of the Gondala project.

Response PH92-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Comment PH92-2 I am concerned about the impact on housing affordability in the area and potential displacement of long time residents. This does not appear to be neither an efficient or viable effort to effectively address transportation needs in the area.

Response PH92-2 Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not exacerbate gentrification or result in displacement of residents in the surrounding neighborhoods and is consistent with Metro's considerations regarding gentrification and displacement. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at LAUS, Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Dodger Stadium draws large regional crowds, with approximately 100 baseball games and other events each year, but there are no permanent transit connections to the venue. The vast majority of visitors drive their personal vehicles to access the venue. These vehicles create congestion on the surface streets leading up to and around Dodger Stadium, including Sunset Boulevard/Cesar E. Chavez from LAUS and throughout the surrounding communities. Given the capacity of the proposed Project's system, approximately 20 percent of the fans could take aerial transit connected to Metro's regional transit system. This would reduce vehicular congestion in and around Dodger Stadium, on neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways during game and special event days. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan. Refer to Section 2.1, Overview of the Project, of the Draft EIR, discussing how the proposed Project would operate daily to serve existing residents, workers, park users, and visitors to Los Angeles. As discussed on page 2-42, in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the proposed Project would provide service to all pre-season, regular season, and post-season Los Angeles Dodger games and any special events (e.g., concerts, the Los

Angeles Marathon) at the Dodger Stadium property. The proposed Project would also provide service to events at the Los Angeles State Historic Park.

Comment PH92-3 The parking study does not seem to adequately address the impact increased demand would have on locally residentially zoned areas. Incentivizing businesses to provide parking packages appears like an appeal to further alienate and endanger the longevity of the historic businesses already existing that actually serve the local community.

Response PH92-3 Parking is not required to be analyzed under CEQA or the Transportation Assessment Guidelines (“TAG”). Nevertheless, the Parking Study was prepared to provide additional information to the community and decision makers about existing parking conditions and the proposed Project’s potential to effect parking conditions around the Alameda Station and Chinatown/State Park Station. As recommended in the Parking Study, the Project Sponsor will prepare, in collaboration with the City, and with robust feedback from community stakeholders, a parking management plan. The City would implement any on-street parking management strategies identified. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the proposed Project would not displace businesses and represents an opportunity for additional visitors along the proposed Project alignment, creating economic opportunities for local businesses, including shops and restaurants, through potential partnerships that drive customers to businesses along the alignment, which, consequently, adds revenues to these small businesses in the communities the proposed Project hopes to serve. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of how during construction, the Project Sponsor would create a Business and Community Support Program to assist local businesses affected by proposed Project construction activities. The proposed Project would provide numerous benefits to local businesses in El Pueblo, Chinatown, and other areas along the proposed Project alignment, including through potential partnerships with these businesses as well as by providing an accessible and affordable mobility option for employees and area residents.

Public Hearing Comment PH93 – Katty Rodriguez

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH93

Comment PH93-1 Public land should be used for public good! The LA State Historic Park and the parcels slated for the proposed towers are all public land.

Response PH93-1 This comment is noted and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, Section 3.16, Parks and Recreational Facilities, and Section 5.0, Other CEQA Considerations, of the Draft EIR, the Chinatown/State Park Station would have a footprint of 2,195 square feet in the Los Angeles State Historic Park (~.1% of the total 32-acre park), and the station canopy would have an overhang of 9,320 square feet over the park. The proposed Project alignment crosses over the westernmost edge of the Los Angeles State Historic Park, adjacent to the existing Metro L Line (Gold) and the associated overhead catenary system. The proposed Project's required aerial clearance would be located above approximately 59,470 square feet of the total 32-acre park, plus an Additional Separation Buffer. With the required clearances and the height at which the cabins would cross over the Los Angeles State Historic Park, the ability to use the vast majority of the Park for kite flying, special events (e.g., concerts, craft fairs, partnership events, 5K/10K runs, workshops, cultural festivals, and the farmers' market), and other passive recreational opportunities (e.g., picnicking, jogging, walking, and informal play) would not be affected by the proposed Project. Refer to Response S2-4 for additional discussion regarding the ability of uses to continue at the Park. Through collaboration with State Parks, the proposed Project has been designed to provide additional benefits to the Los Angeles State Historic Park, including pedestrian improvements between Metro's L Line (Gold) and the park, and integration of the Chinatown/State Park Station into the southern boundary of the park with hardscape and landscape enhancements, a mobility hub, and other park amenities including concessions, restrooms, and a breezeway connecting the concessions and restrooms. Refer to Topical Response F, Los Angeles State Historic Park, for a discussion of the legal framework that allows the California Department of Parks and Recreation to permit the proposed Project's use of Los Angeles State Historic Park.

Comment PH93-2 Private interest should not be coming into the neighborhood to profit off of us. Chinatown is in an affordability crisis. This is a working poor community that does not need the gondola.

Response PH93-2 Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the Draft EIR addresses environmental justice and how the proposed Project supports Metro's goal of prioritizing equity opportunities. The proposed Project is designed to extend affordable, regional access and mobility options to the communities adjacent to the

proposed Project alignment. Public outreach for the proposed Project was designed with environmental justice principles in mind. The proposed Project would not preclude development of uses including housing, grocery stores, and/or healthcare facilities in the surrounding communities, and would itself address a need for a permanent transit connection to one of the region's most visited venues and would alleviate existing congestion on surrounding neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways, thereby reducing associated air pollution in an area disproportionately burdened by pollution, and improving safety. The proposed Project is also designed to be ADA compliant. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project.

Public Hearing Comment PH94 – Helen Villagomez

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH94

Comment PH94-1 I oppose the Gondola, it doesn't provide a true community service. It is not public transportation.

Fee to ride is absurd. Waste of \$.

CDI – should not support and public funds should not be utilized.

Don't threaten the State Historic Park w/ the construction of this thing.

Response PH94-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at LAUS, Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Dodger Stadium draws large regional crowds, with approximately 100 baseball games and other events each year, but there are no permanent transit connections to the venue. The vast majority of visitors drive their personal vehicles to access the venue. These vehicles create congestion on the surface streets leading up to and around Dodger Stadium, including Sunset Boulevard/Cesar E. Chavez from LAUS and throughout the surrounding communities. Given the capacity of the proposed Project's system, approximately 20 percent of the fans could take aerial transit connected to Metro's regional transit system. This would reduce vehicular congestion in and around Dodger Stadium, on neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways during game and special event days. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project. Refer to Section 2.0, Project Description, Section 3.16, Parks and Recreational Facilities, and Section 5.0, Other CEQA Considerations, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the footprint of the proposed Project in the Los Angeles State Historic Park. With the small footprint of the proposed

Project's Chinatown/State Park Station, and the required clearances and the height at which the cabins would cross over the Park, the ability to use the vast majority of the Park would not be affected by the proposed Project. Refer to Response S2-4 for additional discussion regarding the ability of uses to continue at the park.

Public Hearing Comment PH95 - Elva Yanez

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH95

Comment PH95-1 I am a former LA State Parks + Recreation Commission. The LA State Historic Park was the result of one of the foremost environmental justice campaigns in LA history.

Response PH95-1 Metro and the Project Sponsor acknowledge the more than 20 years of effort the community undertook to convert the closed rail yard at River Station to what is now the Los Angeles State Historic Park.

Comment PH95-2 The effort to build the park involved an environmental impact report that DID NOT cover the construction of a gondola hence the gondola is a CEQA violation. There were 65 public meetings in advance of construction of the park – none which involved discussion or mention of the gondola. Again, this is a violation of CEQA – the state’s primary environmental quality law. It would be a travesty if the gondola is built over LA State Historic Park.

Response PH95-2 The Draft EIR includes 7,877 pages of detailed analysis from experts in their respective fields, intended to provide the public and decision makers the information that they need to meaningfully consider the proposed Project’s potential environmental impacts, as well as a shorter executive summary that explains the analysis and conclusions in clean and simple language. The Draft EIR includes the potential effects associated with construction and operation of the proposed Project, including the portion in the Los Angeles State Historic Park. Detailed analysis is provided in Chapter 3.0, Environmental Impact Analysis. Accordingly, the Draft EIR more than adequately complies with CEQA’s requirements for a Draft EIR. As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, Section 3.16, Parks and Recreational Facilities, and Section 5.0, Other CEQA Considerations, of the Draft EIR, the Chinatown/State Park Station would have a footprint of 2,195 square feet in the Los Angeles State Historic Park (~.1% of the total 32-acre park), and the station canopy would have an overhang of 9,320 square feet over the park. The proposed Project alignment crosses over the westernmost edge of the Los Angeles State Historic Park, adjacent to the existing Metro L Line (Gold) and the associated overhead catenary system. The proposed Project’s required aerial clearance would be located above approximately 59,470 square feet of the total 32-acre park, plus an Additional Separation Buffer. With the required clearances and the height at which the cabins would cross over the Los Angeles State Historic Park, the ability to use the vast majority of the Park for kite flying, special events (e.g., concerts, craft fairs, partnership events, 5K/10K runs, workshops, cultural festivals, and the farmers’ market), and other passive recreational opportunities (e.g., picnicking, jogging, walking, and informal play) would not be affected by the proposed Project. Refer to Response S2-4 for additional discussion regarding the ability of uses to continue at the park. Refer to Topical

Response F, Los Angeles State Historic Park, for a discussion of the legal framework that allows the California Department of Parks and Recreation to permit the proposed Project's use of Los Angeles State Historic Park. Refer to Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's public outreach and opportunity for public testimony during the Draft EIR public review period. Refer to Appendix A, Scoping Report, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of outreach and community engagement during the Draft EIR scoping period.

Public Hearing Comment PH96 – Eugene Pesileon

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH96

Comment PH96-1 We don't need a Gandola. We don't need more people displaced from their homes & more money spent on projects that displace more people out of their homes when we have so many countless issues that are more pressing & that demand our attention & resources. This project would mean more money spent on projects that, quite frankly, the residents of this city do not need. We need more money going into housing, homelessness, education, transportation, & infrastructure – what we don't need is a vanity project for the McCourt family that doesn't help anyone other than them & their teams. DO NOT SUPPORT & BUILD THIS PROJECT!

Response PH96-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not displace housing or prevent planned housing. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the proposed Project would not preclude development of uses including housing, grocery stores, and/or healthcare facilities in the surrounding communities, and would itself address a need for a permanent transit connection to one of the region's most visited venues, and would benefit the surrounding community by alleviating existing congestion on surrounding neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways, thereby reducing associated air pollution and improving safety. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project.

Public Hearing Comment PH97 – Eleanor Bray

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH97

Comment PH97-1 I have called Los Angeles my home for 7 years. I am deeply concerned by the LA ART Gondola Project. The problems this gondola will “solve” does nothing to actually solve them.

Response PH97-1 Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. Refer to Section 3.03, Air Quality, Section 3.08, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 3.17, Transportation, Appendix D, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project’s ability to reduce vehicular travel, to improve air quality through reduced emissions, and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through reduced vehicular travel.

Comment PH97-2 There has been no community input, it will waste taxpayer \$\$, and cause more gentrification. We cannot allow billionaires to use LA as their play place.

Response PH97-2 Refer to Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project’s public outreach and opportunity for public testimony during the Draft EIR public review period. Refer to Appendix A, Scoping Report, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of outreach and community engagement during the Draft EIR scoping period. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project’s capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project’s capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not exacerbate gentrification or result in displacement of residents in the surrounding neighborhoods and is consistent with Metro’s considerations regarding gentrification and displacement. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project.

Public Hearing Comment PH98 – Luke Braidizzle

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH98

Comment PH98-1 Gondola seems neat but LA needs some real public transit

Response PH98-1 Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at LAUS, Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Dodger Stadium draws large regional crowds, with approximately 100 baseball games and other events each year, but there are no permanent transit connections to the venue. The vast majority of visitors drive their personal vehicles to access the venue. These vehicles create congestion on the surface streets leading up to and around Dodger Stadium, including Sunset Boulevard/Cesar E. Chavez from LAUS and throughout the surrounding communities. Given the capacity of the proposed Project's system, approximately 20 percent of the fans could take aerial transit connected to Metro's regional transit system. This would reduce vehicular congestion in and around Dodger Stadium, on neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways during game and special event days. Refer to Section 2.1, Overview of the Project, of the Draft EIR, discussing how the proposed Project would operate daily to serve existing residents, workers, park users, and visitors to Los Angeles. As discussed on page 2-42, in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the proposed Project would provide service to all pre-season, regular season, and post-season Los Angeles Dodger games and any special events (e.g., concerts, the Los Angeles Marathon) at the Dodger Stadium property. The proposed Project would also provide service to events at the Los Angeles State Historic Park. In addition to providing service on game and special event days at Dodger Stadium and events at the Los Angeles State Historic Park, it is anticipated that the proposed Project would also provide daily service between 6:00am to 12:00am, for the surrounding communities, including Chinatown, Mission Junction, Elysian Park, Solano Canyon, and the Los Angeles State Historic Park. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan.

Public Hearing Comment PH99 - Huang Li Wei

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH99

Comment PH99-1 We are strongly opposed to the gondola project over Chinatown. The gondola does not provide any benefits when passing through Chinatown. It's a common nuisance to Chinatown. It's all harm but no benefit. It limits Chinatown's future development. I'm a Chinatown resident. Some people just want to ride the gondola to the mountain park, but it doesn't need to pass over Chinatown.

Response PH99-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefit to the surrounding community, including but not limited to sustainability features and open space enhancements, the Community Access Plan for fares, access to parks, mobility hubs, signage, utilization of local artists for site specific artwork at each station reflective of the unique neighborhood culture, design of each component of the proposed Project to complement and reflect the unique character of the surrounding neighborhood, the Business and Community Support Program during construction, and benefits to local businesses along the proposed Project alignment. The Project Sponsor would convene stakeholder groups to coordinate on issues related to proposed Project features. Additionally, refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the proposed Project would not preclude development of uses including housing, grocery stores, and/or healthcare facilities in the surrounding communities, and would itself address a need for a permanent transit connection to one of the region's most visited venues, and would benefit the surrounding community by alleviating existing congestion on surrounding neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways, thereby reducing associated air pollution and improving safety.

Public Hearing Comment PH100 - Nazaro Arreola

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH100

Comment PH100-1 I am a resident of Lincoln Heights and I am in favor. This is because I have a business and I think this would benefit all of us.

Response PH100-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Public Hearing Comment PH101 – No Name Given

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH101

Comment PH101-1 I believe that this can have a positive impact for the community. Based off what I have heard this feels like it can be a positive impact for our community. It can help the environment too!

Response PH101-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Public Hearing Comment PH102 – Chance Menendez

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH102

Comment PH102-1 I believe that to have better public transport we need to accept more forms of it and not supporting the gondola because its not bikes or sidewalks is misguided. I support the gondola and believe it will help the city and public transportation.

Response PH102-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Public Hearing Comment PH103 - Zhu Yue Li

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH103

Comment PH103-1 I object to certain financial groups building a gondola above Chinatown, seeking to occupy the space above. If it is done, Chinatown will lose all possibilities of future development. It has no benefit to Chinatown. I strongly oppose it.

Response PH103-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the proposed Project would not preclude development of uses including housing, grocery stores, and/or healthcare facilities in the surrounding communities, and would itself address a need for a permanent transit connection to one of the region's most visited venues, and would benefit the surrounding community by alleviating existing congestion on surrounding neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways, thereby reducing associated air pollution and improving safety. Additionally, refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the potential added benefits from the proposed Project, including potential partnerships with and benefits to local businesses in Chinatown.

Public Hearing Comment PH104 - Wei Lian Tan

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH104

Comment PH104-1 I strongly oppose building a gondola above Chinatown.

Response PH104-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Public Hearing Comment PH105 – Bin Xie

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH105

Comment PH105-1 We strongly oppose certain financial groups building a gondola above Chinatown, seeking to occupy the space above. If it is done, Chinatown will lose all possibilities of future development. It has no benefit to Chinatown. We strongly oppose it.

Response PH105-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the proposed Project would not preclude development of uses including housing, grocery stores, and/or healthcare facilities in the surrounding communities, and would itself address a need for a permanent transit connection to one of the region's most visited venues, and would benefit the surrounding community by alleviating existing congestion on surrounding neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways, thereby reducing associated air pollution and improving safety. Additionally, refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities, including potential partnerships with and benefits to local businesses in Chinatown.

Public Hearing Comment PH106 - Wu Coi Xia

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH106

Comment PH106-1 I strongly oppose building a gondola above Chinatown. It has no benefit to Chinatown.

Response PH106-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the proposed Project would itself address a need for a permanent transit connection to one of the region's most visited venues, and would benefit the surrounding community by alleviating existing congestion on surrounding neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways, thereby reducing associated air pollution and improving safety. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the potential added benefits from the proposed Project, including potential partnerships with and benefits to local businesses in Chinatown.

Public Hearing Comment PH107 - Qi Guang Chen

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH107

Comment PH107-1 We are strongly opposed to the gondola project in Chinatown. It will occupy Chinatown property. It does not have any economic development benefit. I hope they can accept our feedback.

Response PH107-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the proposed Project would not preclude development of uses including housing, grocery stores, and/or healthcare facilities in the surrounding communities, and would itself address a need for a permanent transit connection to one of the region's most visited venues, and would benefit the surrounding community by alleviating existing congestion on surrounding neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways, thereby reducing associated air pollution and improving safety. Additionally, refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the potential added benefits from the proposed Project, including potential partnerships with and benefits to local businesses in Chinatown. As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the proposed Project creates a first/last mile transit link for residents and businesses along the proposed Project alignment while unifying and connecting communities through transit mobility access. This new mode of transportation will expand rider access to the regional transit system by attracting new visitors including Dodgers fans, and represents an opportunity for additional visitors along the proposed Project alignment, creating economic opportunities for local businesses, including shops and restaurants, through potential partnerships that drive customers to businesses along the alignment, which, consequently, adds revenues to these small businesses in the communities the proposed Project hopes to serve.

Public Hearing Comment PH108 - Wei An Jhu Yen

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH108

Comment PH108-1 We are strongly opposed to the gondola project in Chinatown. It will occupy Chinatown property. It does not have any economic development benefit. I hope they can accept our feedback.

Response PH108-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the proposed Project would not preclude development of uses including housing, grocery stores, and/or healthcare facilities in the surrounding communities, and would itself address a need for a permanent transit connection to one of the region's most visited venues, and would benefit the surrounding community by alleviating existing congestion on surrounding neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways, thereby reducing associated air pollution and improving safety. Additionally, refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the potential added benefits from the proposed Project, including potential partnerships with and benefits to local businesses in Chinatown. As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, and Topical Response C, Project Features, the proposed Project creates a first/last mile transit link for residents and businesses along the proposed Project alignment while unifying and connecting communities through transit mobility access. This new mode of transportation will expand rider access to the regional transit system by attracting new visitors including Dodgers fans, and represents an opportunity for additional visitors along the proposed Project alignment, creating economic opportunities for local businesses, including shops and restaurants, through potential partnerships that drive customers to businesses along the alignment, which, consequently, adds revenues to these small businesses in the communities the proposed Project hopes to serve.

Public Hearing Comment PH109 - Caritina Caro

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH109

Comment PH109-1 We would like the gondola to be built because there is not enough parking and people come from other places, so we, the people who live here, cannot find parking.

We also like it because it will provide a beautiful view, which will look very nice.

Response PH109-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Public Hearing Comment PH110 – Grace Bryant

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH110

Comment PH110-1 THIS PROJECT IS CLEARLY A VANITY PROJECT FOR THE CITY AND A SCHEME BY FRANK MCCOURT. ANY SUGGESTION THAT THIS GONDOLA SERVES AS AN EXPANSION OF PUBLIC TRANSIT IS A LIE. THE AREA SERVED BY THIS GONDOLA IS MISSING SIDEWALKS, BIKE LANES, & BUS SERVICE IN ANY SUFFICIENT CAPACITY. LA METRO SHOULD INVEST IN ITS PUBLIC INFRASTRUCTURE & ADVOCATE FOR THE PEOPLE OF LA, AGAINST MILLION/BILLIONAIRES LIKE FRANK MCCOURT. THIS IS A SHAME.

Response PH110-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response A, SB 44, for discussion of how the proposed Project is public transportation because it will be open to the general public for service at regular, scheduled operating times, operating daily to serve existing residents, workers, park users, and visitors to Los Angeles. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at Los Angeles Union Station (LAUS), Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan. As discussed in Topical Response C, Project Features, the proposed Project would provide active transportation connectivity along the proposed Project alignment through pedestrian access enhancements and first/last mile multi-modal options at the mobility hubs proposed for the Chinatown/State Park Station and the Dodger Stadium Station. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project.

Public Hearing Comment PH111 - Mary Areola

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH111

Comment PH111-1 I would like this project because it would help parking availability, because sometimes I can't find parking.

Response PH111-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Public Hearing Comment PH112 - Luis Herrera

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH112

Comment PH112-1 This is a very engaging project and it looks very nice. But I feel that there is no need to carry out this project because it looks like it is going to benefit the Dodger Stadium only. I think that this project is just an attraction for touristic purposes.

Response PH112-1 Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at LAUS, Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/ State Park Station. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the proposed Project is designed to extend affordable, regional access and mobility options to the communities adjacent to the proposed Project alignment, providing connections to Metro's growing regional public transit system. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan. Refer to Section 2.1, Overview of the Project, of the Draft EIR, discussing how the proposed Project would operate daily to serve existing residents, workers, park users, and visitors to Los Angeles. As discussed on page 2-42, in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the proposed Project would provide service to all pre-season, regular season, and post-season Los Angeles Dodger games and any special events (e.g., concerts, the Los Angeles Marathon) at the Dodger Stadium property. The proposed Project would also provide service to events at the Los Angeles State Historic Park. Additionally, refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities including but not limited to sustainability features and open space enhancements, the Community Access Plan for fares, access to parks, mobility hubs, signage, utilization of local artists for site specific artwork at each station reflective of the unique neighborhood culture, design of each component of the proposed Project to complement and reflect the unique character of the surrounding neighborhood, the Business and Community Support Program during construction, and benefits to local businesses along the proposed Project alignment. The Project Sponsor would convene stakeholder groups to coordinate on issues related to proposed Project features.

Public Hearing Comment PH113 - Yi H

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH113

Comment PH113-1 Object.

Response PH113-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Public Hearing Comment PH114 - Amy Tang

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH114

Comment PH114-1 I support this. Gondola transit will provide citizens with convenience, grow LA's economy, and create a tourism attraction for LA.

Response PH114-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Public Hearing Comment PH115 - Chiu

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH115**Comment PH115-1 Object**

Response PH115-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Public Hearing Comment PH116 - H Wu

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH116**Comment PH116-1 Object**

Response PH116-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Public Hearing Comment PH117 – Liam Ncc

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH117**Comment PH117-1 Object**

Response PH117-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Public Hearing Comment PH118 - Jesus Leija

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH118

Comment PH118-1 I think the community needs to be listened to, and a more precise Benefit and Impact Evaluation needs to be provided. Thank you.

Response PH118-1 Refer to Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's public outreach and opportunity for public testimony during the Draft EIR public review period. Refer to Appendix A, Scoping Report, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of outreach and community engagement during the Draft EIR scoping period. Metro sought to engage the community in each stage of the environmental review process. Metro engaged the public in decision making for the proposed Project beginning with the public scoping period for the Draft EIR in October 2020 to receive public comment on the proposed Project's scope of environmental review under CEQA. In June 2021, the Project Sponsor conducted two virtual public outreach meetings. The input from the public, including local community stakeholders, as well as from agencies, organizations, and interested parties, during this period led directly to changes to the proposed Project to incorporate public feedback. The Draft EIR was released on October 17, 2022, for a 60-day public review period, which Metro extended an additional 30 days for a 90-day public review period ending on January 17, 2023. Eight public meetings were held immediately preceding, during, and immediately following the Draft EIR public review period, with four held in-person in the Project area at Los Angeles Union Station and Cathedral High School, and four held virtually via Zoom webinar. Project materials and information were provided at both the in-person meetings and on Metro's website in English, Spanish, Chinese (Traditional), and Chinese (Simplified). Interpretation was provided in English, Spanish, Mandarin, and Cantonese during the eight public meetings, with interpretation provided in Taishanese during the final two public meetings. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities, including but not limited to sustainability features and open space enhancements, the Community Access Plan for fares, access to parks, mobility hubs, signage, utilization of local artists for site specific artwork at each station reflective of the unique neighborhood culture, design of each component of the proposed Project to complement and reflect the unique character of the surrounding neighborhood, the Business and Community Support Program during construction, and benefits to local businesses along the proposed Project alignment. The Project Sponsor would convene stakeholder groups to coordinate on issues related to proposed Project features. As discussed in Sections 3.01, Aesthetics, 3.04, Biological Resources, 3.05, Cultural Resources, 3.06, Energy, 3.07, Geology and Soils, 3.09, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, 3.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, 3.11, Land Use and

Planning, 3.13, Noise, 3.15, Public Services, 3.16, Parks and Recreational Facilities, 3.17, Transportation, 3.18, Tribal Cultural Resources, 3.19, Utilities and Service Systems, 3.20, Wildfire, and 5.0, Other CEQA Considerations, the proposed Project would have less than significant operational impacts. The Draft EIR includes 7,877 pages of detailed analysis from experts in their respective fields, intended to provide the public and decision makers the information that they need to meaningfully consider the proposed Project's potential environmental impacts, as well as a shorter executive summary that explains the analysis and conclusions in clean and simple language. Accordingly, the Draft EIR more than adequately complies with CEQA's requirements for a Draft EIR.

Public Hearing Comment PH119 - Zhou

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH119**Comment PH119-1 Object**

Response PH119-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Public Hearing Comment PH120 - Ne Hueng Ho M

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH120**Comment PH120-1 Object**

Response PH120-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Public Hearing Comment PH121 - Kai M Fong

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH121**Comment PH121-1** Oppose the Gondola

Response PH121-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Public Hearing Comment PH122 - Sharon

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH122**Comment PH122-1 Object**

Response PH122-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Public Hearing Comment PH123 – Yun Hoc Thai

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH123**Comment PH123-1** Oppose the Gondola

Response PH123-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Public Hearing Comment PH124 - Tan

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH124

Comment PH124-1 Object.

Response PH124-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Public Hearing Comment PH125 – Li Yi Ye

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH125

Comment PH125-1 I strongly oppose building a gondola above Chinatown, as the construction of suspension cables will definitely affect the development of Chinatown. Thus we strongly oppose it. Object.

Response PH125-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the proposed Project would not preclude development of uses including housing, grocery stores, and/or healthcare facilities in the surrounding communities, and would itself address a need for a permanent transit connection to one of the region’s most visited venues, and would benefit the surrounding community by alleviating existing congestion on surrounding neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways, thereby reducing associated air pollution and improving safety. Refer also to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the potential added benefits from the proposed Project, including potential partnerships with and benefits to local businesses in Chinatown.

Public Hearing Comment PH126 – Xiao

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH126

Comment PH126-1 Object.

Response PH126-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Public Hearing Comment PH127 – Yue Xian Fang

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH127

Comment PH127-1 I strongly oppose building a gondola above Chinatown, as the construction of suspension cables will definitely affect the development of Chinatown. Thus we strongly oppose it. Object.

Response PH127-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the proposed Project would not preclude development of uses including housing, grocery stores, and/or healthcare facilities in the surrounding communities, and would itself address a need for a permanent transit connection to one of the region's most visited venues, and would benefit the surrounding community by alleviating existing congestion on surrounding neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways, thereby reducing associated air pollution and improving safety. Refer to Section 2.5, Proposed Project Alignment and Components, with supporting data provided in Appendix Q, Proposed Alignment Plan and Profile, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of how the proposed Project maximizes alignment along the public ROW and publicly owned property and minimizes aerial rights over private properties. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of how the proposed Project would provide numerous benefits to local businesses in El Pueblo, Chinatown, and other areas along the proposed Project alignment, including through potential partnerships with these businesses as well as by providing an accessible and affordable mobility option for employees and area residents. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the proposed Project would not displace businesses and represents an opportunity for additional visitors along the proposed Project alignment, creating economic opportunities for local businesses, including shops and restaurants, through potential partnerships that drive customers to businesses along the alignment, which, consequently, adds revenues to these small businesses in the communities the proposed Project hopes to serve. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of how during construction, the Project Sponsor would create a Business and Community Support Program to assist local businesses affected by proposed Project construction activities. The proposed Project would provide numerous benefits to local businesses in El Pueblo, Chinatown, and other areas along the proposed Project alignment, including through potential partnerships with these businesses as well as by providing an accessible and affordable mobility option for employees and area residents.

Public Hearing Comment PH128 – Rhio Shen Hu

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH128

Comment PH128-1 I support the gondola project. It will provide citizens with convenience, grow LA's economy, and bring a lot of tourists.

Response PH128-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Public Hearing Comment PH129 – Wei Han Tan

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH129

Comment PH129-1 The gondola will get in the way of Chinatown’s future development.

Response PH129-1 Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the proposed Project would not preclude development of uses including housing, grocery stores, and/or healthcare facilities in the surrounding communities, and would itself address a need for a permanent transit connection to one of the region’s most visited venues, and would benefit the surrounding community by alleviating existing congestion on surrounding neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways, thereby reducing associated air pollution and improving safety. Additionally, refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the potential added benefits from the proposed Project, including potential partnerships with and benefits to local businesses in Chinatown.

Public Hearing Comment PH130 – Illegible Name

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH130

Comment PH130-1 We are strongly opposed to building the gondola in Chinatown. We are strongly opposed to it.

Response PH130-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Public Hearing Comment PH131 – Jennifer Ly

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH131

Comment PH131-1 It is absolute disgrace that this project ever reached this stage. None of the affected communities were ever consulted in any meaningful way.

Response PH131-1 Refer to Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project’s public outreach and opportunity for public testimony during the Draft EIR public review period. Refer to Appendix A, Scoping Report, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of outreach and community engagement during the Draft EIR scoping period. Metro sought to engage the community in each stage of the environmental review process. Metro engaged the public in decision making for the proposed Project beginning with the public scoping period for the Draft EIR in October 2020 to receive public comment on the proposed Project’s scope of environmental review under CEQA. In June 2021, the Project Sponsor conducted two virtual public outreach meetings. The input from the public, including local community stakeholders, as well as from agencies, organizations, and interested parties, during this period led directly to changes to the proposed Project to incorporate public feedback. The Draft EIR was released on October 17, 2022, for a 60-day public review period, which Metro extended an additional 30 days for a 90-day public review period ending on January 17, 2023. Eight public meetings were held immediately preceding, during, and immediately following, the Draft EIR public review period, with four held in-person in the Project area at Los Angeles Union Station and Cathedral High School, and four held virtually via Zoom webinar. Project materials and information were provided at both the in-person meetings and on Metro’s website in English, Spanish, Chinese (Traditional), and Chinese (Simplified). Interpretation was provided in English, Spanish, Mandarin, and Cantonese during the eight public meetings, with interpretation provided in Taishanese during the final two public meetings. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, and Appendix A, Scoping Report, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project team’s outreach efforts to neighborhoods along the proposed Project alignment and the proposed Project’s features to enhance and provide additional benefit to the surrounding communities.

Comment PH131-2 Additionally, the developers have failed to provide important information about this vanity project’s safety, long-term operation costs, and budget.

Response PH131-2 Refer to Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR and Topical Response J, Gondola Design and Operations, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project’s design and operations, including discussion of the safety, privacy, and operations features of the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and

Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project.

Comment PH131-3 Additionally, the environmental impacts of this project are terrible. It does not alleviate traffic nor improve are terrible. It does not alleviate traffic nor improve quality of life of any residents. There are already transit options in place that are more effective than this ridiculous gondola.

Response PH131-3 Refer to Section 3.03, Air Quality, Section 3.08, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 3.17, Transportation, Appendix D, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's ability to reduce vehicular travel, to improve air quality through reduced emissions, and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through reduced vehicular travel. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities, including but not limited to, sustainability features and open space enhancements, the Community Access Plan for fares, access to parks, mobility hubs, signage, utilization of local artists for site specific artwork at each station reflective of the unique neighborhood culture, design of each component of the proposed Project to complement and reflect the unique character of the surrounding neighborhood, the Business and Community Support Program during construction, and benefits to local businesses along the proposed Project alignment. The Project Sponsor would convene stakeholder groups to coordinate on issues related to proposed Project features. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at LAUS, Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Dodger Stadium draws large regional crowds, with approximately 100 baseball games and other events each year, but there are no permanent transit connections to the venue. The opportunities for more mobility choices through improved connections to additional public transit options created by the proposed Project are projected to increase the number of attendees of games or events at Dodger Stadium to ride public transportation.

Comment PH131-4 This is an exercise of greed and corruption. In no way shape or form is the gondola beneficial for Los Angeles. Do not move forward with this project unless you want a legacy of destruction and violence.

Response PH131-4 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to

Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefit to the surrounding community. Refer to Topical Response M, Comparable Urban Aerial Transit Systems, for discussion of comparable aerial transit systems in cities around the world that operate safely, efficiently, and in concert with nearby residential and open space uses.

Public Hearing Comment PH132 – Illegible Name

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH132

Comment PH132-1 We are strongly opposed to the gondola project. Do not allow the gondola to be built over Chinatown.

Response PH132-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Public Hearing Comment PH133 – Shu Ma

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH133

Comment PH133-1 Support the Gondola.

Response PH133-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Public Hearing Comment PH134 – Lucy Petrow

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH134

Comment PH134-1 I am against the Gondola.

The Gondola will not take cars off of the road, N is a waste of taxpayer \$\$\$

The result is gentrification.

I do not support using public resources for private profit.

81 home games – come on! No way.

Response PH134-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Section 3.17, Transportation, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project’s ability to reduce vehicular travel. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project’s capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project’s capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not exacerbate gentrification or result in displacement of residents in the surrounding neighborhoods and is consistent with Metro’s considerations regarding gentrification and displacement. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project. Refer to Section 2.1, Overview of the Project, of the Draft EIR, discussing how the proposed Project would operate daily to serve existing residents, workers, park users, and visitors to Los Angeles. As discussed on page 2-42, in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the proposed Project would provide service to all pre-season, regular season, and post-season Los Angeles Dodger games and any special events (e.g., concerts, the Los Angeles Marathon) at the Dodger Stadium property. The proposed Project would also provide service to events at the Los Angeles State Historic Park. In addition to providing service on game and special event days at Dodger Stadium and events at the Los Angeles State Historic Park, it is anticipated that the proposed Project would also provide daily service between 6:00am to 12:00am, for the surrounding

communities, including Chinatown, Mission Junction, Elysian Park, Solano Canyon, and the Los Angeles State Historic Park. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan.

Public Hearing Comment PH135 – Po Wang Knan

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH135

Comment PH135-1 Support the Gondola.

Response PH135-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Public Hearing Comment PH136 – Chi Jing Lee

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH136

Comment PH136-1 Once the Gondola is built, it will get in the way of Chinatown’s future development.

Response PH136-1 Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the proposed Project would not preclude development of uses including housing, grocery stores, and/or healthcare facilities in the surrounding communities, and would itself address a need for a permanent transit connection to one of the region’s most visited venues, and would benefit the surrounding community by alleviating existing congestion on surrounding neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways, thereby reducing associated air pollution and improving safety. Additionally, refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the potential added benefits from the proposed Project, including potential partnerships with and benefits to local businesses in Chinatown.

Public Hearing Comment PH137 – Yang Luong

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH137

Comment PH137-1 An aerial gondola only benefit the rich. It has no benefits to poor people at all.

Response PH137-1 Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of the proposed Project is designed to extend affordable, regional access and mobility options to the communities adjacent to the proposed Project alignment, providing connections to Metro’s growing regional public transit system. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project’s features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities, including but not limited to sustainability features and open space enhancements, the Community Access Plan for fares, access to parks, mobility hubs, signage, utilization of local artists for site specific artwork at each station reflective of the unique neighborhood culture, design of each component of the proposed Project to complement and reflect the unique character of the surrounding neighborhood, the Business and Community Support Program during construction, and benefits to local businesses along the proposed Project alignment. The Project Sponsor would convene stakeholder groups to coordinate on issues related to proposed Project features.

Public Hearing Comment PH138 – Illegible Name

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH138

Comment PH138-1 Oppose the Gondola in Chinatown. We are strongly opposed to it.

Response PH138-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Public Hearing Comment PH139 – Win Am Tim Hui

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH139

Comment PH139-1 We oppose having this aerial gondola through Chinatown.

Response PH139-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Public Hearing Comment PH140 – Hui Qiang Li

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH140

Comment PH140-1 I strongly oppose building this aerial gondola in Chinatown.

Response PH140-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Public Hearing Comment PH141 – Albert Ho

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH141

Comment PH141-1 This project is a scam that only benefits Frank McCourt.

Response PH141-1 Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefit to the surrounding community. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project.

Comment PH141-2 It will not relieve traffic at all around Dodger Stadium. It will increase overall traffic because this gondola isn't just being built for Dodger games. It will be used year-round for events at the stadium during the off-season, which means that the year-round traffic will increase overall. The community around the stadium will only suffer as a result.

Response PH141-2 The proposed Project's ability to reduce vehicular travel is discussed in Section 3.17, Transportation, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by connecting Los Angeles Union Station (LAUS) to Dodger Stadium via an aerial gondola system, including an intermediate station at the southernmost entrance of the Los Angeles State Historic Park. Dodger Stadium draws large regional crowds, with approximately 100 baseball games and other events each year, but there are no permanent transit connections to the venue. Given the capacity of this system, approximately 20 percent of the fans could take aerial transit connected to Metro's regional transit system. This would reduce vehicular congestion in and around Dodger Stadium, on neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways during game and special event days. The lifetime VMT reduction of the project would be a reduction of 129,629,500 VMT. Traffic congestion is not required to be analyzed under CEQA in the Draft EIR following the implementation of Senate Bill 743, which designated "vehicle miles traveled" as the method for assessing transportation impacts on the environment for CEQA projects. Refer to the *Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit Project Non-CEQA Transportation Assessment*, which found that there could be localized increases in traffic at the intersections closest to the proposed Project's Alameda Station and Chinatown/State Park Station due to some riders choosing to park and ride or take Uber/Lyft and recommended the proposed Project work with Metro to identify a transit partnership for the proposed Project riders to further encourage them to take transit, walk, or bike to the proposed Project's stations. Refer to Topical

Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities, including but not limited to, sustainability features and open space enhancements, the Community Access Plan for fares, access to parks, mobility hubs, signage, utilization of local artists for site specific artwork at each station reflective of the unique neighborhood culture, design of each component of the proposed Project to complement and reflect the unique character of the surrounding neighborhood, the Business and Community Support Program during construction, and benefits to local businesses along the proposed Project alignment. The Project Sponsor would convene stakeholder groups to coordinate on issues related to proposed Project features. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the Draft EIR addresses environmental justice by considering the proposed Project's ability to reduce congestion and emissions from on-road vehicles in an area disproportionately burdened by pollution, and including an analysis of the proposed Project's potential impacts to the surrounding community, concluding that the proposed Project could result in air quality benefits for the surrounding communities.

Public Hearing Comment PH142 – Allen Leon

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH142

Comment PH142-1 I support construction. It will help Chinatown prosper and make transport convenient.

Response PH142-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Public Hearing Comment PH143 – Cerianne Robertson

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH143

Comment PH143-1 This gondola project is NOT for residents, and must NOT be approved. The posters showing “impact” fail to take seriously the actual impacts this project will have on long-time working-class residents – gentrification, displacement, and the accelerated conversion of the area into a playground for tourists and a profit-making machine for Frank McCourt’s family.

Response PH143-1 Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at LAUS, Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Dodger Stadium draws large regional crowds, with approximately 100 baseball games and other events each year, but there are no permanent transit connections to the venue. The vast majority of visitors drive their personal vehicles to access the venue. These vehicles create congestion on the surface streets leading up to and around Dodger Stadium, including Sunset Boulevard/Cesar E. Chavez from LAUS and throughout the surrounding communities. Given the capacity of the proposed Project’s system, approximately 20 percent of the fans could take aerial transit connected to Metro’s regional transit system. This would reduce vehicular congestion in and around Dodger Stadium, on neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways during game and special event days. Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not exacerbate gentrification or result in displacement of residents in the surrounding neighborhoods and is consistent with Metro’s considerations regarding gentrification and displacement. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project.

Public Hearing Comment PH144 – Fatima Carrera

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH144

Comment PH144-1 Time & time again we’ve witnessed how these multi-million dollar redevelopment projects prioritize those funding it rather than using & investing into the communities that will be directly impacted by this.

Response PH144-1 Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project’s features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities, including but not limited to sustainability features and open space enhancements, the Community Access Plan for fares, access to parks, mobility hubs, signage, utilization of local artists for site specific artwork at each station reflective of the unique neighborhood culture, design of each component of the proposed Project to complement and reflect the unique character of the surrounding neighborhood, the Business and Community Support Program during construction, and benefits to local businesses along the proposed Project alignment. The Project Sponsor would convene stakeholder groups to coordinate on issues related to proposed Project features. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project.

Comment PH144-2 Something the EIR doesn’t account for is how this will impact housing, displacement, and ultimately lead to more gentrification.

Response PH144-2 Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not exacerbate gentrification or result in displacement of residents in the surrounding neighborhoods and is consistent with Metro’s considerations regarding gentrification and displacement. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the proposed Project would not preclude development of uses including housing.

Comment PH144-3 We need to invest into resources that can be accessed by POC communities. Lets invest into hospitals, schools, better public transportation. A gondola will not improve traffic. Public land should be used for public good!!

Response PH144-3 Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the proposed Project would not preclude development of uses including housing, grocery stores, and/or healthcare facilities in the surrounding communities, and would itself address a need for a permanent transit connection to one of the region’s most visited venues, and would benefit the surrounding community by alleviating existing congestion on surrounding neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways,

thereby reducing associated air pollution and improving safety. The proposed Project is designed to extend affordable, regional access and mobility options to the communities adjacent to the proposed Project alignment, providing connections to Metro's growing regional public transit system. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan. Additionally, refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities, including but not limited to sustainability features and open space enhancements, the Community Access Plan for fares, access to parks, mobility hubs, signage, utilization of local artists for site specific artwork at each station reflective of the unique neighborhood culture, design of each component of the proposed Project to complement and reflect the unique character of the surrounding neighborhood, the Business and Community Support Program during construction, and benefits to local businesses along the proposed Project alignment. The Project Sponsor would convene stakeholder groups to coordinate on issues related to proposed Project features.

Public Hearing Comment PH145 – Xochitl Manzanilla

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH145

Comment PH145-1 My name is Xochitl Manzanilla and I oppose the gondola project for many reasons: we do not need it. We already have free transportation to Dodgers stadium, and it will be a big mistake doing it on areas where only low income families live.

Response PH145-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at Los Angeles Union Station (LAUS), Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Dodger Stadium draws large regional crowds, with approximately 100 baseball games and other events each year, but there are no permanent transit connections to the venue. The vast majority of visitors drive their personal vehicles to access the venue. These vehicles create congestion on the surface streets leading up to and around Dodger Stadium, including Sunset Boulevard/Cesar E. Chavez from LAUS and throughout the surrounding communities. Given the capacity of the proposed Project's system, approximately 20 percent of the fans could take aerial transit connected to Metro's regional transit system. This would reduce vehicular congestion in and around Dodger Stadium, on neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways during game and special event days. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities including but not limited to sustainability features and open space enhancements, the Community Access Plan for fares, access to parks, mobility hubs, signage, utilization of local artists for site specific artwork at each station reflective of the unique neighborhood culture, design of each component of the proposed Project to complement and reflect the unique character of the surrounding neighborhood, the Business and Community Support Program during construction, and benefits to local businesses along the proposed Project alignment. The Project Sponsor would convene stakeholder groups to coordinate on issues related to proposed Project features. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the Draft EIR addresses environmental justice by considering the proposed Project's ability to reduce congestion and emissions from on-road vehicles in an area disproportionately

burdened by pollution, and including an analysis of the proposed Project's potential impacts to the surrounding community, concluding that the proposed Project could result in air quality benefits for the surrounding communities.

Comment PH145-2 It will affect terribly all the programs we have at LASHP like flying kite, farmers market, civic bike, and in the park, tai chi class, yoga class, baseball, and all concerts in the Park. People fought hard so this land will be the beautiful Park that it is today, and it's our beautiful LASHP

Response PH145-2 Metro and the Project Sponsor acknowledge the more than 20 years of effort the community undertook to convert the closed rail yard at River Station to what is now the Los Angeles State Historic Park. As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, Section 3.16, Parks and Recreational Facilities, and Section 5.0, Other CEQA Considerations, of the Draft EIR, the Chinatown/State Park Station would have a footprint of 2,195 square feet in the Los Angeles State Historic Park (~.1% of the total 32-acre park), and the station canopy would have an overhang of 9,320 square feet over the park. The proposed Project alignment crosses over the westernmost edge of the Los Angeles State Historic Park, adjacent to the existing Metro L Line (Gold) and the associated overhead catenary system. The proposed Project's required aerial clearance would be located above approximately 59,470 square feet of the total 32-acre park, plus an Additional Separation Buffer. With the required clearances and the height at which the cabins would cross over the Los Angeles State Historic Park, the ability to use the vast majority of the Park for kite flying, special events (e.g., concerts, craft fairs, partnership events, 5K/10K runs, workshops, cultural festivals, and the farmers' market), and other passive recreational opportunities (e.g., picnicking, jogging, walking, and informal play) would not be affected by the proposed Project. Refer to Response S2-4 for additional discussion regarding the ability of uses to continue at the Park.

Public Hearing Comment PH146 – Vivi

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH146

Comment PH146-1 After careful consideration, and review of LA Arts claims about the benefits of the gondola, they do not solve the real issue of traffic in Chinatown while also potentially contributing to Chinatown’s on-going gentrification. In an ideal world, I see the dream of people using this gondola. However the demand isn’t there. People would have to use public transport to get to Union Station, which they don’t do and still won’t do unless it gets better. I live 2 blocks away. This would be an eyesore.

Response PH146-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Section 3.03, Air Quality, Section 3.08, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 3.17, Transportation, Appendix D, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project’s ability to reduce vehicular travel, to improve air quality through reduced emissions, and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through reduced vehicular travel. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at LAUS, Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Dodger Stadium draws large regional crowds, with approximately 100 baseball games and other events each year, but there are no permanent transit connections to the venue. The vast majority of visitors drive their personal vehicles to access the venue. These vehicles create congestion on the surface streets leading up to and around Dodger Stadium, including Sunset Boulevard/Cesar E. Chavez from LAUS and throughout the surrounding communities. Given the capacity of the proposed Project’s system, approximately 20 percent of the fans could take aerial transit connected to Metro’s regional transit system. This would reduce vehicular congestion in and around Dodger Stadium, on neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways during game and special event days. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan. Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not exacerbate gentrification or result in displacement of residents in the surrounding neighborhoods and is consistent with Metro’s considerations regarding gentrification and displacement. Refer to Section 3.01,

Aesthetics, and Appendix C, Visual Impact Assessment, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the aesthetic impacts of the proposed Project, which would be less than significant. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of how the proposed Project's design takes cues from the immediate neighborhood culture, including how each component of the proposed Project would be designed to complement and reflect the unique character of the surrounding area. Further, the Project Sponsor would utilize local artists for site specific artwork at each station reflective of the unique neighborhood culture, and would create numerous opportunities to collaborate with and showcase local artists, including convening stakeholder groups to coordinate on issues including utilization of local artists and identification of sites along the proposed Project alignment to showcase the work of local artists.

Comment PH146-2 Lastly, it would be concerning to me that a private entity would claim to solve a public transportation issue. They must make a profit at the end of the day, and want to use my neighborhood's airspace to make a buck. Where is the money coming from? The LA Art team would not give me a clear answer, and I was very open to hearing their ideas for a solution. All in all, this seems to just be a means to make \$\$\$ on our community's space under the fake guise of curbing traffic which UCLA Mobility Lab has already debunked.

Response PH146-2 Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response O, Response to UCLA Mobility Lab Study, for detailed responses to the items in the Mobility Lab Study. The Mobility Lab Study was not submitted by its authors at the Mobility Lab as a comment on the proposed Project's Draft EIR, and does not appear to have been prepared for that purpose.

Public Hearing Comment PH147 – Li Ping Ma

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH147

Comment PH147-1 I support the gondola.

Response PH147-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Public Hearing Comment PH148 – Yu Hue Chi

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH148

Comment PH148-1 Support the Gondola.

Response PH148-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Public Hearing Comment PH149 – Ciro Avila

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH149

Comment PH149-1 This project is not neutral, since minorities are affected, including adjacent residents' privacy, and there will be more people moving in the community. Also, it is not fair that people take advantage for their own benefit by claiming that they are acting on behalf of the residents and the City of Los Angeles.

Response PH149-1 Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. Refer to Section 3.03, Air Quality, Section 3.08, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 3.17, Transportation, Appendix D, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's ability to reduce vehicular travel, to improve air quality through reduced emissions, and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through reduced vehicular travel. Refer to Topical Response M, Comparable Urban Aerial Transit Systems, discussing how, like the proposed Project, comparable aerial transit systems in cities around the world are integrated with their surrounding urban environments. In particular, comparable aerial transit systems in other locations demonstrate that such systems can operate safely, efficiently, and in concert with nearby residential and open space uses, including parks and other recreational facilities. The proposed Project would be located in a densely-populated, urban environment surrounded by a variety of commercial, industrial, and residential development types. In this type of environment, it is common for public transportation, such as Metro's light rail, to be located adjacent to residential uses and modern aerial transit systems in other cities, including Portland, Oregon and New York City, operate adjacent to residential uses. Nevertheless, as discussed in Topical Response J, Gondola Design and Operations and Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, cabin windows can be equipped with privacy glass that can become opaque while adjacent to sensitive views, and the proposed Project would work with stakeholders adjacent to the proposed Project alignment to identify locations where the use of privacy glass would be warranted. Considerations as to the locations along the proposed Project alignment where the privacy glass could be activated include the subject adjacent sensitive views and the vertical and horizontal distance between the proposed Project cabins and the adjacent sensitive views.

Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the proposed Project supports Metro's goal of prioritizing equity opportunities. Refer also to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of how the proposed Project would provide privacy features and for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities,

including but not limited to sustainability features and open space enhancements, the Community Access Plan for fares, access to parks, mobility hubs, signage, utilization of local artists for site specific artwork at each station reflective of the unique neighborhood culture, design of each component of the proposed Project to complement and reflect the unique character of the surrounding neighborhood, the Business and Community Support Program during construction, and benefits to local businesses along the proposed Project alignment. The Project Sponsor would convene stakeholder groups to coordinate on issues related to proposed Project features.

Public Hearing Comment PH150 – Cui Lian Wu

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH150

Comment PH150-1 The gondola will not bring any benefits to Chinatown. It's all harm but no benefit.

Response PH150-1 Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities, including but not limited to, sustainability features and open space enhancements, the Community Access Plan for fares, access to parks, mobility hubs, signage, utilization of local artists for site specific artwork at each station reflective of the unique neighborhood culture, design of each component of the proposed Project to complement and reflect the unique character of the surrounding neighborhood, the Business and Community Support Program during construction, and benefits to local businesses along the proposed Project alignment. The Project Sponsor would convene stakeholder groups to coordinate on issues related to proposed Project features.

Public Hearing Comment PH151 – Wu Cui Xia

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH151

Comment PH151-1 The gondola will limit Chinatown’s future development.

Response PH151-1 Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the proposed Project would not preclude development of uses including housing, grocery stores, and/or healthcare facilities in the surrounding communities, and would itself address a need for a permanent transit connection to one of the region’s most visited venues, and would benefit the surrounding community by alleviating existing congestion on surrounding neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways, thereby reducing associated air pollution and improving safety.

Public Hearing Comment PH152 – Jasmine Wang

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH152

Comment PH152-1 I DO NOT SUPPORT THE LA ART / GONDOLA PROJECT. THERE IS ALREADY SUFFICIENT FORMS OF TRANSPORTATION TO DODGERS STADIUM INCLUDING THE GOLD LINE, DODGERS BUS, RIDESHARES, AND WALKING. THE LA ART / GONDOLA PROJECT PRIORITIZES THOSE WITH THE MOST POWER AND NEGATIVELY AFFECT THE LOCAL COMMUNITY RESIDENTS. MOREOVER, WE HAVE GREATER NEEDS THAN AN AERIAL TRAIN OVER US.

Response PH152-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response H, The Draft EIR Considered an Appropriate Range of Alternatives and Design Options, for discussion of the Transportation Systems Management Alternative for an enhanced Dodger Stadium Express is unlikely to achieve the same level of ridership as the proposed Project, and otherwise fails to meet most of the Project Objectives, which seek to achieve the proposed Project's underlying purpose of providing a permanent direct transit connection between Los Angeles Union Station (LAUS) and the Dodger Stadium property and improving connectivity for surrounding communities, including Chinatown, Mission Junction, Elysian Park, Solano Canyon, and the Los Angeles State Historic Park. Refer to Section 5.0, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR, for discussion of a Pedestrian Enhancement Alternative to the proposed Project in which the proposed Project would not be constructed, and instead an enhanced pedestrian walkway and vertical circulation elements would be constructed to improve the safety, comfort, and accessibility of walking between the Metro L Line (Gold) Station and Dodger Stadium. This alternative was considered but dismissed from further detailed analysis because it did not meet most of the basic objectives of the proposed Project. Improving the connection between LAUS and Dodger Stadium via the proposed Project would provide the quickest, most frequent, and highest capacity transit connection for the greatest number of riders traveling to Dodger Stadium to have the most travel time competitive transit trips from more locations in the region. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities.

Public Hearing Comment PH153 – Edwin Li

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH153

Comment PH153-1 WASTE OF MONEY. WILL NOT HELP RESIDENTS. IT'S A PRIVATE COMPANY THAT IS USING PUBLIC LAND FOR IT'S OWN BENEFIT. THE DRAFT EIR IS NOT OBJECTIVE. IT IS USED TO PROMOTE GONDOLA. CHINATOWN AND THE PEOPLE WILL NOT BENEFIT, IF PASSENGERS ARE FLYING OVER CHINATOWN, HOW WILL THE BUSINESS BENEFIT.

Response PH153-1 Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, discussing the proposed Project's potential partnerships with and benefits to local businesses. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project. As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, and Topical Response C, Project Features, the proposed Project creates a first/last mile transit link for residents and businesses within Chinatown while unifying and connecting communities through transit mobility access. This new mode of transportation will expand rider access to the regional transit system by attracting new visitors including Dodgers fans, and represents an opportunity for additional visitors along the proposed Project alignment, creating economic opportunities for local businesses, including shops and restaurants, through potential partnerships that drive customers to Chinatown and other businesses along the proposed Project alignment, which, consequently, adds revenues to these small businesses in the communities the proposed Project hopes to serve. The Draft EIR includes 7,877 pages of detailed analysis from experts in their respective fields, intended to provide the public and decision makers the information that they need to meaningfully consider the proposed Project's potential environmental impacts, as well as a shorter executive summary that explains the analysis and conclusions in clean and simple language.

Public Hearing Comment PH154 – Luke MacDonald

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH154

Comment PH154-1 I am against the gondola. Waste of money, doesn't make sense – how will it function effectively in the rush after a game?

Response PH154-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provides detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response B, Ridership Model; Queueing at Stations and Pre-game and Post-game Transportation, for discussion of the proposed Project's ridership model which is based on extensive data sources and assumptions validated by data, and the management of queuing at stations, and pre-game and post-game transportation.

Comment PH154-2 Eyesore, gentrification project, privacy issue.

Response PH154-2 Refer to Section 3.01, Aesthetics, and Appendix C, Visual Impact Assessment, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the aesthetic impacts of the proposed Project, which would be less than significant. Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not exacerbate gentrification or result in displacement of residents in the surrounding neighborhoods and is consistent with Metro's considerations regarding gentrification and displacement. Refer to Topical Response M, Comparable Urban Aerial Transit Systems, discussing how, like the proposed Project, comparable aerial transit systems in cities around the world are integrated with their surrounding urban environments. In particular, comparable aerial transit systems in other locations demonstrate that such systems can operate safely, efficiently, and in concert with nearby residential and open space uses, including parks and other recreational facilities. The proposed Project would be located in a densely-populated, urban environment surrounded by a variety of commercial, industrial, and residential development types. In this type of environment, it is common for public transportation, such as Metro's light rail, to be located adjacent to residential uses and modern aerial transit systems in other cities, including Portland, Oregon and New York City, operate adjacent to residential uses. Nevertheless, as discussed in Topical Response J, Gondola Design and Operations and Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, cabin windows can be equipped with privacy glass that can become

opaque while adjacent to sensitive views, and the proposed Project would work with stakeholders adjacent to the proposed Project alignment to identify locations where the use of privacy glass would be warranted. Considerations as to the locations along the proposed Project alignment where the privacy glass could be activated include the subject adjacent sensitive views and the vertical and horizontal distance between the proposed Project cabins and the adjacent sensitive views.

Public Hearing Comment PH155 – Casa Wilson

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH155

Comment PH155-1 I am vehemently opposed to the Gondola project! I don't want my tax money going to this nightmare. I don't want to lose half the greenspace of Angeles National Park! Dodgers Stadium already ruin our lives half the year. Now you want to bring traffic, congestion, and tourists to our homes year round! It's an absurd, corrupt project that will destroy the property values of everyone who owns a home here for what? To take a few people up to a baseball game? STOP THE GONDOLA!!

Response PH155-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provides detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project. As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, Section 3.16, Parks and Recreational Facilities, and Section 5.0, Other CEQA Considerations, of the Draft EIR, the Chinatown/State Park Station would have a footprint of 2,195 square feet in the Los Angeles State Historic Park (~.1% of the total 32-acre park), and the station canopy would have an overhang of 9,320 square feet over the park. The proposed Project alignment crosses over the westernmost edge of the Los Angeles State Historic Park, adjacent to the existing Metro L Line (Gold) and the associated overhead catenary system. The proposed Project's required aerial clearance would be located above approximately 59,470 square feet of the total 32-acre park, plus an Additional Separation Buffer. With the required clearances and the height at which the cabins would cross over the Los Angeles State Historic Park, the ability to use the vast majority of the Park for kite flying, special events (e.g., concerts, craft fairs, partnership events, 5K/10K runs, workshops, cultural festivals, and the farmers' market), and other passive recreational opportunities (e.g., picnicking, jogging, walking, and informal play) would not be affected by the proposed Project. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at Los Angeles Union Station (LAUS), Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Dodger Stadium draws large regional crowds, with approximately 100 baseball games and other events each year, but there are no permanent transit connections to the venue. The vast majority of visitors

drive their personal vehicles to access the venue. These vehicles create congestion on the surface streets leading up to and around Dodger Stadium, including Sunset Boulevard/Cesar E. Chavez from LAUS and throughout the surrounding communities. Given the capacity of the proposed Project's system, approximately 20 percent of the fans could take aerial transit connected to Metro's regional transit system. This would reduce vehicular congestion in and around Dodger Stadium, on neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways during game and special event days. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan.

Public Hearing Comment PH156 – Rachel Day

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH156

Comment PH156-1 I am opposed to the proposed gondola from Union Station to Dodgers Stadium. While traffic around Dodgers Stadium before and after games has always been significant, building permanent infrastructure is a misguided use of resources and is a myopic non-solution to the problem. I am in favor of expanding the already existing shuttle system that runs the same route. It's unfortunate that Metro has chosen to work with a private company to build transportation that will have lasting effect on multiple neighborhoods – Downtown, Chinatown, Echo Park – especially given the obvious conflicts of interest with Frank McCourt, his son, Dodger Stadium, and LA ART

Response PH156-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provides detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response H, The Draft EIR Considered an Appropriate Range of Alternatives and Design Options, for discussion of the Transportation Systems Management Alternative for an enhanced Dodger Stadium Express is unlikely to achieve the same level of ridership as the proposed Project, and otherwise fails to meet most of the Project Objectives, which seek to achieve the proposed Project's underlying purpose of providing a permanent direct transit connection between LAUS and the Dodger Stadium property and improving connectivity for surrounding communities, including Chinatown, Mission Junction, Elysian Park, Solano Canyon, and the Los Angeles State Historic Park. As discussed in Sections 3.01, Aesthetics, 3.04, Biological Resources, 3.05, Cultural Resources, 3.06, Energy, 3.07, Geology and Soils, 3.09, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, 3.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, 3.11, Land Use and Planning, 3.13, Noise, 3.15, Public Services, 3.16, Parks and Recreational Facilities, 3.17, Transportation, 3.18, Tribal Cultural Resources, 3.19, Utilities and Service Systems, 3.20, Wildfire, and 5.0, Other CEQA Considerations, the proposed Project would have less than significant operational impacts, including to Downtown, Chinatown, and Echo Park.

Public Hearing Comment PH157 – Maria Elena Patino

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH157

Comment PH157-1 As a resident who cares about our community, especially our young people, I oppose this project. Anahuak has championed recreational areas for our children and families for years.

Response PH157-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Comment PH157-2 We know that each soccer field, each park is not enough, and we need more so our youngsters can enjoy sports.

Response PH157-2 This comment is noted and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Comment PH157-3 The Gondola Project does not bring any benefits in terms of public transportation; it is a tourist attraction that will only benefit the ambitions of one single person, Frank McCourt.

Response PH157-3 Refer to Topical Response A, SB 44, for discussion of how the proposed Project is public transportation because it will be open to the general public for service at regular, scheduled operating times, operating daily to serve existing residents, workers, park users, and visitors to Los Angeles. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at Los Angeles Union Station (LAUS), Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Dodger Stadium draws large regional crowds, with approximately 100 baseball games and other events each year, but there are no permanent transit connections to the venue. The vast majority of visitors drive their personal vehicles to access the venue. These vehicles create congestion on the surface streets leading up to and around Dodger Stadium, including Sunset Boulevard/Cesar E. Chavez from Los Angeles Union Station and throughout the surrounding communities. Given the capacity of the proposed Project's system, approximately 20 percent of the fans could take aerial transit connected to Metro's regional transit system. This would reduce vehicular congestion in and around Dodger Stadium, on neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways during game and

special event days. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefit to the surrounding community. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project.

Comment PH157-4 Don't waste money from our federal taxes on a project that won't do anything to keep our environment clean.

Response PH157-4 Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project. Refer to Section 3.03, Air Quality, Section 3.08, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 3.17, Transportation, Appendix D, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's ability to reduce vehicular travel, to improve air quality through reduced emissions, and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through reduced vehicular travel.

Comment PH157-5 I am asking you to keep using the bus transit service from Union Station to the Dodger field. That is a system that has been very successful, and most importantly, it is FREE.

I am asking you to keep using the means of transportation that do work and don't waste money in such a way that benefits only one person.

Response PH157-5 Refer to Topical Response H, The Draft EIR Considered an Appropriate Range of Alternatives and Design Options, for discussion of how the Transportation Systems Management Alternative for an enhanced Dodger Stadium Express is unlikely to achieve the same level of ridership as the proposed Project, and otherwise fails to meet most of the Project Objectives, which seek to achieve the proposed Project's underlying purpose of providing a permanent direct transit connection between LAUS and the Dodger Stadium property and improving connectivity for surrounding communities, including Chinatown, Mission Junction, Elysian Park, Solano Canyon, and the Los Angeles State Historic Park. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of how the proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents,

employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan. Refer to Response PH157-4 for discussion of the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding. Refer to Response PH157-3 for discussion of the Project Sponsor.

Public Hearing Comment PH158 – Berta Avila

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH158

Comment PH158-1 This project will not help w/ traffic, it will not alleviate any of the many issues on the roads in L.A. and will only increase traffic in Chinatown.

Response PH158-1 Refer to Section 3.17, Transportation, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's ability to reduce vehicular travel. Traffic congestion is not required to be analyzed under CEQA in the Draft EIR following the implementation of Senate Bill 743, which designated "vehicle miles traveled" as the method for assessing transportation impacts on the environment for CEQA projects. Refer to the Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit Project Non-CEQA Transportation Assessment, which found that there could be localized increases in traffic at the intersections closest to the proposed Project's Alameda Station and Chinatown/State Park Station due to some riders choosing to park and ride or take Uber/Lyft and recommended the proposed Project work with Metro to identify a transit partnership for the proposed Project riders to further encourage them to take transit, walk, or bike to a proposed Project's stations.

Comment PH158-2 How is this beneficial to the people of L.A.? It is certainly not beneficial for the environment – people will still drive their cars to the gondola stops and more cars will drive to Union Station.

Response PH158-2 Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of how the proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at Los Angeles Union Station (LAUS), Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Refer to Section 3.03, Air Quality, Section 3.08, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 3.17, Transportation, Appendix D, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's ability to reduce vehicular travel, to improve air quality through reduced emissions, and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through reduced vehicular travel. Refer to Response PH158-1 for discussion of how the Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit Project Non-CEQA Transportation Assessment recommended the proposed Project work with Metro to identify a transit partnership for the proposed Project riders.

Comment PH158-3 Please do not pretend this is public transit – it is a private development masking itself as a public project to access gov't dollars and to get the citizens of LA to foot the bill

for Frank McCourt, (or LA ART or Climate Resolve or whatever other shell organization is created).

Response PH158-3 Refer to Topical Response A, SB 44, for discussion of how the proposed Project is public transportation because it will be open to the general public for service at regular, scheduled operating times, operating daily to serve existing residents, workers, park users, and visitors to Los Angeles. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project.

Public Hearing Comment PH159 – Katie Miles

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH159

Comment PH159-1 I am an Echo Park / Chinatown resident, and I am very opposed to the Gondola. We need safe, reliable, frequent, and affordable public transportation in our neighborhood, that takes us where we need to go. The gondola is none of that. The gondola will hurt neighborhoods and will not meet our public transportation needs. I am very impacted by traffic for Dodgers Stadium, and the gondola won't make it any better. We need more buses!

Response PH159-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at LAUS, Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Dodger Stadium draws large regional crowds, with approximately 100 baseball games and other events each year, but there are no permanent transit connections to the venue. The vast majority of visitors drive their personal vehicles to access the venue. These vehicles create congestion on the surface streets leading up to and around Dodger Stadium, including Sunset Boulevard/Cesar E. Chavez from LAUS and throughout the surrounding communities. Given the capacity of the proposed Project's system, approximately 20 percent of the fans could take aerial transit connected to Metro's regional transit system. This would reduce vehicular congestion in and around Dodger Stadium, on neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways during game and special event days. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition to providing service on game and special event days at Dodger Stadium and events at the Los Angeles State Historic Park, it is anticipated that the proposed Project would also provide daily service between 6:00am to 12:00am, for the surrounding communities, including Chinatown, Mission Junction, Elysian Park, Solano Canyon, and the Los Angeles State Historic Park. The proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the proposed Community Access Plan.

Public Hearing Comment PH160 – Rebecca

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH160

Comment PH160-1 The Gondola will have negative lasting impact on the Chinatown community for generations to come. SHAME ON FRANK MCCOURT and the LA Dodgers Corp. for pushing a disgusting self-indulgent project with no regard for the community it affects. This public forum was a sham and your science fair was full of lies about the Gondola. STOP THE GONDOLA

Response PH160-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project. Refer to Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's public outreach during the Draft EIR public review period. The format of the in-person public meetings immediately preceding and during the Draft EIR public review period was an Open House, consistent with standard Metro practice, where attendees could learn more about the proposed Project and the key analyses and conclusions of the Draft EIR, and also a public comment opportunity. Twelve stations were set up throughout the venue, with ten stations focused on specific subject matter areas of the Draft EIR. Attendees could walk around to each station and ask questions to subject-matter experts about the proposed Project. Each station had large, printed boards summarizing the subject matter of that station, including: the Project Description, Aesthetics, Air Quality, GHG, and Energy, Cultural (Archaeology and Historical Resources), Parks and Recreation, Noise, Transportation, and Parking. Each station also included printed materials that attendees could review and/or take with them, including fact sheets in English, Spanish, and Chinese (Simplified) and printed copies of the presentation from the virtual public hearing in English, Spanish, Chinese (Simplified) and Chinese (Traditional). A hard copy of the Draft EIR was also available at the Summary of Impacts station for attendees to review. The meeting was staffed by Metro and AECOM staff, experts on subject matter areas including Transportation and Parking; Archaeology; Historical Resources; Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas, and Energy; Ropeway Engineering; Noise; and Aesthetics, and the Project team, who answered questions from attendees on the Draft EIR key analyses and conclusion. During the two in-person public meetings that were public hearings, comments could be submitted either in writing on forms provided by Metro, or verbally to the court reporters who were set up at a "comment station" in the venue. Written comment forms provided instructions on how to comment on the Draft EIR in English, Spanish, and Chinese (Simplified). Interpretation was provided in English, Spanish, Mandarin,

and Cantonese during the eight public meetings, with interpretation provided in Taishanese during the final two public meetings. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities, including Chinatown, Mission Junction, Elysian Park, Solano Canyon, and the Los Angeles State Historic Park.

Public Hearing Comment PH161 – Gabe Ross

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH161

Comment PH161-1 I am opposed to the gondola and its lack of transparency.

Response PH161-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project’s public outreach and opportunity for public testimony during the Draft EIR public review period. Refer to Appendix A, Scoping Report, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of outreach and community engagement during the Draft EIR scoping period.

Public Hearing Comment PH162 – Kevin Giron

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH162

Comment PH162-1 From what I saw and gathered from the information being communicated here, its clear that this project puts minimal effort in the quality of life of the people living in this community. The draft feels badly planned and exists solely to sap resources out of all Angelenos. Where is the inclusivity in the design of this project? All it targets is the money getting in peoples' wallets. This is a disgrace, plain and simple. Angelenos deserve better than what's being offered here. NO TO LA ART!

-From someone who lives here

Response PH162-1 This comment indicating opposition to the Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at Los Angeles Union Station (LAUS), Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Dodger Stadium draws large regional crowds, with approximately 100 baseball games and other events each year, but there are no permanent transit connections to the venue. The vast majority of visitors drive their personal vehicles to access the venue. These vehicles create congestion on the surface streets leading up to and around Dodger Stadium, including Sunset Boulevard/Cesar E. Chavez from LAUS and throughout the surrounding communities. Given the capacity of the proposed Project's system, approximately 20 percent of the fans could take aerial transit connected to Metro's regional transit system. This would reduce vehicular congestion in and around Dodger Stadium, on neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways during game and special event days. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the Draft EIR addresses environmental justice and supports Metro's goal of prioritizing equity opportunities. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefit to the surrounding community, including but not limited to, sustainability features and open space enhancements, the Community Access Plan for fares, access to parks, mobility hubs, signage, utilization of local artists for site specific artwork at each station reflective of the unique neighborhood culture, design of each component of the proposed Project to complement and reflect the

unique character of the surrounding neighborhood, the Business and Community Support Program during construction, and benefits to local businesses along the proposed Project alignment. The Project Sponsor would convene stakeholder groups to coordinate on issues related to proposed Project features.

Public Hearing Comment PH163 – Kevin Lau

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH163

Comment PH163-1 I don't believe enough alternative solutions were explored. LA has such a strong car culture that is the primary deterrent to public transportation. I don't think the gondola is a long term solution. It'll be nice once or twice and never used again. I believe the Dodger Organization should be looking into more ways to accomodate their fans. Just like stores have to hire security to manage lines outside of their store. This shouldn't be a city problem.

Electrification of metro buses and incentivizing use of Dodger Express I think should be tried before committing to such a large project that impacts many. Creating more pick up points for fans. Alternative solutions should be enacted before committing to this.

Response PH163-1 Refer to Topical Response H, The Draft EIR Considered an Appropriate Range of Alternatives and Design Options and Section 4.0, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR, for a discussion of the Draft EIR's consideration of a range of reasonable alternatives, properly identifying an "environmentally superior" alternative and analyzing a "No Project" alternative, pursuant to CEQA. Improving the connection between LAUS and Dodger Stadium via the proposed Project would provide the quickest, most frequent, and highest capacity transit connection for the greatest number of riders travelling to Dodger Stadium to have the most travel time competitive transit trips from more locations in the region. Refer to Topical Response B, Ridership Model; Queueing at Stations and Pre-game and Post-game Transportation, for discussion of the proposed Project's ridership model which is based on extensive data sources and assumptions validated by data, and the management of queuing at stations, and pre-game and post-game transportation. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at LAUS, Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Dodger Stadium draws large regional crowds, with approximately 100 baseball games and other events each year, but there are no permanent transit connections to the venue. The vast majority of visitors drive their personal vehicles to access the venue. These vehicles create congestion on the surface streets leading up to and around Dodger Stadium, including Sunset Boulevard/Cesar E. Chavez from LAUS and throughout the surrounding communities. Given the capacity of the proposed Project's system, approximately 20 percent of the fans could take aerial transit connected to Metro's regional transit system. This would reduce vehicular congestion in and around Dodger Stadium, on

neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways during game and special event days. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan. In addition to providing service on game and special event days at Dodger Stadium and events at the Los Angeles State Historic Park, it is anticipated that the proposed Project would also provide daily service between 6:00am to 12:00am, for the surrounding communities, including Chinatown, Mission Junction, Elysian Park, Solano Canyon, and the Los Angeles State Historic Park.

Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provides detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project.

Refer to Topical Response H, The Draft EIR Considered an Appropriate Range of Alternatives and Design Options, for discussion of how the Transportation Systems Management Alternative for an enhanced Dodger Stadium Express is unlikely to achieve the same level of ridership as the proposed Project, and otherwise fails to meet most of the Project Objectives, which seek to achieve the proposed Project's underlying purpose of providing a permanent direct transit connection between LAUS and the Dodger Stadium property and improving connectivity for surrounding communities, including Chinatown, Mission Junction, Elysian Park, Solano Canyon, and the Los Angeles State Historic Park. Electrification of the Dodger Stadium Express buses would not negate the operational issues associated with substantially expanding the Dodger Stadium Express. Further, as discussed in Topical Response H, a system of buses from numerous remote locations throughout the Los Angeles region to and from Dodger Stadium events would require a substantial increase in the number of buses which, similar to expanding the fleet for an expanded Dodger Stadium Express service, would result in a fleet of buses that would either be underutilized most of the time or regular Metro bus service that utilizes these vehicles would be disrupted every time a Dodger game or event at the stadium is held. Such a service would also incur substantial costs in paid time and mileage for driving empty buses out to the remote locations before a game and back from the remote locations after a game and paid idle time during the game. Buses from a variety of remote locations would also need to travel in rush hour congestion to get to Dodger Stadium. With limited regional facilities that provide bus only lanes that these services could utilize, they would not materially improve transit travel time compared with driving. For example, the current Dodger Stadium Express service from South Bay serves a broad area of southern Los Angeles County at stations spread across eight miles, is

free, and travels on a priority lane within the I-110 freeway median for most of its trip, but the South Bay Dodger Stadium Express carried an average of only 415 passengers per game in 2019, which is substantially lower than the ridership of 1,895 riders per game on the LAUS Dodger Stadium Express.

Public Hearing Comment PH164 – Jian Ai Li

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH164

Comment PH164-1 We strongly object to certain financial groups building a gondola above Chinatown, seeking to occupy the space above. If it is done, Chinatown will lose all possibilities of future development. It has no benefit to Chinatown. I strongly oppose it.

Response PH164-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the proposed Project would not preclude development of uses including housing, grocery stores, and/or healthcare facilities in the surrounding communities, and would itself address a need for a permanent transit connection to one of the region's most visited venues, and would benefit the surrounding community by alleviating existing congestion on surrounding neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways, thereby reducing associated air pollution and improving safety. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities, including but not limited to sustainability features and open space enhancements, the Community Access Plan for fares, access to parks, mobility hubs, signage, utilization of local artists for site specific artwork at each station reflective of the unique neighborhood culture, design of each component of the proposed Project to complement and reflect the unique character of the surrounding neighborhood, the Business and Community Support Program during construction, and benefits to local businesses along the proposed Project alignment. The Project Sponsor would convene stakeholder groups to coordinate on issues related to proposed Project features.

Public Hearing Comment PH165 – Jess Gudie

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH165

Comment PH165-1 I'm a local resident and represent my neighbors and family on Eastlake Avenue and we are against the plans for a gondola. Money should go towards the community and not to accommodate the money making dodgers stadium [goers] end beneficiaries

Response PH165-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provides detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities.

Public Hearing Comment PH166 – Lai Chiung Mi

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH166

Comment PH166-1 I support the gondola. It will make transport convenient and help Chinatown prosper.

Response PH166-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Public Hearing Comment PH167 – Kun Goc Leon

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH167

Comment PH167-1 Support the Gondola. It will improve traffic and urban prosperity in Chinatown.

Response PH167-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Public Hearing Comment PH168 – No Name Given

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH168

Comment PH168-1 As a lifelong member

Response PH168-1 This comment is noted and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Public Hearing Comment PH169 – No Name Given

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH169

Comment PH169-1 Gondola. Object.

Response PH169-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Public Hearing Comment PH170 – Santiago Vega

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH170

Comment PH170-1 LAART is, in my opinio, a criminal mafia. Frank McCour paid his lackie Garcetti to push Metro to make Metro a devil’s advocate. Garcetti got millions from McCourt in political contributions. And Metro Cory Zelmer is their donkey! I have copes of all the state records!

McCourt, Garcetti + Zelmer “the devil’s handmaidens”!

Helga!

Response PH170-1 This comment is noted and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project.

Public Hearing Comment PH171 – Kevin Lau

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH171

Comment PH171-1 MR. LAU: All right. I just wanted to express concern about the gondola in Chinatown. There area lot of questions I don't think have been like really answered.

Economically, I'll ask, like how much will the project cost? How much will riders be charged? Will they be charged each way? I know top parking usually is \$40 to \$50 regularly over at Dodger Stadium.

Will the gondola be open during non-event days? Who would use it and why? Do they plan on holding other events up in the parking lot?

Response PH171-1 Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provides detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan.

Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the proposed Project is designed to extend affordable, regional access and mobility options to the communities adjacent to the proposed Project alignment, providing connections to Metro's growing regional public transit system.

Refer to Section 2.01, Overview of the Project, of the Draft EIR, discussing how the proposed Project would operate daily to serve existing residents, workers, park users, and visitors to Los Angeles. As discussed on page 2-42, in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the proposed Project would provide service to all pre-season, regular season, and post-season Los Angeles Dodger games and any special events (e.g., concerts, the Los Angeles Marathon) at the Dodger Stadium property. The proposed Project would also provide service to events at the Los Angeles State Historic Park. In addition to providing service on game and special event days at Dodger Stadium and events at the Los Angeles State Historic Park, it is anticipated that the proposed Project would also provide daily service between 6:00am to 12:00am, for the surrounding communities, including Chinatown, Mission Junction, Elysian Park, Solano Canyon, and the Los Angeles State Historic Park.

Comment PH171-2 I'm concerned for the businesses in Chinatown and Olvera Street that I think will be negatively affected by having less of a friction from Union Station up to the Dodger Stadium.

Response PH171-2 Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, discussing the proposed Project's potential partnerships with and benefits to local businesses. As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, and Topical Response C, Project Features, the proposed Project creates a first/last mile transit link for residents and businesses within Chinatown while unifying and connecting communities through transit mobility access. This new mode of transportation will expand rider access to the regional transit system by attracting new visitors including Dodgers fans, and represents an opportunity for additional visitors along the proposed Project alignment, creating economic opportunities for local businesses, including shops and restaurants, through potential partnerships that drive customers to Chinatown and other businesses along the proposed Project alignment, which, consequently, adds revenues to these small businesses in the communities the proposed Project hopes to serve.

Comment PH171-3 I don't want it to be just something like Angels Flight, some sort of like something stupid that's there.

Response PH171-3 Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project.

Comment PH171-4 Will air rights be negotiated for property owners that have the gondola over them?

Response PH171-4 As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the proposed Project was chosen as it maximizes alignment along the public ROW and publicly owned property and minimizes aerial rights over private properties, taking into account existing and future adjacent land uses. As described throughout the Draft EIR, the proposed Project would require aerial easements for certain properties along the proposed Project (see Sections 2.05 of Section 2, Project Description and 3.11.1, Figure 6-12 of Section 3.11, Land Use and Planning). How the Project Sponsor acquires the aerial rights for the proposed Project is beyond the scope of the Draft EIR.

Comment PH171-5 Environmental impact. I'm concerned about the positive, what they're saying about the traffic reduction. Because if they're just taking passengers from Union Station who would normally take the Dodger Express, are you really reducing any traffic? All right.

Response PH171-5 Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at Los Angeles Union Station (LAUS), Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Dodger Stadium

draws large regional crowds, with approximately 100 baseball games and other events each year, but there are no permanent transit connections to the venue. The vast majority of visitors drive their personal vehicles to access the venue. These vehicles create congestion on the surface streets leading up to and around Dodger Stadium, including Sunset Boulevard/Cesar E. Chavez from LAUS and throughout the surrounding communities. Given the capacity of the proposed Project's system, approximately 20 percent of the fans could take aerial transit connected to Metro's regional transit system. This would reduce vehicular congestion in and around Dodger Stadium, on neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways during game and special event days. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan. The main VMT reduction benefit of the proposed Project would come from travelers shifting from driving to Dodger Stadium to taking transit. The VMT change associated with some riders who park and ride rather than park at Dodger Stadium are factored into the analysis but are minor in their effect given the proximity of the Union Station and Chinatown areas to Dodger Stadium. Additionally, the VMT benefit associated with existing Dodger Stadium Express ridership are already accounted for in the calculations of existing Dodger Stadium VMT. The Draft EIR estimates the proposed Project's net benefit from existing conditions. The shift of riders from Dodger Stadium Express to the proposed Project would not result in a change in Dodger Stadium VMT, and the EIR accurately does not assign any VMT benefit associated with this potential shift from one mode of transit to another.

Comment PH171-6 What are the carbon emissions that will be used to build the gondola system? All right. How many passengers have to use the gondola in order to offset the carbon produced in order to build the gondola?

Response PH171-6 Refer to Section 3.03, Air Quality, Section 3.08, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 3.17, Transportation, Appendix D, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's construction emissions and ability to reduce vehicular travel, to improve air quality through reduced emissions, and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through reduced vehicular travel. For the purposes of the GHG analysis, the Draft EIR followed industry standard practice in CEQA documents and SCAQMD guidance to assume a 30-year project life for purposes of amortizing construction GHG emissions, such that construction emissions can be considered together with the operational emissions. This approach is described in Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, of the Draft EIR. Overall, the proposed Project's benefits to air quality and greenhouse gas emissions are expected to increase over time.

Comment PH171-7 Safety. Definitely, especially with the past week with the amount of rain we had, there's a lot of soil instability.

Response PH171-7 Refer to Section 3.07, Geology and Soils, and Appendix I, Geotechnical Document in Support of the Environmental Impact Report, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of how the proposed Project would have less than significant impacts related to geology and soils upon implementation of Mitigation Measures GEO-A.

Comment PH171-8 And then, let's see. I don't see any, I haven't seen any third-party independent data that states if it supports this is a good idea. Are there any? Can that be provided? All right?

Is there any data about Dodger fans or people in Chinatown that want this?

Response PH171-8 Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. Refer to Section 3.17, Transportation, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's ability to reduce vehicular travel. Metro hired Stantec to peer review the transportation analyses conducted for the proposed Project, including Section 3.17, Transportation, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices of the Draft EIR.² Stantec is an internationally respected global design and delivery firm that provides transportation engineering and planning services among its many service lines. Stantec concluded that the proposed Project ridership forecasting model and the model inputs and data sources were credible, defensible, and appropriate to use for the analysis and that they agreed with the ridership forecasts in the Draft EIR. Refer to Topical Response M, Comparable Urban Aerial Transit Systems, discussing how, like the proposed Project, comparable aerial transit systems in cities around the world are integrated with their surrounding urban environments. In particular, comparable aerial transit systems in other locations demonstrate that such systems can operate safely, efficiently, and in concert with nearby residential and open space uses, including parks and other recreational facilities. As discussed in the Technology Penetration Analysis, included in Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, of the Draft EIR, a large capacity for a new mode of transportation in Los Angeles will allow passengers to see the potential for other emerging innovations to be integrated into the public transit system, and the proposed Project would thus exemplify how alternative transportation technology can be integrated into a city's transportation infrastructure and will show that new technology can successfully operate in concert with other existing modes of transportation. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the Draft EIR addresses environmental justice and how the proposed Project supports Metro's goal of prioritizing equity opportunities. The proposed Project is designed to extend affordable, regional access and mobility options to the communities adjacent to the proposed Project alignment. Public outreach for the proposed Project was designed

² Stantec. 2023. Memo to Holly Rockwell Regarding Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit (LA ART) Project Transportation Analysis Peer Review.

with environmental justice principles in mind. The proposed Project would not preclude development of uses including housing, grocery stores, and/or healthcare facilities in the surrounding communities, and would itself address a need for a permanent transit connection to one of the region's most visited venues and would alleviate existing congestion on surrounding neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways, thereby reducing associated air pollution and improving safety, and how the proposed Project is designed to be ADA compliant.

Comment PH171-9 I think we need to focus more on affordable housing or getting a supermarket.

Response PH171-9 Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing, and Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not displace housing, prevent planned housing, or preclude development of uses including housing, grocery stores, and/or healthcare facilities in the surrounding communities.

Comment PH171-10 Let's see. I don't think I have enough time for anything else. It's like two seconds. I just wanted to make a closing. Oh, okay.

So, a lot of my research says that the '84 LA Games of the Olympics was one of the most successful Olympics ever, and a lot of that was because it did not lose any money. But, more importantly, it revitalized the urban core of the cities, but not at the expense of its residents. And I feel as if this is just a plan that's being pushed without actually taking into account the actual people affected by this being built in our community.

And I just want these – I want these answers, as a resident.

Thank you.

Response PH171-10 Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provides detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities, including but not limited to sustainability features and open space enhancements, the Community Access Plan for fares, access to parks, mobility hubs, signage, utilization of local artists for site specific artwork at each station reflective of the unique neighborhood culture, design of each component of the proposed Project to complement and reflect the unique character of the surrounding neighborhood, the Business and Community Support Program during construction, and benefits to local businesses along the proposed Project alignment. The Project Sponsor would convene stakeholder groups to coordinate on issues related to proposed Project

features. Refer to Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's public outreach and opportunity for public testimony during the Draft EIR public review period. Refer to Appendix A, Scoping Report, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of outreach and community engagement during the Draft EIR scoping period.

Public Hearing Comment PH172 – Kathleen Johnson

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH172

Comment PH172-1 MS. JOHNSON: My name is Kathleen Johnson, K-A-T-H-L-E-E-N J-O-H-N-S-O-N. My name is Kathleen Johnson, Executive Director of the nonprofit LA River State Park Partners, the support organization for LA State Historic Park.

A gondola through LA State Historic Park would significantly alter the park's southern and middle sections and their mature native landscapes and compromise users' experience of the peaceful, quiet, open land and skies of the entire park.

Response PH172-1 As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, Section 3.16, Parks and Recreational Facilities, and Section 5.0, Other CEQA Considerations, of the Draft EIR, the Chinatown/State Park Station would have a footprint of 2,195 square feet in the Los Angeles State Historic Park (~.1% of the total 32-acre park), and the station canopy would have an overhang of 9,320 square feet over the park. The proposed Project alignment crosses over the westernmost edge of the Los Angeles State Historic Park, adjacent to the existing Metro L Line (Gold) and the associated overhead catenary system. The proposed Project's required aerial clearance would be located above approximately 59,470 square feet of the total 32-acre park, plus an Additional Separation Buffer. With the required clearances and the height at which the cabins would cross over the Los Angeles State Historic Park, the ability to use the vast majority of the Park for kite flying, special events (e.g., concerts, craft fairs, partnership events, 5K/10K runs, workshops, cultural festivals, and the farmers' market), and other passive recreational opportunities (e.g., picnicking, jogging, walking, and informal play) would not be affected by the proposed Project. Refer to Response S2-4 for additional discussion regarding the ability of uses to continue at the Park. Further, through collaboration with State Parks, the proposed Project has been designed to provide additional benefits to the Los Angeles State Historic Park, including pedestrian improvements between Metro's L Line (Gold) and the park, and integration of the Chinatown/State Park Station into the southern boundary of the park with hardscape and landscape enhancements, a mobility hub, and other park amenities including concessions, restrooms, and a breezeway connecting the concessions and restrooms. As discussed in Sections 3.01, Aesthetics, 3.04, Biological Resources, 3.05, Cultural Resources, 3.06, Energy, 3.07, Geology and Soils, 3.09, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, 3.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, 3.11, Land Use and Planning, 3.13, Noise, 3.15, Public Services, 3.16, Parks and Recreational Facilities, 3.17, Transportation, 3.18, Tribal Cultural Resources, 3.19, Utilities and Service Systems, 3.20, Wildfire, and 5.0, Other CEQA Considerations, the proposed Project would have less than significant operational impacts, including to Los Angeles State Historic Park.

Comment PH172-2 Taking public parkland for a looming station building and 98-foot tower, the route would convey cars just 26 feet overhead on six massive cables. The gondola would destroy 81 mature trees, permanently alter the park's thoughtfully-designed vistas, jeopardize event revenues and vital maintenance, and threaten historic features.

Response PH172-2 Refer to Response PH172-1 for discussion regarding the ability of uses to continue at the Park. As discussed in Sections 3.01, Aesthetics, 3.04, Biological Resources, 3.05, Cultural Resources, 3.06, Energy, 3.07, Geology and Soils, 3.09, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, 3.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, 3.11, Land Use and Planning, 3.13, Noise, 3.15, Public Services, 3.16, Parks and Recreational Facilities, 3.17, Transportation, 3.18, Tribal Cultural Resources, 3.19, Utilities and Service Systems, 3.20, Wildfire, and 5.0, Other CEQA Considerations, the proposed Project would have less than significant operational impacts, including to Los Angeles State Historic Park. The proposed Project would implement BIO-PDF-F and adhere to ordinances and requirements applicable to tree replacement, based on the corresponding jurisdiction of the property where each tree is located. As discussed on page 3.4-23, in Section 3.04, Biological Resources of the Draft EIR, and in Appendix E, Biological Resources Assessment, of the Draft EIR, and Appendix G, Supplemental Biological Resources Report, of this Final EIR, the removal of the 75 trees within Los Angeles State Historic Park would require a permit or approval from the California Department of Parks and Recreation, and all existing trees required to be removed on California Department of Parks and Recreation property would be replaced at a minimum 1:1 ratio within the Park or as agreed to as part of the approvals required for implementation of the proposed Project from the Department. In addition, 6 trees within the public ROW located near the Los Angeles State Historic Park would be replaced at a ratio specified by the Urban Forestry Division, typically, at a 2:1 ratio. Refer to Section 3.01, Aesthetics, and Appendix C, Visual Impact Assessment, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the aesthetic impacts of the proposed Project, which would be less than significant. Regarding scenic vistas, as analyzed in the Draft EIR, there are no designated scenic vistas present in the area of potential impact. However, the Project area provides views that are considered scenic by certain viewers, including views of the downtown Los Angeles skyline, LAUS, El Pueblo, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Arroyo Seco Parkway, Dodger Stadium, and the mountains that make up the Transverse Ranges, including the San Gabriel and San Bernardino Mountains. Specifically, as it pertains to Los Angeles State Historic Park, the open views of the Park, as well as the view of the downtown Los Angeles skyline, make the Park "visually memorable." As discussed in Section 3.01, Aesthetics, and Appendix C, Visual Impact Assessment, views considered to be scenic locally would not be substantially impacted. In addition, while views from the Park toward the surrounding existing urban landscape exhibit various visual values, and the proposed Project would not substantially impact these views as shown in the simulated views. Therefore, the proposed Project would not block any designated scenic views, alter a designated scenic area, or block panoramic views, and impacts to scenic or panoramic

views would be less than significant. The Draft EIR fully analyzed and addressed the proposed Project's potential impacts to historic resources in Section 3.05, Cultural Resources, with supporting data provided in Appendix G, Historical Resource Technical Report for the Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit Project (HRTR). As discussed in Section 3.05, the Draft EIR's analysis concludes that all potential impacts related to historical resources would be less than significant.

Comment PH172-3 These major park impacts, grossly underexamined in the Draft EIR, represent an environmental injustice. The park was born from community activism that transformed a former rail yard brownfield into an urban green oasis – with all of the related health and community benefits. After this long struggle, residents deserve to have their original designs and uses for the park respected and their land protected.

Response PH172-3 Refer to PH172-1 for discussion regarding the ability of uses to continue at the Park. Metro and the Project Sponsor acknowledge the more than 20 years of effort the community undertook to convert the closed rail yard at River Station to what is now the Los Angeles State Historic Park.

Comment PH172-4 I'm not here to comment on the wisdom of the gondola enterprise, but simply to insist that taxpayer-funded public parkland not be commandeered for its use.

Thank you.

Response PH172-4 This comment provides a general conclusion regarding the comments raised in the letter. Responses to the comments contained in this letter are provided above in Responses PH172-1 to PH172-3.

Public Hearing Comment PH173 – Olivia Viera

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH173

Comment PH173-1 I’m a resident of Solano Canyon, which is east, adjacent to Dodger Stadium. So, I’ve been affected by the traffic for the last 22 years.

I’m also the founder of a community arts organization called Indigenous Wellness Collective, which serves hundreds of BIPOC folks in the area.

Response PH173-1 This comment is noted and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Comment PH173-2 There is a lot of trauma in this area going back to the era of my great uncle, Tony Montez, who was displaced when the Dodgers moved from Brooklyn to Los Angeles. His family was robbed of housing.

So, I’m distinctly aware of the trauma in the area regarding government or big corporations moving in and making decisions for the community that directly affect the community.

Response PH173-2 Refer to Section 5.0, Corrections and Additions, of this Final EIR for a discussion of Chavez Ravine. Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not displace housing or prevent planned housing. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project’s features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities including but not limited to sustainability features and open space enhancements, the Community Access Plan for fares, access to parks, mobility hubs, signage, utilization of local artists for site specific artwork at each station reflective of the unique neighborhood culture, design of each component of the proposed Project to complement and reflect the unique character of the surrounding neighborhood, the Business and Community Support Program during construction, and benefits to local businesses along the proposed Project alignment. The Project Sponsor would convene stakeholder groups to coordinate on issues related to proposed Project features. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the Draft EIR addresses environmental justice by considering the proposed Project’s ability to reduce congestion and emissions from on-road vehicles in an area disproportionately burdened by pollution, and including

an analysis of the proposed Project's potential impacts to the surrounding community, concluding that the proposed Project could result in air quality benefits for the surrounding communities.

Comment PH173-3 One of the best things that has happened so far is the Metro non-gas buses coming in and bringing hundreds of people to the stadium. This has relieved traffic immensely, although I realize there are some improvements that need to be made there.

Response PH173-3 While many Dodgers Stadium Express riders may choose to ride the proposed Project to take advantage of the much quicker travel time and frequent service, the average estimated ridership of the proposed Project (6,000 in 2026 and 10,000 in 2042) is greater than the average number of Dodger Stadium Express riders per game from LAUS (1,845). In addition, while funding sources for Dodger Stadium Express are not known beyond the 2023 season, the proposed Project would not preclude the continued operation of the Dodger Stadium Express, which would provide further transit capacity to Dodger Stadium.

Comment PH173-4 The gondola is offensive to the neighborhood of Chinatown, Solano Canyon, Echo Park, and Lincoln Heights. It is blatant capitalist greed.

If the gondola were a free ticket, I would reconsider my position. But, as of now, I stand 100 percent against the construction of this gondola in this part of the city. I would like to see it overlooking the marina instead.

Thank you.

Response PH173-4 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Response PH173-2 for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefit to the surrounding communities and how the Draft EIR addresses environmental justice. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at LAUS, Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Dodger Stadium draws large regional crowds, with approximately 100 baseball games and other events each year, but there are no permanent transit connections to the venue. The vast majority of visitors drive their personal vehicles to access the venue. These vehicles create congestion on the surface streets leading up to and around Dodger Stadium, including Sunset Boulevard/Cesar E. Chavez from LAUS and throughout the surrounding communities. Given the capacity of the proposed Project's system, approximately 20 percent of the fans could take aerial transit connected to Metro's regional transit system. This would reduce vehicular congestion in and around Dodger Stadium, on neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways during game and

special event days. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project.

Public Hearing Comment PH174 – Melissa Arechiga

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH174

Comment PH174-1 Okay. My name is Melissa Arechiga. I stand here before you as a representative of surviving families that were vitally evicted from Palo Verde, La Loma, and Bishop, three Mexican indigenous communities that were destroyed to build Dodger Stadium.

I am here today opposing the gondola project from Union Station to Dodger Stadium. While this may be exciting to some, it is a sign of change, and change that is not inclusive to all, specifically people of color.

Response PH174-1 This comment provides a general introduction to the comments raised in this letter. Responses to the comments contained in this letter are provided below in Response PH174-2.

Comment PH174-2 The Dodgers Corporation and the City of Los Angeles have a long partnership together working to destroy and exploit communities of color. The gondola represents gentrification, the destruction of not only our communities, but environment and our beloved wildlife.

The gondola project is no different than the deal that was made to take away our families' generational wealth by destroying out three communities to build Dodger Stadium. The Dodgers and the Los Angeles City Council set to build the gondola in the middle of our communities, and this would only benefit the Los Angeles Dodgers. Our residents and small business owners will suffer. And with the so-called Revitalization Project, this is code word in our communities of color as gentrification, a long term that leaves our most vulnerable community members displaced with no benefits.

The history between the Los Angeles Dodgers and the Los Angeles City Council has left our city in worst conditions from the deal in the 1950s, when our homes in our three communities were destroyed, and the lies that were told to the public of building public housing today leave us with the current issues of our houseless, our unhoused and affordability crisis that affects us all today.

It is a win-win for the Dodgers and has been since Black Friday, May 8th, 1959, when our three communities were bulldozed and our families dragged out.

It is time to put a stop to Dodgers Corporation on exploiting the people of Los Angeles. I am strongly urging that everyone in the public and all elected officials oppose this project, as it will have damaging effects for generations to generations.

(Pause.)

It is time to put a stop to the Dodgers Corporation of exploiting the people of Los Angeles. I strongly urge that everyone in the public and elected officials oppose this project, as it will have damaging effects that will last for generations to generations.

Response PH174-2 Refer to Section 5.0, Corrections and Additions, of this Final EIR for a discussion of Chavez Ravine. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the Draft EIR addresses environmental justice and how the proposed Project supports Metro's goal of prioritizing equity opportunities. The proposed Project is designed to extend affordable, regional access and mobility options to the communities adjacent to the proposed Project alignment. Public outreach for the proposed Project was designed with environmental justice principles in mind. The proposed Project would not preclude development of uses including housing, grocery stores, and/or healthcare facilities in the surrounding communities, and would itself address a need for a permanent transit connection to one of the region's most visited venues and would alleviate existing congestion on surrounding neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways, thereby reducing associated air pollution and improving safety. The proposed Project is also designed to be ADA compliant. Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not exacerbate gentrification or result in displacement of residents in the surrounding neighborhoods and is consistent with Metro's considerations regarding gentrification and displacement. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities, including but not limited to sustainability features and open space enhancements, the Community Access plan for fares, access to parks, mobility hubs, signage, utilization of local artists for site specific artwork at each station reflective of the unique neighborhood culture, design of each component of the proposed Project to complement and reflect the unique character of the surrounding neighborhood, the Business and Community Support Program during construction, and benefits to local businesses along the proposed Project alignment. The Project Sponsor would convene stakeholder groups to coordinate on issues related to proposed Project features.

Public Hearing Comment PH175 – Xiangtian Xu

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH175

Comment PH175-1 My name is Xiangtian Xu. I have been a resident in the Chinatown area for more than 28 years.

I came here today to -- I want to say that I am very happy and I welcome and express support to the project, the LA ART Project by Metro.

Chinatown has had a lot of problems in the past, and I think this project is going to bring a great solution to those problems because it's going to alleviate the traffic issues. It's going to bring great businesses to this area. It's going to bring extra tourists. It's going to revitalize the Chinatown area, and it's also going to make the air quality much, much better.

In the past, we don't have a supermarket; we don't have a hospital; we don't have a library. People don't come to our area because the traffic is too bad.

But the LA ART Project is going to change all of that. It's going to make our community more prosperous and it's going to bring a lot of benefits for its residents. It's going to make our area more lively, and this project brings great effect on the aesthetics. I really like it.

In the apartment community that I live in, there are more than 500 residents just like me. Because of the weather, because they're old age, they are not able to come here today, but they have told me to must tell you that they also express support and welcome to this project. And they also wish for this project to finish rapidly, so we can start enjoying the benefits that it brings to us.

I want to express my sincere thanks and gratitude to the project and the company behind it.

Response PH175-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefit to the surrounding community, including but not limited to sustainability features and open space enhancements, the Community Access Plan for fares, access to parks, mobility hubs, signage, utilization of local artists for site specific artwork at each station reflective of the unique neighborhood culture, design of each component of the proposed Project to complement and reflect the unique character of the surrounding neighborhood, the Business and Community Support Program during construction, and benefits to local businesses along the proposed Project alignment. The Project Sponsor would convene stakeholder groups to coordinate on issues related to proposed Project features.

Public Hearing Comment PH176 – Chris Gibson

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH176

Comment PH176-1 MR. GIBSON: Hello. My name is Chris Gibson, G-I-B-S-O-N, and I'm here to say that we do not want the gondola, for a variety of reasons, one being that there's no guarantee that the city won't be paying for this and the benefits of it will be privatized.

Response PH176-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities, including Chinatown, Mission Junction, Elysian Park, Solano Canyon, and the Los Angeles State Historic Park.

Comment PH176-2 Another issue is that the UCLA Mobility Lab has shown that it won't reduce traffic,

Response PH176-2 Refer to Topical Response O, Response to UCLA Mobility Lab Study, for detailed responses to the items in the Mobility Lab Study. The Mobility Lab Study was not submitted by its authors at the Mobility Lab as a comment on the proposed Project's Draft EIR and does not appear to have been prepared for that purpose. Specifically, refer to Response ML-1 in Topical Response O, Response to UCLA Mobility Lab Study for discussion of the proposed Project's transportation analysis.

Comment PH176-3 and it certainly won't help with emissions because it's not an actual public transit. It's a novelty.

Response PH176-3 Refer to Section 3.03, Air Quality, Section 3.08, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 3.17, Transportation, Appendix D, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's ability to reduce vehicular travel, to improve air quality through reduced emissions, and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through reduced vehicular travel. Refer to Topical Response A, SB 44, for discussion of how the proposed Project is public transportation because it will be open to the general public for service at regular,

scheduled operating times, operating daily to serve existing residents, workers, park users, and visitors to Los Angeles.

Comment PH176-4 And then, the third is that it will be a disaster for the people who live in this area and who are already being burdened by increasing rents, and will only be further pushed out by the gentrification as a result of the gondola.

And that's it. Thank you.

Response PH176-4 Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not exacerbate gentrification or result in displacement of residents in the surrounding neighborhoods and is consistent with Metro's considerations regarding gentrification and displacement.

Public Hearing Comment PH177 – Gabriel Owens-Flores

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH177

Comment PH177-1 MR. OWENS-FLORES: Hey, my name is Gabriel Owens-Flores. That's Gabriel Owens, O-W-E-N-S, dash, F-L-O-R-E-S. As a member of this community, I've lived here all my life. We're vehemently opposed to this. Every single one of my neighbors that I talk to on my street is opposed to this.

Response PH177-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Comment PH177-2 There has truly been no period of public comment where we felt that we've been listened to. Every single part of this process has felt very -- has not felt transparent at all.

COURT REPORTER: Give me one second.

(Pause.)

Whenever you're ready.

MR. OWENS-FLORES: Okay, cool.

It has not felt transparent in the slightest.

Response PH177-2 Refer to Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's public outreach and opportunity for public testimony during the Draft EIR public review period. Refer to Appendix A, Scoping Report, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of outreach and community engagement during the Draft EIR scoping period. Metro sought to engage the community in each stage of the environmental review process. Metro engaged the public in decision making for the proposed Project beginning with the public scoping period for the Draft EIR in October 2020 to receive public comment on the proposed Project's scope of environmental review under CEQA. In June 2021, the Project Sponsor conducted two virtual public outreach meetings. The input from the public, including local community stakeholders, as well as from agencies, organizations, and interested parties, during this period led directly to changes to the proposed Project to incorporate public feedback. The Draft EIR was released on October 17, 2022, for a 60-day public review period, which Metro extended an additional 30 days for a 90-day public review period ending on January 17, 2023. Eight public meetings were held immediately preceding, during, and immediately following, the Draft EIR public review period, with four held in-person in the Project area at Los Angeles Union Station and Cathedral High School, and four

held virtually via Zoom webinar. Project materials and information were provided at both the in-person meetings and on Metro's website in English, Spanish, Chinese (Traditional), and Chinese (Simplified). Interpretation was provided in English, Spanish, Mandarin, and Cantonese during the eight public meetings, with interpretation provided in Taishanese during the final two public meetings.

Comment PH177-3 What we need, instead of a very expensive gondola, is more sidewalks. We need buses. We need all of these other resources that we've been systematically denied all this time.

I remember, like from my house, I have to walk about 30 minutes to get to a bus. There's no reason the buses can't go through every single one of the major arteries in and out of Dodger Stadium, and a single gondola is both something static that cannot be reused in other days and it is also way more expensive. Buses can be recommissioned and can be put on any different route on any different day; whereas, with the gondola, 283 days of the year, it supposedly will have no service.

Response PH177-3 In addition to providing service on game and special event days at Dodger Stadium and events at the Los Angeles State Historic Park, it is anticipated that the proposed Project would also provide daily service between 6:00am to 12:00am, for the surrounding communities, including Chinatown, Mission Junction, Elysian Park, Solano Canyon, and the Los Angeles State Historic Park. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan. Refer to Section 5.0, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR, for discussion of a Pedestrian Enhancement Alternative to the proposed Project in which the proposed Project would not be constructed, and instead an enhanced pedestrian walkway and vertical circulation elements would be constructed to improve the safety, comfort, and accessibility of walking between the Metro L Line (Gold) Station and Dodger Stadium. This alternative was considered but dismissed from further detailed analysis because it did not meet most of the basic objectives of the proposed Project.

Comment PH177-4 The other thing is I'm afraid of the gentrification that will occur. Like I said, 283 days of the year, this won't be used for game-day transit, which means it will just not be used at all. Instead, I suggest that it will be used, and what it will be used for is for building up of, basically, like a mall at Dodger Stadium and the continued gentrification of Chinatown, where people come, drive in, park at Dodger Stadium, and then, shop around there, and then, go to Chinatown to get food, or whatever, or go to any of the new, like any of the new buildings, then all of the commercial properties there and do retail there as well.

Response PH177-4 Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not

exacerbate gentrification or result in displacement of residents in the surrounding neighborhoods and is consistent with Metro's considerations regarding gentrification and displacement. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at LAUS, Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Also refer to Topical Response G, No Improper Project Segmentation: The Proposed Project Is Intended to Create a Transit Connection from Metro's Union Station Transportation Hub via an Aerial Gondola System to the Dodger Stadium Property, for discussion of how the proposed Project solely proposes an aerial gondola system. The proposed Project does not include other development, and neither the Project Sponsor nor any other applicant has applied for other development unrelated to the existing stadium uses on the Dodger Stadium property. Refer to Section 2.01, Overview of the Project, of the Draft EIR, discussing how the proposed Project would operate daily to serve existing residents, workers, park users, and visitors to Los Angeles. As discussed on page 2-42, in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the proposed Project would provide service to all pre-season, regular season, and post-season Los Angeles Dodger games and any special events (e.g., concerts, the Los Angeles Marathon) at the Dodger Stadium property. The proposed Project would also provide service to events at the Los Angeles State Historic Park. In addition to providing service on game and special event days at Dodger Stadium and events at the Los Angeles State Historic Park, it is anticipated that the proposed Project would also provide daily service between 6:00am to 12:00am, for the surrounding communities, including Chinatown, Mission Junction, Elysian Park, Solano Canyon, and the Los Angeles State Historic Park. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan.

Comment PH177-5 So, I'm entirely against this. I think that it is a very, very wild and disrespectful use of public funding.

Response PH177-5 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provides detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project.

Comment PH177-6 And I just want buses. I just want more buses. Just like have a bus at every single artery in and out, on Scott, on Academy, every single one. Just have them run through and just like create a network of buses instead.

Thank you.

Response PH177-6 Refer to Topical Response H, The Draft EIR Considered an Appropriate Range of Alternatives and Design Options, for discussion of how the Transportation Systems Management Alternative for an enhanced Dodger Stadium Express is unlikely to achieve the same level of ridership as the proposed Project, and otherwise fails to meet most of the Project Objectives which seek to achieve the proposed Project's underlying purpose of providing a permanent direct transit connection between LAUS and the Dodger Stadium property and improving connectivity for surrounding communities, including Chinatown, Mission Junction, Elysian Park, Solano Canyon, and the Los Angeles State Historic Park. As discussed in Topical Response H, a system of buses from numerous remote locations throughout the Los Angeles region to and from Dodger Stadium events would require a substantial increase in the number of buses which, similar to expanding the fleet for an expanded Dodger Stadium Express service, would result in a fleet of buses that would either be underutilized most of the time or regular Metro bus service that utilizes these vehicles would be disrupted every time a Dodger game or event at the stadium is held. Such a service would also incur substantial costs in paid time and mileage for driving empty buses out to the remote locations before a game and back from the remote locations after a game and paid idle time during the game. Buses from a variety of remote locations would also need to travel in rush hour congestion to get to Dodger Stadium. With limited regional facilities that provide bus only lanes that these services could utilize, they would not materially improve transit travel time compared with driving. For example, the current Dodger Stadium Express service from South Bay serves a broad area of southern Los Angeles County at stations spread across eight miles, is free, and travels on a priority lane within the I-110 freeway median for most of its trip, but the South Bay Dodger Stadium Express carried an average of only 415 passengers per game in 2019, which is substantially lower than the ridership of 1,895 riders per game on the LAUS Dodger Stadium Express.

Public Hearing Comment PH178 – Xulan Chen

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH178

Comment PH178-1 MS. CHEN (Speaking through a translator): She wants to stop the gondola in Chinatown. We waste a lot of tax money. I hope the tax money can be spent on the hospitals and the low-income housing. We want the tax money to spend on senior housing and housing for the homeless.

So, we want the tax money spent on building a hospital, 24-hour urgent care, a hospital, so the seniors, then, have a place to go to when they need it.

Also, we would like our tax money spent on building more -- a grocery store, shopping more, public restrooms. Also, the bridge across the street to help the people with disability.

Thank you so much.

Response PH178-1 Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing, and Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not displace housing, prevent planned housing, or preclude development of uses including housing, grocery stores, and/or healthcare facilities in the surrounding communities.

Public Hearing Comment PH179 – Edwin Li

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH179

Comment PH179-1 MR. LI: All right. My name is Edwin Li. I am a Chinatown resident. My name is spelled E-D-W-I-N L-I.

And I am against the gondola. I don't believe that it will benefit Chinatown or its residents. Most of the business that the gondola people claim will benefit Chinatown, those people will fly over Chinatown. The gondola will not help.

Response PH179-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities, including but not limited to, sustainability features and open space enhancements, the Community Access Plan for fares, access to parks, mobility hubs, signage, utilization of local artists for site specific artwork at each station reflective of the unique neighborhood culture, design of each component of the proposed Project to complement and reflect the unique character of the surrounding neighborhood, the Business and Community Support Program during construction, and benefits to local businesses along the proposed Project alignment. The Project Sponsor would convene stakeholder groups to coordinate on issues related to proposed Project features.

Comment PH179-2 I also believe it's such an invasion of privacy.

(Pause.)

Response PH179-2 Refer to Topical Response M, Comparable Systems, discussing how, like the proposed Project, comparable aerial transit systems in cities around the world are integrated with their surrounding urban environments. In particular, comparable aerial transit systems in other locations demonstrate that such systems can operate safely, efficiently, and in concert with nearby residential and open space uses, including parks and other recreational facilities. The proposed Project would be located in a densely populated, urban environment surrounded by a variety of commercial, industrial, and residential development types. In this type of environment, it is common for public transportation, such as Metro's light rail, to be located adjacent to residential uses and, as discussed in Topical Response M, Comparable Systems, modern aerial transit systems in other cities, including Portland, Oregon and New York City, operate adjacent to residential uses. Nevertheless, as discussed in Topical Response J, Gondola Design and Operations, of the Final EIR, and Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, cabin windows can be equipped with privacy glass that can become opaque while adjacent to sensitive views, and the proposed Project

would work with stakeholders adjacent to the proposed Project alignment to identify locations where the use of privacy glass would be warranted. Considerations as to the locations along the proposed Project alignment where the privacy glass could be activated include the subject adjacent sensitive views and the vertical and horizontal distance between the proposed Project cabins and the adjacent sensitive views.

Comment PH179-3 I am definitely against this gondola, and I believe this whole meeting is a farce. Everything here is promoting the gondola with these big-time billboards. I don't think the people with the gondola have the community's best interests.

Response PH179-3 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's public outreach during the Draft EIR public review period. The format of the in-person public meetings immediately preceding and during the Draft EIR public review period was an Open House, consistent with standard Metro practice, where attendees could learn more about the proposed Project and the key analyses and conclusions of the Draft EIR, and also a public comment opportunity. Twelve stations were set up throughout the venue, with ten stations focused on specific subject matter areas of the Draft EIR. Attendees could walk around to each station and ask questions to subject-matter experts about the proposed Project. Each station had large, printed boards summarizing the subject matter of that station, including: the Project Description, Aesthetics, Air Quality, GHG, and Energy, Cultural (Archaeology and Historical Resources), Parks and Recreation, Noise, Transportation, and Parking. Each station also included printed materials that attendees could review and/or take with them, including fact sheets in English, Spanish, and Chinese (Simplified) and printed copies of the presentation from the virtual public hearing in English, Spanish, Chinese (Simplified) and Chinese (Traditional). A hard copy of the Draft EIR was also available at the Summary of Impacts station for attendees to review. The meeting was staffed by Metro and AECOM staff, experts on subject matter areas including Transportation and Parking; Archaeology; Historical Resources; Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas, and Energy; Ropeway Engineering; Noise; and Aesthetics, and the Project team, who answered questions from attendees on the Draft EIR key analyses and conclusion. During the two in-person public meetings that were public hearings, comments could be submitted either in writing on forms provided by Metro, or verbally to the court reporters who were set up at a "comment station" in the venue. Written comment forms provided instructions on how to comment on the Draft EIR in English, Spanish, and Chinese (Simplified). Interpretation was provided in English, Spanish, Mandarin, and Cantonese during the eight public meetings, with interpretation provided in Taishanese during the final two public meetings. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, Appendix A, Scoping Report, of the Draft EIR, and Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project team's outreach efforts to neighborhoods along the proposed Project alignment and the proposed Project's

features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities. Metro sought to engage with stakeholders in neighborhoods along the proposed Project alignment in each stage of the environmental review process. Input from the public, including local community stakeholders, led directly to the selection of the proposed Project alignment, including an intermediate station in Chinatown (the Chinatown/State Park Station), as well as to the redesign of the proposed Project stations and junction and additional pedestrian enhancements including hardscape and landscape improvements.

Comment PH179-4 Most of the people who are pro-gondola don't live in the neighborhood, and I think it will displace a lot of elderly.

Response PH179-4 Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not displace housing or prevent planned housing.

Comment PH179-5 Before, I never knew what a gondola was. It never even came into my vernacular. I think a more reasonable and practical form of transportation, if that is their goal, which I do not believe so, is to use the Dodger Express which we already have. It will be a lot less money and it would actually transport people in and out of Dodger Stadium.

Thanks. Yes, that's it.

Response PH179-5 Although forms of aerial transit technology have been available and utilized for the last 100 years, modern applications have seen the evolution of the technology as a feasible mode of urban rapid transit. Refer to Topical Response M, Comparable Urban Aerial Transit Systems, discussing how, like the proposed Project, comparable aerial transit systems in cities around the world are integrated with their surrounding urban environments. In particular, comparable aerial transit systems in other locations demonstrate that such systems can operate safely, efficiently, and in concert with nearby residential and open space uses, including parks and other recreational facilities. Refer to Topical Response H, The Draft EIR Considered an Appropriate Range of Alternatives and Design Options and Section 4.0, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR, for a discussion of the Transportation Systems Management Alternative for an enhanced Dodger Stadium Express. The Draft EIR concluded that, even with a substantially increased Dodger Stadium Express bus capacity, the Dodger Stadium Express's slower travel time to/from Dodger Stadium as compared to the proposed Project and the additional transfer time for riders to walk between LAUS and the maintenance facility, would render the Alternative substantially less competitive with driving time than the proposed Project, thus reducing its ridership potential compared to the proposed Project.

Public Hearing Comment PH180 – Chris Hannan

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH180

Comment PH180-1 MR. HANNAN: Hello. My name is Chris Hannan, C-H-R-I-S, separate word Hannan, H-A-N-N-A-N.

Again, my name is Chris Hannan. I represent the Los Angeles/Orange Counties Building and Construction Trades Council. We represent 48 affiliates with over 140,000 members. We're located at 1626 Beverly Boulevard, Los Angeles 90026.

Our members are going to build the project which is going to take cars off the streets. It's going to reduce traffic. It's going to reduce pollution. We're going to do it all union with local hire, giving an entry point into our apprenticeship programs and our local unions for local community.

We 100 percent support the project and believe it will be good for the City of Los Angeles. It will be good for workers and it would be good for the environment.

Thank you.

Response PH180-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. The proposed Project will enter into a Project Labor Agreement and will work in coordination with the LA/OC Building and Construction Trades.

Public Hearing Comment PH181 – Howard Amster

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH181

Comment PH181-1 Okay, My name is Howard Amster, A-M, as in Mary; S, as in Sam; T, as in Tom; E-R. I live in the San Fernando Valley.

I am very much for the gondola.

Response PH181-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment PH181-2 However, I posted the LA Daily News article from a couple of days ago. I posted that on Facebook and I got back a bunch of replies, one of which said, from a fellow named David Swartz, “I don’t know, Howard. I used to ride the red line to work every day and I stopped because it got so unpleasant.” I have since spoken with him. He is referring to the homeless problem.

I would be riding the red line to get to the gondola at Union Station. I often ride the gondola to the Ahmanson and the Dorothy Chandler. And I’m embarrassed to take a date there because it is so unpleasant because of the homeless problem.

My concern is affecting ridership on the gondola and just I have to drive down there now to the Ahmanson, but I would prefer to take the red line to get there, and to the gondola, when it’s running. But something needs to be done to make this redline – and I am also told the blue line is an even bigger problem – to make it a more pleasant ride.

Another friend of mine said, “I’m not going to bring my 8-year-old son on a homeless train like this. This is like a billion-dollar mobile homeless shelter, is what the subway has become.”

Those are my concerns. Thank you very much.

Response PH181-2 The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at LAUS, Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station.

Public Hearing Comment PH182 – Kevin James

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH182

Comment PH182-1 REPORTER: Hi, your name?

MR. JAMES: My name is Kevin James, K-E-V-I-N J-A-M-E-S. Okay, I'm here representing almost 19,000 members of the International Union of Operating Engineers, Local Number 12, the majority of which reside here in Southern California.

Our members are the people who survey, inspect, build, and repair roads, bridges, and other critical infrastructure such as water systems, sewers, and storm drain systems, along with high-rise buildings and rail systems.

I'm here today to communicate the International Union of Operating Engineers' unconditional support for the proposed project labor agreement.

Please consider the benefits of project labor agreements such as providing contractors with a reliable and uninterrupted supply of qualified workers, ensuring the project will be completed on time and on budget due to the consistent supply of skilled and trained labor and creating an avenue to implement provisions to require contractors to participate in the improvement of local residents, and providing access to Union employment apprenticeship and training programs for women, minorities, veterans, and other under-represented groups.

I encourage you to join our membership in support of this important project labor agreement. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Response PH182-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. The proposed Project will enter into a Project Labor Agreement and will work in coordination with the LA/OC Building and Construction Trades.

Public Hearing Comment PH183 – Chris Wilson

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH183

Comment PH183-1 MR. WILSON: Good evening, and thank you. My name is Chris Wilson, representing the Los Angeles County Business Federation, known as BizFed. We are a grass roots alliance of 213 diverse business groups mobilizing 410 employers with five million employees in LA County.

We continue to be in support of the proposed aerial gondola for several reasons. For one, this project will have the capacity to move approximately 5,000 people per hour out of the cars and into a zero admissions transit, thus reducing traffic congestion, pollutants, and greenhouse gas emissions that contribute to climate change. In other words, you will be able to get to a Dodger game without having to get into a car.

And secondly, the LA aerial rapid transit will operate daily to connect communities of El Pueblo, Chinatown, Mission Junction, Solana Canyon, and William Mead Homes to Union Station while creating a pedestrian link between the Chinatown goal line and LA's State Historic Park.

This is a win/win for LA, its local economy, and Angelenos everywhere, to get there by air. Thank you so much.

Response PH183-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR and Topical Response J, Gondola Design and Operations, of the Final EIR, for discussion of how the proposed Project would carry up to approximately 5,000 passengers per hour per direction (pphpd). Refer to Section 3.03, Air Quality, Section 3.08, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 3.17, Transportation, Appendix D, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's ability to reduce vehicular travel, to improve air quality through reduced emissions, and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through reduced vehicular travel. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at LAUS, Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station.

Public Hearing Comment PH184 – Andrew Vought

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH184

Comment PH184-1 MR. VOUGHT: My name is Andrew Vought, V-O-U-G-H-T. I'm a resident of Los Angeles. I'd like to state my opposition to the proposed gondola which goes over Los Angeles State Historic Park.

Response PH184-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Comment PH184-2 The project would defile an historic state park for the private profit of a real estate developer, and none of the economics add up.

This costly solution will be an environmental disaster,

Response PH184-2 As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, Section 3.16, Parks and Recreational Facilities, and Section 5.0, Other CEQA Considerations, of the Draft EIR, the Chinatown/State Park Station would have a footprint of 2,195 square feet in the Los Angeles State Historic Park (~.1% of the total 32-acre park), and the station canopy would have an overhang of 9,320 square feet over the park. The proposed Project alignment crosses over the westernmost edge of the Los Angeles State Historic Park, adjacent to the existing Metro L Line (Gold) and the associated overhead catenary system. The proposed Project's required aerial clearance would be located above approximately 59,470 square feet of the total 32-acre park, plus an Additional Separation Buffer. With the required clearances and the height at which the cabins would cross over the Los Angeles State Historic Park, the ability to use the vast majority of the Park for kite flying, special events (e.g., concerts, craft fairs, partnership events, 5K/10K runs, workshops, cultural festivals, and the farmers' market), and other passive recreational opportunities (e.g., picnicking, jogging, walking, and informal play) would not be affected by the proposed Project. Refer to Response S2-4 for additional discussion regarding the ability of uses to continue at the park. Further, through collaboration with State Parks, the proposed Project has been designed to provide additional benefits to the Los Angeles State Historic Park, including pedestrian improvements between Metro's L Line (Gold) and the park, and integration of the Chinatown/State Park Station into the southern boundary of the park with hardscape and landscape enhancements, a mobility hub, and other park amenities including concessions, restrooms, and a breezeway connecting the concessions and restrooms. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to

supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project.

Comment PH184-3 lots of un-needed investment in concrete while, according to UCLA research, it would be many times worse for the environment than that current free, commissions-free shuttle solution for electric vehicles.

Response PH184-3 Refer to Topical Response O, Response to UCLA Mobility Lab Study, for detailed responses to the items in the Mobility Lab Study. The Mobility Lab Study was not submitted by its authors at the Mobility Lab as a comment on the proposed Project's Draft EIR and does not appear to have been prepared for that purpose. Refer to Topical Response H, The Draft EIR Considered an Appropriate Range of Alternatives and Design Options, for discussion of how the Transportation Systems Management Alternative for an enhanced Dodger Stadium Express is unlikely to achieve the same level of ridership as the proposed Project, and otherwise fails to meet most of the Project Objectives which seek to achieve the proposed Project's underlying purpose of providing a permanent direct transit connection between LAUS and the Dodger Stadium property and improving connectivity for surrounding communities, including Chinatown, Mission Junction, Elysian Park, Solano Canyon, and the Los Angeles State Historic Park. In addition, electrification of the Dodger Stadium Express buses would not negate the operational issues associated with substantially expanding the Dodger Stadium Express. The commenter asserts that there would be greater environmental impacts from the proposed Project compared to the Dodger Stadium Express without delineating specific environmental impacts of concern. The proposed Project offers a variety of environmental benefits. As shown in Table 3.3-5, Maximum Mass Daily Emissions Due to Operation of the Project, and Table 3.8-1, Summary of Project GHG Emissions, of the Draft EIR, the proposed Project would result in a net reduction in criteria pollutant and greenhouse gas emissions, respectively, in both 2026 (Build Out) and 2042 (Horizon Year) by reducing vehicle miles travelled and thereby decreasing emissions compared to existing conditions. Furthermore, the reductions in VMT would result in less traffic and congestion around Dodger Stadium, which the TSM Alternative would not alleviate due to the increased presence of buses on the streets in and around Dodger stadium. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan.

Comment PH184-4 The project will gentrify our community, but the whole point here will vastly enrich the real estate developers.

Response PH184-4 Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not exacerbate gentrification or result in displacement of residents in the surrounding neighborhoods and is consistent with Metro’s considerations regarding gentrification and displacement. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project.

Comment PH184-5 The idea of gifting the gondola to a non-profit merely means that the developer will wash his hands of any responsibility for operation and maintenance. That will be paid for either by your tax dollars or by philanthropy which, instead, should be going to support our community and our open space.

Response PH184-5 This comment is noted and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project’s capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project’s capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project’s features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities, including but not limited to sustainability features and open space enhancements.

Comment PH184-6 People say LA should get on the program because countries like Bolivia, Chile, and Germany use gondolas. I say we don't need to imitate these other countries. We need to do what is right for Los Angeles. Shame on Metro for promoting this sham project which will destroy our community. Thank you.

Response PH184-6 Refer to Topical Response M, Comparable Urban Aerial Transit Systems, for discussion of comparable aerial transit systems in cities around the world and their operations, integration with nearby residential and open space uses, community benefits, promotion of public art and collaborations with local artists, and evidence that such

systems can reduce violent crime in nearby areas and promote a sense of security compared to other modes of public transportation. As discussed in the Technology Penetration Analysis, included in Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, of the Draft EIR, a large capacity for a new mode of transportation in Los Angeles will allow passengers to see the potential for other emerging innovations to be integrated into the public transit system, and the proposed Project would thus exemplify how alternative transportation technology can be integrated into a city's transportation infrastructure and will show that new technology can successfully operate in concert with other existing modes of transportation. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities, including but not limited to sustainability features and open space enhancements, the Community Access Plan for fares, access to parks, mobility hubs, signage, utilization of local artists for site specific artwork at each station reflective of the unique neighborhood culture, design of each component of the proposed Project to complement and reflect the unique character of the surrounding neighborhood, the Business and Community Support Program during construction, and benefits to local businesses along the proposed Project alignment. The Project Sponsor would convene stakeholder groups to coordinate on issues related to proposed Project features.

Public Hearing Comment PH185 – Eleanor Bray

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH185

Comment PH185-1 MS. BRAY: My name is Eleanor. It's spelled E-L-E-A-N-O-R, last name, Bray, B as in boy, R-A-Y. So Los Angeles has been my home for the past seven years. I am deeply concerned about the Los Angeles aerial rapid transit project.

I'm currently pursuing my Master's in Social Work at Cal State LA, and social work is a profession where the foundation of it is to solve problems, but solving problems with the understanding that those closest to the problem are closest to the solution.

So what problems does the gondola solve, and who determined that billionaire Frank McCourt is the right person to be providing a solution to these problems.

Response PH185-1 This comment is noted and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at Los Angeles Union Station (LAUS), Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project.

Comment PH185-2 Problem number one is the claim that the gondola will have a traffic. However, based on the research done by the UCLA Mobility Lab, it only reduces traffic around the stadium by one percent on game nights, but it does significantly increase traffic in other areas.

Response PH185-2 Refer to Topical Response O, Response to UCLA Mobility Lab Study, for detailed responses to the items in the Mobility Lab Study. The Mobility Lab Study was not submitted by its authors at the Mobility Lab as a comment on the proposed Project's Draft EIR and does not appear to have been prepared for that purpose.

Comment PH185-3 Problem number two is the claim that the gondola will help reduce greenhouse emissions. However, the likelihood that people will simply just drive to the gondola station instead of driving to the stadium means that emissions won't be reduced at all. The traffic will just be displaced.

Response PH185-3 Refer to Section 3.03, Air Quality, Section 3.08, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 3.17, Transportation, Appendix D, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, and Appendix N,

Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's ability to reduce vehicular travel, to improve air quality through reduced emissions, and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through reduced vehicular travel. As shown in Table 3.8-1, Summary of Project GHG Emissions, the proposed Project would result in a net reduction in greenhouse gas emissions in both 2026 (Build Out) and 2042 (Horizon Year) by reducing vehicle miles travelled (VMT) and thereby decreasing emissions compared to existing conditions. As a fixed guideway transit project, providing new high-frequency high speed transit connections between the regional transit hub of LAUS and Dodger Stadium, the proposed Project is forecast to reduce VMT, as game and event attendees shift their travel mode from driving to Dodger Stadium to utilizing transit on the proposed Project. The Draft EIR provides details on how the existing, 2026 (Build Out), and 2041 (Horizon Year) VMT estimates were calculated in Section 3.17, Transportation, which is supported by analyses in Appendix N, Transportation Appendices. The comment provides no basis for their statement on anticipated traffic conditions from implementation of the proposed Project. Traffic congestion is not required to be analyzed under CEQA in the Draft EIR following the implementation of Senate Bill 743, which designated "vehicle miles traveled" as the method for assessing transportation impacts on the environment for CEQA projects. Refer to the Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit Project Non-CEQA Transportation Assessment, which found that there could be localized increases in traffic at the intersections closest to the proposed Project's Alameda Station and Chinatown/State Park Station due to some riders choosing to park and ride or take Uber/Lyft and recommended the proposed Project work with Metro to identify a transit partnership for the proposed Project riders to further encourage them to take transit, walk, or bike to the proposed Project's stations.

Comment PH185-4 Problem number three is the claim that the gondola provides much needed public transportation to Dodger Stadium, but we already literally have a shuttle bus that runs from Union Station on game night. And it's free, and people like using it.

Response PH185-4 Refer to Topical Response O, Response to the UCLA Mobility Lab Study, for a discussion of how the Dodger Stadium Express would not be precluded from operating by the proposed Project. While existing riders of the Dodger Stadium Express may choose to switch to the proposed Project to take advantage of its substantial travel time savings, some riders may prefer to ride the Union Station Dodger Stadium Express for other reasons. The opportunities for more mobility choices through improved connections to additional public transit options created by the proposed Project are projected to increase the number of attendees of games or events at Dodger Stadium to ride public transportation. Refer to Topical Response H, The Draft EIR Considered an Appropriate Range of Alternatives and Design Options, for discussion of how the Transportation Systems Management Alternative for an enhanced Dodger Stadium Express is unlikely to achieve the same level of ridership as the proposed Project, and otherwise fails to meet most of the Project Objectives, which seek to achieve the proposed Project's underlying purpose of providing a

permanent direct transit connection between LAUS and the Dodger Stadium property and improving connectivity for surrounding communities, including Chinatown, Mission Junction, Elysian Park, Solano Canyon, and the Los Angeles State Historic Park. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of how the proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan.

Comment PH185-5 So why are we asking those in the communities this will affect what their actual problems are and going to them for actual solutions. What about problems like investing in real public transit in needed areas of LA, affordable housing, community services, services for unhoused. No one asked for this gondola, and we shouldn't allow billionaires to use low income areas of Los Angeles as their play place. Thank you.

Response PH185-5 Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, Appendix A, Scoping Report, of the Draft EIR, and Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project team's outreach efforts to neighborhoods along the proposed Project alignment and the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities. Metro sought to engage with stakeholders in neighborhoods along the proposed Project alignment in each stage of the environmental review process. Input from the public, including local community stakeholders, led directly to the selection of the proposed Project alignment, including an intermediate station in Chinatown (the Chinatown/State Park Station), as well as to the redesign of the proposed Project stations and junction and additional pedestrian enhancements including hardscape and landscape improvements. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the Draft EIR addresses environmental justice and how the proposed Project supports Metro's goal of prioritizing equity opportunities. The proposed Project is designed to extend affordable, regional access and mobility options to the communities adjacent to the proposed Project alignment, and public outreach for the proposed Project was designed with environmental justice principles in mind. The proposed Project would not preclude development of uses including housing, grocery stores, and/or healthcare facilities in the surrounding communities, and would itself address a need for a permanent transit connection to one of the region's most visited venues and would alleviate existing congestion on surrounding neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways, thereby reducing associated air pollution and improving safety. The proposed Project is also designed to be ADA compliant. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project.

Public Hearing Comment PH186 – Kenneth Chan

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH186

Comment PH186-1 MR. CHAN: My name is Kenneth Chan, K-3 E-N-N-E-T-H, last name, C-H-A-N. I'm a resident of the neighborhood. I am against this project. I think that the process has been undemocratic. I think that the fact that we've had these fake pubic hearings where they shuttered everyone out in the back to make public comment without actually being public comment, that's no definition of public.

Response PH186-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's opportunities for public testimony during the Draft EIR public review period. During the public review period, comments on the Draft EIR could be submitted in writing via email or mail, by phone, and during the four public hearings. Comments on the Draft EIR could be submitted by email to LAART@metro.net, by mail to One Gateway Plaza, Mail Stop 99-22-6, Los Angeles, CA 90012, or over the phone by calling (213) 922-6913. Comments could also be submitted at each of the four public hearings. At virtual public hearings, comments could be given verbally. In light of the disruptions at the January 12, 2023, public hearing, Metro provided a fourth public hearing by way of a virtual public hearing held on February 8, 2023. Verbal comments made at the virtual February 8, 2023 public hearing were deemed timely submitted for the purposes of the Draft EIR public review period. At the two public hearings held in person, comments could be submitted either in writing on forms provided by Metro, or verbally to the court reporters who were set up at a "comment station" in the venue. Written comment forms provided instructions on how to comment on the Draft EIR in English, Spanish, and Chinese (Simplified). Interpretation was provided in English, Spanish, Mandarin, and Cantonese during all four public hearings, with interpretation provided in Taishanese during the final two public hearings. Under CEQA, the purpose of a Final EIR is to respond to comments received on the Draft EIR during the public review period and incorporate changes to a proposed project in response to such comments. (CEQA Guidelines, § 15088). Consistent with CEQA, comments received on the Draft EIR were responded to in this Final EIR.

Comment PH186-2 And I'm also against this project because it's a bad use of public lands and it's a bad use of public funds. There's no transparency around the financing and what any of that looks like.

Response PH186-2 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for

the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at Los Angeles Union Station (LAUS), Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Dodger Stadium draws large regional crowds, with approximately 100 baseball games and other events each year, but there are no permanent transit connections to the venue. The vast majority of visitors drive their personal vehicles to access the venue. These vehicles create congestion on the surface streets leading up to and around Dodger Stadium, including Sunset Boulevard/Cesar E. Chavez from LAUS and throughout the surrounding communities. Given the capacity of the proposed Project's system, approximately 20 percent of the fans could take aerial transit connected to Metro's regional transit system. This would reduce vehicular congestion in and around Dodger Stadium, on neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways during game and special event days. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of how the proposed Project would provide numerous benefits to local businesses in El Pueblo, Chinatown, and other areas along the proposed Project alignment, including through potential partnerships with these businesses as well as by providing an accessible and affordable mobility option for employees and area residents. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project.

Comment PH186-3 It's so obvious that McCourt funneled this project through a non-profit to get this through and has plans to develop the outlying area. This neighborhood needs more grocery stores, needs more affordable housing, needs an actual laundromat. And we are barely, you know, we're fighting for crumbs.

And yet whenever people come into this neighborhood, developers, et cetera, people like LAR, they just see it as a playground where they can throw up the gondola under the guise of public transportation, which we know is BS.

Response PH186-3 Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response G, No Improper Project Segmentation: The Proposed Project Is Intended to Create a Transit Connection from Metro's Union Station Transportation Hub via an

Aerial Gondola System to the Dodger Stadium Property, for a discussion of how the proposed Project solely proposes an aerial gondola system. The proposed Project does not include other development, and neither the Project Sponsor nor any other applicant has applied for other development unrelated to the existing stadium uses on the Dodger Stadium property. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the Draft EIR addresses environmental justice, how the proposed Project supports Metro's goal of prioritizing equity opportunities and is designed to extend affordable, regional access and mobility options to the communities adjacent to the proposed Project alignment. Public outreach for the proposed Project was designed with environmental justice principles in mind. Further, the proposed Project would not preclude development of uses including housing, grocery stores, and/or healthcare facilities in the surrounding communities, and would itself address a need for a permanent transit connection to one of the region's most visited venues and would alleviate existing congestion on surrounding neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways, thereby reducing associated air pollution and improving safety. The proposed Project is also designed to be ADA compliant. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities, including but not limited to, sustainability features and open space enhancements, the Community Access Plan for fares, access to parks, mobility hubs, signage, utilization of local artists for site specific artwork at each station reflective of the unique neighborhood culture, design of each component of the proposed Project to complement and reflect the unique character of the surrounding neighborhood, the Business and Community Support Program during construction, and benefits to local businesses along the proposed Project alignment. The Project Sponsor would convene stakeholder groups to coordinate on issues related to proposed Project features. Refer to Topical Response A, SB 44, for discussion of how the proposed Project is public transportation because it will be open to the general public for service at regular, scheduled operating times, operating daily to serve existing residents, workers, park users, and visitors to Los Angeles.

Comment PH186-4 They haven't given us any indication on what the pricing will be.

Response PH186-4 This comment is noted and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project.

Comment PH186-5 They haven't given us any indication on, like, how efficient it will be as use of public transit. There's the UCLA study out that actually shows that it won't improve traffic.

Response PH186-5 The proposed Project's ability to reduce vehicular travel is discussed in Section 3.03, Air Quality, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by connecting LAUS to Dodger Stadium via an aerial gondola system, including an intermediate station at the southernmost entrance of the Los Angeles State Historic Park. Dodger Stadium draws large regional crowds, with approximately 100 baseball games and other events each year, but there are no permanent transit connections to the venue. Given the capacity of this system, approximately 20 percent of the fans could take aerial transit connected to Metro's regional transit system. This would reduce vehicular congestion in and around Dodger Stadium, on neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways during game and special event days. The lifetime VMT reduction of the proposed Project would be a reduction of 129,629,500 VMT. Refer to Topical Response O, Response to UCLA Mobility Lab Study, for detailed responses to the items in the Mobility Lab Study. The Mobility Lab Study was not submitted by its authors at the Mobility Lab as a comment on the proposed Project's Draft EIR and does not appear to have been prepared for that purpose.

Comment PH186-6 This is just another luxury type development that they're trying to push into this neighborhood just like every luxury apartment that they build in this neighborhood that they say will be good for us. Yeah, and I'll yield the rest of my time.

Response PH186-6 Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at LAUS, Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the Draft EIR addresses environmental justice, how the proposed Project supports Metro's goal of prioritizing equity opportunities, is designed to extend affordable, regional access and mobility options to the communities adjacent to the proposed Project alignment, how the public outreach for the proposed Project was designed with environmental justice principles in mind, how the proposed Project would not preclude development of uses including housing, grocery stores, and/or healthcare facilities in the surrounding communities, and would itself address a need for a permanent transit connection to one of the region's most visited venues and would alleviate existing congestion on surrounding neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways, thereby reducing associated air pollution and improving safety, and how the proposed Project is designed to be ADA compliant. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities, including but not limited to, sustainability features and

open space enhancements, the Community Access Plan for fares, access to parks, mobility hubs, signage, utilization of local artists for site specific artwork at each station reflective of the unique neighborhood culture, design of each component of the proposed Project to complement and reflect the unique character of the surrounding neighborhood, the Business and Community Support Program during construction, and benefits to local businesses along the proposed Project alignment. The Project Sponsor would convene stakeholder groups to coordinate on issues related to proposed Project features.

Public Hearing Comment PH187 – Richard Zaldivar

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH187

Comment PH187-1 MR. ZALDIVAR: Yeah, it's Richard Zaldivar, R-I-C-H-A-R-D , Zaldivar, Z-A-L-D-I-V-3 A-R. I am a community leader and I own, run a non-profit here in Los Angeles in downtown. I oppose this project. One, it is not environmental friendly.

Response PH187-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Section 3.03, Air Quality, Section 3.08, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 3.17, Transportation, Appendix D, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's ability to reduce vehicular travel, to improve air quality through reduced emissions, and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through reduced vehicular travel.

Comment PH187-2 It will create a lot more noise in the community. Our civic leaders fought many years to develop a state park, not to have something that's not natural to fly over their heads.

Response PH187-2 Refer to Section 3.13, Noise and Vibration, and Appendix M, Noise and Vibration Technical Report, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of how operational noise impacts from the proposed Project would be less than significant. Metro and the Project Sponsor acknowledge the more than 20 years of effort the community undertook to convert the closed rail yard at River Station to what is now the Los Angeles State Historic Park. As shown in Figure 5-2 of the Draft EIR, more than 30 of the park's 32 acres are not beneath the proposed Project's alignment. ANSI B77.1 requires the following vertical clearances: vehicles – five feet; vegetation or terrain – five feet; at-grade where pedestrians are present – eight feet; buildings – five feet; and roadways or railways – to be determined with the authority having jurisdiction. The proposed Project's vertical clearance to the bottom of the cabins would range from 26 to 53 feet with an average of approximately 40 feet from ground level over the park. Given these required clearances and the height at which the cabins would travel over the Los Angeles State Historic Park, it will continue to be possible for most events to take place both under the majority of the alignment within the park and adjacent to the alignment. Use of more than 30 of the park's 32 acres for kite flying, special events (e.g., concerts, craft fairs, partnership events, 5K/10K runs, workshops, cultural festivals, and the farmers' market), and other passive recreational opportunities (e.g., picnicking, jogging, walking, and informal play) would not be affected by the proposed Project. Refer to Response S2-4 for additional discussion regarding the ability of uses to continue at the Park.

Comment PH187-3 It's not going to alleviate traffic going to cause called more traffic and new access points.

Response PH187-3 The proposed Project's ability to reduce vehicular travel is discussed in Section 3.17, Transportation, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by connecting LAUS to Dodger Stadium via an aerial gondola system, including an intermediate station at the southernmost entrance of the Los Angeles State Historic Park. Dodger Stadium draws large regional crowds, with approximately 100 baseball games and other events each year, but there are no permanent transit connections to the venue. Given the capacity of this system, approximately 20 percent of the fans could take aerial transit connected to Metro's regional transit system. This would reduce vehicular congestion in and around Dodger Stadium, on neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways during game and special event days. The lifetime VMT reduction of the project would be a reduction of 129,629,500 VMT. Traffic congestion is not required to be analyzed under CEQA in the Draft EIR following the implementation of Senate Bill 743, which designated "vehicle miles traveled" as the method for assessing transportation impacts on the environment for CEQA projects. Refer to the Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit Project Non-CEQA Transportation Assessment, which found that there could be localized increases in traffic at the intersections closest to the proposed Project's Alameda Station and Chinatown/State Park Station due to some riders choosing to park and ride or take Uber/Lyft and recommended the proposed Project work with Metro to identify a transit partnership for the proposed Project riders to further encourage them to take transit, walk, or bike to the proposed Project's stations.

Comment PH187-4 And finally, I don't think that it makes sense, when the Dodgers have such a big problem with alcohol abuse, and fights, and stabbings, to entice Dodger fans to ride over a park.

Response PH187-4 Refer to Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, and Topical Response J, Gondola Design and Operations, for discussion of how the proposed Project would be equipped with security features and how the Emergency Operations Plan for the proposed Project would include emergency response protocols and safety procedures developed in conjunction with the operator, system provider, and local authorities.

Comment PH187-5 And lastly, in any kind of business, when you apply for a license, when you apply for funding, or any kind of permit, you are also looked upon in your past history. The current owners or the leaders of this, the McCourts, have had a poor record of bankrupting the Dodgers and bringing in embarrassment to the City of Los Angeles. I don't think we want to do this again with a gondola project.

Response PH187-5 This comment is noted and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or

raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project.

Public Hearing Comment PH188 –Lee Suan

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH188

Comment PH188-1 MR. LEE: My name is Lee Suan, L-E-E S-U-A-N. I live in Chinatown. My zip code is 90012. I am living here almost, like, in Chinatown, on this area, around this area 30 years. I grew up here, almost a traffic jam every night when the games started. And after the game, it would get worse until people complained.

People from outside parking on, I mean, like, housing area, you know, public area, and not convenient for tenants to come back to park their car. So I agree that they want to build, they call it a train, so what, like ---

REPORTER: The gondola.

MR. LEE: The gondola, yes. I agree they build the gondola. It's the best thing that -- even other countries are doing that. And why can't our area do it?

And people need for Chinatown, people moving around easy, you know, that area. And then from that side, I mean, from, I mean, area town that even every, what do you call, Mediacenter, Civic Center, and here they have, I mean, how do you say. And even they have a traffic jam and then for three hours for people to get in the parking lot.

And we come back to that, on that side of any concert, you know, for an area that they are not, I mean, inconvenient for us to pass through any traffic lights, and even a lot of people moving around the area looking for parking.

My comment is I agree with them to build, I mean, the location is okay. It's not big deal, and we'll get dollars for it too.

And convenient for people from outside who are taking the line, red line, blue lines, any line from Union Station so that is easy for them to go to Dodger Stadium. And even at night, you know, there's more traffic. I mean, for this, I mean, what do you call, is a thing --

REPORTER: The gondola.

MR. LEE: Okay. And then at least no, I mean, after the season is over people can go and see Chinatown and go downtown. That area people, I mean, the people from other counties can visit, get down from Union Station.

REPORTER: Is that your comment?

MR. LEE: Yes.

Response PH188-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefit to the surrounding community, including but not limited to sustainability features and open space enhancements, the Community Access Plan for fares, access to parks, mobility hubs, signage, utilization of local artists for site specific artwork at each station reflective of the unique neighborhood culture, design of each component of the proposed Project to complement and reflect the unique character of the surrounding neighborhood, the Business and Community Support Program during construction, and benefits to local businesses along the proposed Project alignment. The Project Sponsor would convene stakeholder groups to coordinate on issues related to proposed Project features.

Public Hearing Comment PH189 – Anne Freiermuth

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH189

Comment PH189-1 MS. FREIERMUTH: Thanks. My name is Anne Freiermuth, F as in Frank, R-E-I-E-R-M, as in Mary, U-T-H. I live in West Los Angeles, and I am opposed to the gondola project.

I really troubled at the idea that the city would spend billions of dollars for a tourist trap that has nothing to do with public transit. I would love to spend billions of dollars improving our public transit system.

Response PH189-1 Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project. Additionally, refer to Topical Response A, SB 44, for discussion of how the proposed Project is public transportation because it will be open to the general public for service at regular, scheduled operating times, operating daily to serve existing residents, workers, park users, and visitors to Los Angeles.

Comment PH189-2 And I don't think the gondola, which covers a very small amount of land, is going to get people out of their cars, it's not going to improve any part of going to Dodger Stadium.

It just seems so insanely, just such a insanely bad way to spend money and does not, I think, accomplish any of the goals that as they're stated.

Response PH189-2 The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by connecting LAUS to Dodger Stadium via an aerial gondola system, including an intermediate station at the southernmost entrance of the Los Angeles State Historic Park. Dodger Stadium draws large regional crowds, with approximately 100 baseball games and other events each year, but there are no permanent transit connections to the venue. Given the capacity of this system, approximately 20 percent of the fans could take aerial transit connected to Metro's regional transit system. This would reduce vehicular congestion in and around Dodger Stadium, on neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways during game and special event days, thereby reducing VMT and GHG emissions. Accordingly, the proposed Project would result in air quality benefits to the surrounding communities. The lifetime emissions of the proposed Project over its useful life would be a reduction of 166,653 MT CO₂e. The lifetime VMT reduction of the proposed Project would be a reduction of 129,629,500 VMT. Emissions are decreased through reducing vehicle miles traveled. The proposed

Project would result in a net reduction in criteria pollutant emissions by reducing vehicle miles travelled. The proposed Project's ability to reduce vehicular travel, to improve air quality through reduced emissions, and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through reduced vehicular travel are discussed in Section 3.03, Air Quality, Section 3.08, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 3.17, Transportation, Appendix D, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project.

Comment PH189-3 This proposal was put forth earlier. The community defeated it. It has now been moved to Metro, given brand new branding, but the base problem is still there. This doesn't help transportation, it's very much opposed by the people who live nearby. It's a poor use of resources and makes no sense.

Response PH189-3 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Public Hearing Comment PH190 – William Wong

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH190

Comment PH190-1 MR. WONG: I oppose the gondola being built here in Chinatown.

(Simultaneous Speaking.)

MR. WONG: The reason being the gondola is very detrimental to the interests of Chinatown. The airspace above Chinatown should not have any gondola going through it.

The developer had the freedom and liberty to develop the gondola all the way over by the hilltop but definitely not in the airspace above Chinatown, because it has no advantage or benefits to Chinatown.

Response PH190-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities, including but not limited to sustainability features and open space enhancements, the Community Access Plan for fares, access to parks, mobility hubs, signage, utilization of local artists for site specific artwork at each station reflective of the unique neighborhood culture, design of each component of the proposed Project to complement and reflect the unique character of the surrounding neighborhood, the Business and Community Support Program during construction, and benefits to local businesses along the proposed Project alignment. As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the proposed Project creates a first/last mile transit link for residents and businesses within Chinatown while unifying and connecting communities through transit mobility access. This new mode of transportation will expand rider access to the regional transit system by attracting new visitors including Dodgers fans, and represents an opportunity for additional visitors along the proposed Project alignment, creating economic opportunities for local businesses, including shops and restaurants, through potential partnerships that drive customers to Chinatown and other businesses along the proposed Project alignment, which, consequently, adds revenues to these small businesses in the communities the proposed Project hopes to serve. The Project Sponsor would convene stakeholder groups to coordinate on issues related to proposed Project Features

Comment PH190-2 I am just wondering what's the reason behind centering the project here in Chinatown. What was the reason behind all this? I suppose its motivation is to stop Chinatown from ever developing again.

Currently, Chinatown is not doing well economically. The gondola is not going to bring any kind of benefit to Chinatown. Instead it will be all detriment.

Chinatown is ours, for the Chinese community, the general Asian population. It's the home to this group of people. I don't know how long -- it's about 200 years of U.S. history with Chinatown here.

Response PH190-2 Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at LAUS, Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the proposed Project creates a first/last mile transit link for residents and businesses within Chinatown while unifying and connecting communities through transit mobility access. This new mode of transportation will expand rider access to the regional transit system by attracting new visitors including Dodgers fans, and represents an opportunity for additional visitors along the proposed Project alignment, creating economic opportunities for local businesses, including shops and restaurants, through potential partnerships that drive customers to Chinatown and other businesses along the proposed Project alignment, which, consequently, adds revenues to these small businesses in the communities the proposed Project hopes to serve. Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing, and Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not displace housing, prevent planned housing, or preclude development of uses including housing, grocery stores, and/or healthcare facilities in the surrounding communities.

Comment PH190-3 There are more and more illegal structures, which goes against the planning for the land, a lot of buildings whose purpose are against the interest of the park, the skyscrapers or tall buildings where low income foreigners will never be able to afford, those with limited resources, or the low income earners find some way to improve our living conditions.

You know what I'm saying? Do you agree with me? I'm just talking practically.

Response PH190-3 This comment is noted and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Comment PH190-4 Again whatever defines the facility they're setting up, who will be there? How many people 3 are visiting that stadium?

I've been here about 30 years. I never visited there even one time, no money, no talk. They're not going to be happy. That's why. I'm 75 years of age. So we fight for our interest. Thank you.

Response PH190-4 Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at LAUS, Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Dodger Stadium draws large regional crowds, with approximately 100 baseball games and other events each year, but there are no permanent transit connections to the venue. The vast majority of visitors drive their personal vehicles to access the venue. These vehicles create congestion on the surface streets leading up to and around Dodger Stadium, including Sunset Boulevard/Cesar E. Chavez from LAUS and throughout the surrounding communities. Given the capacity of the proposed Project's system, approximately 20 percent of the fans could take aerial transit connected to Metro's regional transit system. This would reduce vehicular congestion in and around Dodger Stadium, on neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways during game and special event days.

Public Hearing Comment PH191 – Judy Chow

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH191

Comment PH191-1 MS. CHOW: First of all, I really oppose the construction if the gondola. Chinatown should have more hospitals, more markets, so that we get more prosperous.

Response PH191-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing, and Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not displace housing, prevent planned housing, or preclude development of uses including housing, grocery stores, and/or healthcare facilities in the surrounding communities.

Comment PH191-2 Immediately stop the construction of the gondola. Whatever they're doing is not respecting the citizens and residents of Chinatown. If they want better public transportation, do some subway building, whatever, but never a gondola, never.

Response PH191-2 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at Los Angeles Union Station (LAUS), Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station.

Comment PH191-3 Also implication in terms of air quality will obviously get even worse. Construction should immediately cease and never again. I recommend build some more bus stations, more metro subway stations, probably that.

That's all, thank you.

Response PH191-3 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Section 3.03, Air Quality, Section 3.08, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 3.17, Transportation, Appendix D, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's ability to reduce vehicular travel, to improve air quality through reduced emissions, and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through reduced vehicular travel.

Public Hearing Comment PH192 – Elva Yanez

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH192

Comment PH192-1 MS. YANEZ: My name is Elva Yanez. I'm a resident of El Sereno. I'm also active in environmental and environmental justice issues.

(Simultaneous Speaking.)

MS. YANEZ: And I am here today to basically say that I'm a former California State Park and Recreation Commissioner. I served from 2011 to 2019 during the time when LA State Historic Park was finishing up the interim use and moving into construction.

That entire time there was never a mention of a gondola. There was never a mention of the gondola during the environmental impacts report process. There was never a mention of gondola to public members who attended 65 public meetings about what they wanted to see in the start park when it was constructed.

Response PH192-1 Metro and the Project Sponsor acknowledge the more than 20 years of effort the community undertook to convert the closed rail yard at River Station to what is now the Los Angeles State Historic Park.

Comment PH192-2 And very simply, this is a violation of CEQA. The idea that the EIR indicates no major impacts on the park and it's users is ludicrous.

So I fully expect a law suit. And really, at the end of the day, I believe that is where this issue will be resolved and justice for the communities who fought so hard to stop the warehouses on this land and to put a state park to provide rest, respite, for the people who have no park, who had no park before this park built in this region. So thank you.

REPORTER: Thank you.

Response PH192-2 Metro and the Project Sponsor acknowledge the more than 20 years of effort the community undertook to convert the closed rail yard at River Station to what is now the Los Angeles State Historic Park. As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, Section 3.16, Parks and Recreational Facilities, and Section 5.0, Other CEQA Considerations, of the Draft EIR, the Chinatown/State Park Station would have a footprint of 2,195 square feet in the Los Angeles State Historic Park (~.1% of the total 32-acre park), and the station canopy would have an overhang of 9,320 square feet over the park. The proposed Project alignment crosses over the westernmost edge of the Los Angeles State Historic Park, adjacent to the existing Metro L Line (Gold) and the associated overhead catenary system. The proposed Project's required aerial clearance would be located above approximately 59,470 square feet of the total 32-acre park, plus an Additional Separation Buffer. With the required clearances and the

height at which the cabins would cross over the Los Angeles State Historic Park, the ability to use the vast majority of the Park for kite flying, special events (e.g., concerts, craft fairs, partnership events, 5K/10K runs, workshops, cultural festivals, and the farmers' market), and other passive recreational opportunities (e.g., picnicking, jogging, walking, and informal play) would not be affected by the proposed Project. Refer to Response S2-4 for additional discussion regarding the ability of uses to continue at the park. As discussed in Sections 3.01, Aesthetics, 3.04, Biological Resources, 3.05, Cultural Resources, 3.06, Energy, 3.07, Geology and Soils, 3.09, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, 3.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, 3.11, Land Use and Planning, 3.13, Noise, 3.15, Public Services, 3.16, Parks and Recreational Facilities, 3.17, Transportation, 3.18, Tribal Cultural Resources, 3.19, Utilities and Service Systems, 3.20, Wildfire, and 5.0, Other CEQA Considerations, the proposed Project would have less than significant operational impacts, including to Los Angeles State Historic Park.

Public Hearing Comment PH193 – Jennifer Rodriguez

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH193

Comment PH193-1 MS. RODRIGUEZ: My name is Jennifer Rodriguez, J-E-N-N-I-F-E-R, Rodriguez, R-O-D-R-I-G-U-I-E-Z.

REPORTER: Thank you.

MS. RODRIGUEZ: And my public comment is to not build this project, the gondola project, on our land. Because it is not something that the community wants or needs at this time.

We need more public infrastructure of not in this manner. We also need more park space, more open space. And this project would take that away.

Response PH193-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at Los Angeles Union Station(LAUS), Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, Appendix A, Scoping Report, of the Draft EIR, and Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project team’s outreach efforts to neighborhoods along the proposed Project alignment and the proposed Project’s features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities, including Chinatown, Mission Junction, Elysian Park, Solano Canyon, and the Los Angeles State Historic Park. Metro sought to engage with stakeholders in neighborhoods along the proposed Project alignment in each stage of the environmental review process. Input from the public, including local community stakeholders, led directly to the selection of the proposed Project alignment, including an intermediate station in Chinatown (the Chinatown/State Park Station), as well as to the redesign of the proposed Project stations and junction and additional pedestrian enhancements including hardscape and landscape improvements. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of how the proposed Project would include several sustainability features and open space enhancements, including pedestrian enhancements and drought tolerant landscaping, open space enhancements, including at the Alameda Triangle, the Los Angeles State Historic Park, and along the pedestrian pathway connecting Dodger Stadium Station and Dodger Stadium, and improved access to Los Angeles State Historic Park and Elysian Park.

Comment PH193-2 And we also need the Metro to listen to the community that clearly does not want this project as well.

Response PH193-2 Refer to Appendix A, Scoping Report, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of outreach and community engagement during the Draft EIR scoping period. Metro sought to engage the community in each stage of the environmental review process. Metro engaged the public, including local community stakeholders, as well as from agencies, organizations, and interested parties, in decision making for the proposed Project beginning with the public scoping period for the Draft EIR in October 2020 to receive public comment on the proposed Project's scope of environmental review under CEQA. In June 2021, the Project Sponsor conducted two virtual public outreach meetings. The public input during this period led directly to changes to the proposed Project to incorporate public feedback, including changes to the proposed Project alignment to include the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station, redesign of the proposed Project stations and junction and additional pedestrian enhancements including hardscape and landscape improvements. Refer to Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, for discussion of outreach and community engagement during the Draft EIR public review period and community engagement efforts during the preparation of the Final EIR. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities, including but not limited to, sustainability features and open space enhancements, the Community Access Plan for fares, access to parks, mobility hubs, signage, utilization of local artists for site specific artwork at each station reflective of the unique neighborhood culture, design of each component of the proposed Project to complement and reflect the unique character of the surrounding neighborhood, the Business and Community Support Program and Business Interruption Assistance Program during construction, and benefits to local businesses along the proposed Project alignment. The Project Sponsor would convene stakeholder groups to coordinate on issues related to proposed Project features.

Comment PH193-3 And this will not help with traffic, or congestion, or whatever the project is claiming to help with. I know this because I live in Cypress Park, so I'm a nearby resident and I ride my bike though here all the time.

And Dodger Scandium just makes the traffic awful when they have games. And I am pretty certain that adding an, like, an attraction is only going to increase that traffic, not decrease it as is proposed or thought to happen.

Response PH193-3 Refer to Section 3.03, Air Quality, Section 3.8, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 3.17, Transportation, Appendix D, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's ability to reduce vehicular travel, to improve air quality through reduced emissions,

and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through reduced vehicular travel. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by connecting LAUS to Dodger Stadium via an aerial gondola system, including an intermediate station at the southernmost entrance of the Los Angeles State Historic Park. Dodger Stadium draws large regional crowds, with approximately 100 baseball games and other events each year, but there are no permanent transit connections to the venue. Given the capacity of this system, approximately 20 percent of the fans could take aerial transit connected to Metro's regional transit system. This would reduce vehicular congestion in and around Dodger Stadium, on neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways during game and special event days. The lifetime VMT reduction of the project would be a reduction of 129,629,500 VMT. Traffic congestion is not required to be analyzed under CEQA in the Draft EIR following the implementation of Senate Bill 743, which designated "vehicle miles traveled" as the method for assessing transportation impacts on the environment for CEQA projects. Refer to the Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit Project Non-CEQA Transportation Assessment, which found that there could be localized increases in traffic at the intersections closest to the proposed Project's Alameda Station and Chinatown/State Park Station due to some riders choosing to park and ride or take Uber/Lyft and recommended the proposed Project work with Metro to identify a transit partnership for the proposed Project riders to further encourage them to take transit, walk, or bike to the proposed Project's stations. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of how the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan. The proposed Project would provide active transportation connectivity along the proposed Project alignment through pedestrian access enhancements and first / last mile multi-modal options at the mobility hubs proposed for the Chinatown/State Park Station and the Dodger Stadium Station.

Public Hearing Comment PH194 – Miriam Bar-Zemer

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH194

Comment PH194-1 MS. BAR-ZEMER: So I have been opposed to the gondola project since I first learned about it, that it hadn't gone through a proper bidding process.

Response PH194-1 This comment indicating opposition the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted. Nevertheless, this comment raises issues that were litigated and decided in *The California Endowment v. Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority*, Case No. 22STCP01030 (Jan. 9, 2023, Order Denying Petition for Writ of Mandate). There, the Los Angeles Superior Court upheld Metro's sole source determination for the proposed Project.

Comment PH194-2 And there didn't seem to be an honest review of various transportation modes that could potentially serve the Dodger Stadium if that was the initial intention. LA transportation is notoriously horrible.

Response PH194-2 Refer to Topical Response H, The Draft EIR Considered an Appropriate Range of Alternatives and Design Options, for discussion of how the Draft EIR considered a range of reasonable alternatives, properly identifying an "environmentally superior" alternative and analyzing a "No Project" alternative, pursuant to CEQA. In compliance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(c), Section 4.2.1, Alternatives Considered but Dismissed from Detailed Analysis, of the Draft EIR, identifies alternatives that the Lead Agency considered but dismissed as infeasible during the scoping process, providing the reasons underlying this determination. Section 4.2.1, Alternatives Considered but Dismissed from Detailed Analysis, of the Draft EIR, considered five potential alternatives, including alignment and station location alternatives and direct alignment alternatives. The Draft EIR declined to carry forward an analysis of the alternative locations studied in the direct alignment alternatives, as such alternatives failed to avoid significant environmental impacts and otherwise would not meet the project objectives, and the Project Sponsor would likely be unable to reasonably acquire, control, or otherwise have access to alternative sites required for the direct alignment alternatives. The Draft EIR adequately identifies and analyzes a reasonable range of alternatives in full compliance with CEQA's requirements. Refer to Section 5.0, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR, for discussion of a Pedestrian Enhancement Alternative to the proposed Project in which the proposed Project would not be constructed, and instead an enhanced pedestrian walkway and vertical circulation elements would be constructed to improve the safety, comfort, and accessibility of walking between the Metro L Line (Gold) Station and Dodger Stadium. In response to public comments, this alternative was considered but dismissed from

further detailed analysis in the Final EIR because it did not meet most of the basic objectives of the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response A, SB 44, for discussion of how the proposed Project is public transportation because it will be open to the general public for service at regular, scheduled operating times, operating daily to serve existing residents, workers, park users, and visitors to Los Angeles. Refer to Section 2.1, Overview of the Project, of the Draft EIR, discussing how the proposed Project would operate daily to serve existing residents, workers, park users, and visitors to Los Angeles. As discussed on page 2-42, in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the proposed Project would provide service to all pre-season, regular season, and post-season Los Angeles Dodger games and any special events (e.g., concerts, the Los Angeles Marathon) at the Dodger Stadium property. The proposed Project would also provide service to events at the Los Angeles State Historic Park. In addition to providing service on game and special event days at Dodger Stadium and events at the Los Angeles State Historic Park, it is anticipated that the proposed Project would also provide daily service between 6:00am to 12:00am, for the surrounding communities, including Chinatown, Mission Junction, Elysian Park, Solano Canyon, and the Los Angeles State Historic Park. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan.

Comment PH194-3 And I don't think the proposal really reveals the continuity of the cost that will be basically revealed for this -- sorry, I'm not expressing myself.

REPORTER. No, that's okay. If it gets a little loud, we'll give you some extra.

Response PH194-3 This comment is noted and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project.

Comment PH194-4 MS. BAR-ZEMER: Okay. And I started the draft environmental report. I have lived in downtown for basically 30 years at this point. I was raised here. And I am really saddened to know that the path -- I'm not anti-gondola in principle, but the path that it's taken is directly over our beloved state park which will, honestly, just ruin the view shed.

Response PH194-4 As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, Section 3.16, Parks and Recreational Facilities, and Section 5.0, Other CEQA Considerations, of the Draft EIR, the Chinatown/State Park Station would have a footprint of 2,195 square feet in the Los Angeles State Historic Park (~.1% of the total 32-acre park), and the station canopy would have an overhang of 9,320 square feet over the park. The proposed Project alignment crosses over the westernmost edge of the Los Angeles State Historic Park, adjacent to the existing Metro L Line (Gold) and the associated overhead catenary system. The proposed Project's required aerial clearance would be located above approximately 59,470 square feet of the total 32-acre park, plus an Additional Separation Buffer. With the required clearances and the height at which the cabins would cross over the Los Angeles State Historic Park, the ability to use the vast majority of the Park for kite flying, special events (e.g., concerts, craft fairs, partnership events, 5K/10K runs, workshops, cultural festivals, and the farmers' market), and other passive recreational opportunities (e.g., picnicking, jogging, walking, and informal play) would not be affected by the proposed Project. Refer to Response S2-4 for additional discussion regarding the ability of uses to continue at the Park. Refer to Section 3.01, Aesthetics, and Appendix C, Visual Impact Assessment, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the aesthetic impacts of the proposed Project, which would be less than significant, including at the Park. Regarding scenic vistas, as analyzed in the Draft EIR, there are no designated scenic vistas present in the area of potential impact. However, the Project area provides views that are considered scenic by certain viewers, including views of the downtown Los Angeles skyline, Los Angeles Union Station (LAUS), El Pueblo, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Arroyo Seco Parkway, Dodger Stadium, and the mountains that make up the Transverse Ranges, including the San Gabriel and San Bernardino Mountains. Specifically, as it pertains to Los Angeles State Historic Park, the open views of the Park, as well as the view of the downtown Los Angeles skyline, make the Park "visually memorable." As discussed in Section 3.01, Aesthetics, and Appendix C, Visual Impact Assessment, views considered to be scenic locally would not be substantially impacted. In addition, while views from the Park toward the surrounding existing urban landscape exhibit various visual values, the proposed Project would not substantially impact these views as shown in the simulated views. Therefore, the proposed Project would not block any designated scenic views, alter a designated scenic area, or block panoramic views, and impacts to scenic or panoramic views would be less than significant.

Comment PH194-5 And all the concerns that this community is raising in terms of gentrification I find very valid. It's been a long battle for Chinatown to maintain its status here. And reportability is obviously one of the biggest concerns. And this is just not a asset to the people who live here.

Response PH194-5 Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not exacerbate gentrification or result in displacement of residents in the surrounding

neighborhoods and is consistent with Metro’s considerations regarding gentrification and displacement. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project’s features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities, including but not limited to, sustainability features and open space enhancements, the Community Access Plan for fares, access to parks, mobility hubs, utilization of local artists for site specific artwork at each station reflective of the unique neighborhood culture, design of each component of the proposed Project to complement and reflect the unique character of the surrounding neighborhood, the Business and Community Support Program during construction, and benefits to local businesses along the proposed Project alignment. The Project Sponsor would convene stakeholder groups to coordinate on issues related to proposed Project features.

Comment PH194-6 It really feels like a vanity project. Yeah, it's really more about the transparency of the process that feels really lost. So thank you.

Response PH194-6 Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. Refer to Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project’s public outreach and opportunity for public testimony during the Draft EIR public review period. Refer to Appendix A, Scoping Report, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of outreach and community engagement during the Draft EIR scoping period.

Public Hearing Comment PH195 – Ron Frank

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH195

Comment PH195-1 MR. FRANK: Okay, I'm Ron Frank, R-O-N F-R-A-N-K.

REPORTER: And please proceed, Ron.

MR. FRANK: I do live in this neighborhood, but if I didn't I would still be against this project. It's very much obviously a scam, and this should not be happening just to enrich one person.

Ostensibly, this is about saving the environment. Actually, it's a moving goal post, a moving horizon. They have so many different reasons for saying they want this gondola project to go through, and none of them will solve any problem with our -- the gondola is not a solution to any environmental or neighborhood problems.

It's a solution for Frank McCourt's problem with what to do with his half of the Dodger Stadium parking lot. And nobody talks about all the environmental damage that will happen when he does end up developing his half of the parking lot. And that's down the line, and that's something that's not at all addressed in any way.

And I'm certain that whatever project he comes up with will create environmental damage in the building of it and in the people patronizing it afterwards. It'll increase the attendance at Dodger Stadium when there's not a game.

Response PH195-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at LAUS, Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Dodger Stadium draws large regional crowds, with approximately 100 baseball games and other events each year, but there are no permanent transit connections to the venue. The vast majority of visitors drive their personal vehicles to access the venue. These vehicles create congestion on the surface streets leading up to and around Dodger Stadium, including Sunset Boulevard/Cesar E. Chavez from LAUS and throughout the surrounding communities. Given the capacity of the proposed Project's system, approximately 20 percent of the fans could take aerial

transit connected to Metro's regional transit system. This would reduce vehicular congestion in and around Dodger Stadium, on neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways during game and special event days. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan. Refer to Topical Response G, No Improper Project Segmentation: The Proposed Project Is Intended to Create a Transit Connection from Metro's Union Station Transportation Hub via an Aerial Gondola System to the Dodger Stadium Property, for discussion of how the proposed Project solely proposes an aerial gondola system. The proposed Project does not include other development, and neither the Project Sponsor nor any other applicant has applied for other development unrelated to the existing stadium uses on the Dodger Stadium property.

Comment PH195-2 As well, and this is just a personal thing, I have come to really love the wildlife in my neighborhood. And this would greatly affect that. I realize that's seen as a lesser thing in these matters, but the wildlife is important in the neighborhood. And it's great that it's here.

REPORTER: That concludes your comment?

MR. FRANK: I'm sure I have much more to say, if I was a little more organized, but that's it off the top of my head.

REPORTER: Okay, thank you.

Response PH195-2 The Draft EIR addressed Biological Resources in Section 3.04, Biological Resources, with supporting data provided in Appendix E, Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit Biological Resources Assessment, of the Draft EIR, and Appendix G Supplemental Biological Resources Report, of this Final EIR. The Draft EIR found that the proposed Project would result in less than significant impacts to biological resources.

Comment PH195-3 MR. FRANK: My name is Ron Frank, R-O-N F-R-A-N-K. And another concerning thing about this whole process is that it's very much that they don't -- there's no transparency in so many aspects of this, from even this here today. Who are all these people manning these booths? I imagine they're employees.

And it seems like a lot of people here are against the gondola, and a lot of people here who are for it are employed to be for it.

As well, there are so many changing names of who's trying to make this happen. It started out with Frank McCourt, then Climate Resolve, then Zero Emissions, then Metro, and who knows who else.

Response PH195-3 Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit,

a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project.

Refer to Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's public outreach and opportunity for public testimony during the Draft EIR public review period. Refer to Appendix A, Scoping Report, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of outreach and community engagement during the Draft EIR scoping period. Metro sought to engage the community in each stage of the environmental review process. Metro engaged the public in decision making for the proposed Project beginning with the public scoping period for the Draft EIR in October 2020 to receive public comment on the proposed Project's scope of environmental review under CEQA. In June 2021, the Project Sponsor conducted two virtual public outreach meetings. The input from the public, including local community stakeholders, as well as from agencies, organizations, and interested parties, during this period led directly to changes to the proposed Project to incorporate public feedback. The Draft EIR was released on October 17, 2022, for a 60-day public review period, which Metro extended an additional 30 days for a 90-day public review period ending on January 17, 2023. Eight public meetings were held immediately preceding, during, and immediately after the Draft EIR public review period, with four held in-person in the Project area at Los Angeles Union Station and Cathedral High School, and four held virtually via Zoom webinar. The format of the in-person public meetings immediately preceding and during the Draft EIR public review period was an Open House, consistent with standard Metro practice, where attendees could learn more about the proposed Project and the key analyses and conclusions of the Draft EIR, and also a public comment opportunity. Twelve stations were set up throughout the venue, with ten stations focused on specific subject matter areas of the Draft EIR. Attendees could walk around to each station and ask questions to subject-matter experts about the proposed Project. Each station had large, printed boards summarizing the subject matter of that station, including: the Project Description, Aesthetics, Air Quality, GHG, and Energy, Cultural (Archaeology and Historical Resources), Parks and Recreation, Noise, Transportation, and Parking. Each station also included printed materials that attendees could review and/or take with them, including fact sheets in English, Spanish, and Chinese (Simplified) and printed copies of the presentation from the virtual public hearing in English, Spanish, Chinese (Simplified) and Chinese (Traditional). A hard copy of the Draft EIR was also available at the Summary of Impacts station for attendees to review. The meeting was staffed by Metro and AECOM staff, experts on subject matter areas including Transportation and Parking; Archaeology; Historical Resources; Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas, and Energy; Ropeway Engineering; Noise; and Aesthetics, and the Project team, who answered questions from attendees on the Draft EIR key analyses and conclusion. During the two in-person public meetings that were public hearings, comments could be submitted either in writing on forms provided by Metro, or verbally to the court reporters who had set up at a "comment station" in the venue. Written comment

forms provided instructions on how to comment on the Draft EIR in English, Spanish, and Chinese (Simplified). Interpretation was provided in English, Spanish, Mandarin, and Cantonese during the eight public meetings, with interpretation provided in Taishanese during the final two public meetings.

Comment PH195-4 And another big secret has to do with -- involves the budget. If somehow this project does get jammed through, what provisions are there for this to be paid for when they go over schedule and over budget? And how are they going to prevent the tax payers from having to rescue this boondoggle?

REPORTER: Does that conclude your comment? Please continue.

MR. FRANK: It offers nothing but blight and ruin. And it must be stopped before it gets to a point where it's gone too far, and it's just going to be a big bus wreck. Okay, thank you.

Response PH195-4 Refer to Section 3.01, Aesthetics, and Appendix C, Visual Impact Assessment, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the aesthetic impacts of the proposed Project, which would be less than significant. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project.

Public Hearing Comment PH196 – Xochitl Mazanilla

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH196

Comment PH196-1 MS. MANZANILLA: Yes, my name is Xochitl Manzanilla.

REPORTER: And could you spell that for me?

MS. MANZANILLA: I spell it, like, X-O-C-H-I-T-L.

REPORTER: Yes.

MS. MANZANILLA: And my last name is Manzanilla, M-A-N-Z, as in zebra, A-N-I-L-L-A.

REPORTER; Okay, and your comments, please?

MS. MANZANILLA: My comments is that I oppose the gondola project very strongly for many reasons. We do not need it, the first -- number one. We do not need it. We already have free transportation to Dodger Stadium.

Response PH196-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at Los Angeles Union Station (LAUS), Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Dodger Stadium draws large regional crowds, with approximately 100 baseball games and other events each year, but there are no permanent transit connections to the venue. The vast majority of visitors drive their personal vehicles to access the venue. These vehicles create congestion on the surface streets leading up to and around Dodger Stadium, including Sunset Boulevard/Cesar E. Chavez from LAUS and throughout the surrounding communities. Given the capacity of the proposed Project's system, approximately 20 percent of the fans could take aerial transit connected to Metro's regional transit system. This would reduce vehicular congestion in and around Dodger Stadium, on neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways during game and special event days. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan. Refer to Topical Response H, The Draft EIR Considered an Appropriate Range of Alternatives and Design Options, for discussion of how the Transportation Systems Management Alternative for an enhanced Dodger Stadium Express is unlikely to achieve the same level of ridership as the proposed Project, and otherwise fails to meet most of the Project Objectives

which seek to achieve the proposed Project's underlying purpose of providing a permanent direct transit connection between LAUS and the Dodger Stadium property and improving connectivity for surrounding communities, including Chinatown, Mission Junction, Elysian Park, Solano Canyon, and the Los Angeles State Historic Park.

Comment PH196-2 And it will be a big mistake doing it on areas where only low income families live. These are communities, the people work hard to put the bread on the table. And this will be a big mistake for that reason, because they are poor people. And having to pay \$40 to ride the gondola, I think it will be not fair.

Response PH196-2 Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the proposed Project is designed to extend affordable, regional access and mobility options to the communities adjacent to the proposed Project alignment, providing connections to Metro's growing regional public transit system. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities including but not limited to sustainability features and open space enhancements, the Community Access Plan for fares, access to parks, mobility hubs, signage, utilization of local artists for site specific artwork at each station reflective of the unique neighborhood culture, design of each component of the proposed Project to complement and reflect the unique character of the surrounding neighborhood, the Business and Community Support Program during construction, and benefits to local businesses along the proposed Project alignment. The Project Sponsor would convene stakeholder groups to coordinate on issues related to proposed Project features.

Comment PH196-3 And it will affect terribly all the programs that we have at LA State Historic Park, Los Angeles State Historic Park. Like, flying the kites is a program, the farmers market that we have in the park, CiBiC Bike, Art in the Park, Tai Chi class, Yoga class, baseball, and all concerts in the park, and more programs that I cannot mention.

Response PH196-3 As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, Section 3.16, Parks and Recreational Facilities, and Section 5.0, Other CEQA Considerations, of the Draft EIR, the Chinatown/State Park Station would have a footprint of 2,195 square feet in the Los Angeles State Historic Park (~.1% of the total 32-acre park), and the station canopy would have an overhang of 9,320 square feet over the park. The proposed Project alignment crosses over the westernmost edge of the Los Angeles State Historic Park, adjacent to the existing Metro L Line (Gold) and the associated overhead catenary system. The proposed Project's required aerial clearance would be located above approximately 59,470 square feet of the total 32-acre park, plus an Additional Separation Buffer. With the required clearances and the height at which the cabins

would cross over the Los Angeles State Historic Park, the ability to use the vast majority of the Park for kite flying, special events (e.g., concerts, craft fairs, partnership events, 5K/10K runs, workshops, cultural festivals, and the farmers' market), and other passive recreational opportunities (e.g., picnicking, jogging, walking, and informal play) would not be affected by the proposed Project. Refer to Response S2-4 for additional discussion regarding the ability of uses to continue at the Park.

Comment PH196-4 The real estate will be affected very badly with this gondola. People fought very hard so this land will be the beautiful park that it is today. And it's our beautiful LA State Historic Park. We don't want nothing to mess or destroy, come and destroy our beautiful park that we enjoy so wonderfully. Thank you.

Response PH196-4 Refer to Response PH196-3 for discussion of how the ability to use the vast majority of the Park would not be affected by the proposed Project. Refer to Section 3.01, Aesthetics, and Appendix C, Visual Impact Assessment, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the aesthetic impacts of the proposed Project, which would be less than significant, including at the Park.

Public Hearing Comment PH197 – Miho Murai

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH197

Comment PH197-1 MS. MURAI: Hi, my name is Miho Murai.

And I am a Chinatown resident. And I am here because I want to show my opposition to the gondola project. I do not believe there's enough transparency regarding the funding for the project from Metro and Frank McCourt.

The construction costs could go up to \$300 million. And the question that I have is who will be paying for this? Will taxpayers' dollars be used to fund this project? And if so, how much of our public funds are estimated to be used? And when will we find out about this? Also, who will pay for the maintenance and daily operations of the gondola?

Response PH197-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project.

Comment PH197-2 Another major issue is, as a resident of Chinatown, there is no need for a gondola, because the transportation from Union Station to Dodger Stadium already exists as a free shuttle system.

Response PH197-2 Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of how the proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan. Refer to Topical Response H, The Draft EIR Considered an Appropriate Range of Alternatives and Design Options, for discussion of how the Transportation Systems Management Alternative for an enhanced Dodger Stadium Express is unlikely to achieve the same

level of ridership as the proposed Project, and otherwise fails to meet most of the Project Objectives, which seek to achieve the proposed Project's underlying purpose of providing a permanent direct transit connection between Los Angeles Union Station (LAUS) and the Dodger Stadium property and improving connectivity for surrounding communities, including Chinatown, Mission Junction, Elysian Park, Solano Canyon, and the Los Angeles State Historic Park.

Comment PH197-3 People that are going to use the gondola are tourists that are going to come in because they want to have the view. But the reality is the people that live in the community will be the ones affected by the transportation, by the traffic.

Response PH197-3 Refer to Section 2.1, Overview of the Project, of the Draft EIR, discussing how the proposed Project would operate daily to serve existing residents, workers, park users, and visitors to Los Angeles. As discussed on page 2-42, in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the proposed Project would provide service to all pre-season, regular season, and post-season Los Angeles Dodger games and any special events (e.g., concerts, the Los Angeles Marathon) at the Dodger Stadium property. The proposed Project would also provide service to events at the Los Angeles State Historic Park. In addition to providing service on game and special event days at Dodger Stadium and events at the Los Angeles State Historic Park, it is anticipated that the proposed Project would also provide daily service between 6:00am to 12:00am, for the surrounding communities, including Chinatown, Mission Junction, Elysian Park, Solano Canyon, and the Los Angeles State Historic Park. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game and the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the proposed Community Access Plan. Refer to Topical Response B, Ridership Model; Queueing at Stations and Pre-game and Post-game Transportation, for discussion of the proposed Project's ridership model which is based on extensive data sources and assumptions validated by data, and the management of queueing at stations, and pre-game and post-game transportation. Traffic congestion is not required to be analyzed under CEQA in the Draft EIR following the implementation of Senate Bill 743, which designated "vehicle miles traveled" as the method for assessing transportation impacts on the environment for CEQA projects. Refer to the Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit Project Non-CEQA Transportation Assessment, which found that there could be localized increases in traffic at the intersections closest to the proposed Project's Alameda Station and Chinatown/State Park Station due to some riders choosing to park and ride or take Uber/Lyft and recommended the proposed Project work with Metro to identify a transit partnership for the proposed Project riders to further encourage them to take transit, walk, or bike to the proposed Project's stations.

Comment PH197-4 And we do not have -- and we don't even know how much the gondola is going to cost. Most likely, it's going to not even be affordable to the residents. Chinatown is one of the most lowest income and cities within the LA County.

Response PH197-4 Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at LAUS, Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of how the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan. The proposed Project would provide active transportation connectivity along the proposed Project alignment through pedestrian access enhancements and first / last mile multi-modal options at the mobility hubs proposed for the Chinatown/State Park Station and the Dodger Stadium Station.

Comment PH197-5 And then finally, I want to – the gondola project will impact historic and culture resources such as the LA State Historic Park, the Union Station, and the Pueblo de Los Historic Monument. The towers that are going to be built are not suitable to the locations at where they're at.

Response PH197-5 The Draft EIR fully analyzed and addressed the proposed Project's potential impacts to cultural resources including the Los Angeles State Historic Park, LAUS, and El Pueblo in Section 3.05, Cultural Resources, with supporting data provided in Appendix F, Archaeological and Paleontological Resources Assessment for the Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit Project, and Appendix G, Historical Resource Technical Report for the Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit Project (HRTR). As discussed in Section 3.05, the Draft EIR's analysis concludes that all potential impacts related to historical resources would be less than significant, and all potential impacts related to archaeological resources would be either less than significant or reduced to less than significant with mitigation.

Comment PH197-6 And more importantly, a gondola, it's just going to look weird. I'm sorry.

Response PH197-6 Refer to Section 3.01, Aesthetics, and Appendix C, Visual Impact Assessment, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the aesthetic impacts of the proposed Project, which would be less than significant. Refer to Topical Response M, Comparable Urban Aerial Transit Systems, discussing how, like the proposed Project, comparable aerial transit systems in cities around the world are integrated with their surrounding urban environments. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, discussing how the proposed Project's design takes cues from the immediate neighborhood culture, including how each component of the proposed Project would be designed to complement and reflect the unique character of the surrounding area.

Comment PH197-7 And then finally, this project will lead to displacement and increase the cost of rent in the area. And that's already happening all the time, gentrification.

Where I live currently, there's an 21 apartment building right across from me. For a two-bedroom apartment, it's \$5,000. And as a result of that, they raised our rent in December. And so projects like this are not for the community.

And what it's going to lead to is the gentrification of our community. And it's going to lead to tourists coming into our community that can enjoy the gondola. But then they can go home and leave.

Response PH197-7 Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not exacerbate gentrification or result in displacement of residents in the surrounding neighborhoods and is consistent with Metro's considerations regarding gentrification and displacement. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities, including potential partnerships with and benefits to local businesses in Chinatown.

Comment PH197-8 And then who is going to be impacted by the air, who's going to be impacted by the traffic? It's us, the community. So we ask you to first ask the community what we want.

Response PH197-8 Refer to Section 3.03, Air Quality, Section 3.08, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 3.17, Transportation, Appendix D, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's ability to reduce vehicular travel, to improve air quality through reduced emissions, and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through reduced vehicular travel. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the Draft EIR addresses environmental justice. The proposed Project supports Metro's goal of prioritizing equity opportunities and is designed to extend affordable, regional access and mobility options to the communities adjacent to the proposed Project alignment. Public outreach for the proposed Project was designed with environmental justice principles in mind. The proposed Project would not preclude development of uses including housing, grocery stores, and/or healthcare facilities in the surrounding communities, and would itself address a need for a permanent transit connection to one of the region's most visited venues and would alleviate existing congestion on surrounding neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways, thereby reducing associated air pollution and improving safety. The proposed Project is also designed to be ADA compliant. Refer to Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's public outreach and opportunity for public testimony during the Draft EIR public review period. Refer to Appendix A,

Scoping Report, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of outreach and community engagement during the Draft EIR scoping period.

Comment PH197-9 What we want is we want more affordable housing. We want markets, we want public transportation, we need to address the unhoused. And these are the things that we need right now as we're fighting the COVID pandemic.

We do not need a gondola project that's going to ruin our community and not at all support our community. Thank you.

Response PH197-9 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing, and Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not displace housing, prevent planned housing, or preclude development of uses including housing, grocery stores, and/or healthcare facilities in the surrounding communities. Refer to Topical Response A, SB 44, for discussion of how the proposed Project is public transportation because it will be open to the general public for service at regular, scheduled operating times, operating daily to serve existing residents, workers, park users, and visitors to Los Angeles. In addition to providing service on game and special event days at Dodger Stadium and events at the Los Angeles State Historic Park, it is anticipated that the proposed Project would also provide daily service between 6:00am to 12:00am, for the surrounding communities, including Chinatown, Mission Junction, Elysian Park, Solano Canyon, and the Los Angeles State Historic Park. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game and the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the proposed Community Access Plan. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities, including but not limited to, sustainability features and open space enhancements, the Community Access Plan for fares, access to parks, mobility hubs, signage, utilization of local artists for site specific artwork at each station reflective of the unique neighborhood culture, design of each component of the proposed Project to complement and reflect the unique character of the surrounding neighborhood, the Business and Community Support Program during construction, and benefits to local businesses along the proposed Project alignment. The Project Sponsor would convene stakeholder groups to coordinate on issues related to proposed Project features.

Public Hearing Comment PH198 - Martha Woodhull

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH198

Comment PH198-1 MS. WOODHULL: Hello.

MS. SISCO: Hi. We can hear you.

MS. WOODHULL: Yes, good. Don't start the clock yet. I want to turn mine on real quick so I can parallel yours. And I can do that whenever you're ready, and I can begin.

Shall I start my clock?

MS. SISCO: Sure. Please go ahead.

MS. WOODHULL: Thank you very much. My name is Martha Woodhull. My professional name is Marta. I'm a resident of the Metro Chinatown Senior Lofts. Forgive the slurring sound in my speech. I have a Invisalign in, yes? At the age of 68, I'm getting Invisalign, finally.

The reason I'm commenting is due to health issues. I had COVID and long COVID. I was unable to attend any meetings, but I have followed all of the documents.

Response PH198-1 This comment is noted and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Comment PH198-2 Early on, when you first proposed this project, there was a representative actually at our building at Metro Chinatown, and I asked her to walk into my apartment to observe the impact of the Alpine Tower. I don't know that anyone has ever actually come inside any of our homes to experience what it will be like as a resident of the Metro Chinatown.

We have one window. We are a loft, narrow loft type of building, and our only window faces the Alameda Quarter. I am literally directly opposite the Alpine Tower, and I'm at about 100, 125 feet in the air. So, I'm very glad to see, looking at the EIR today -- EIR, I mean, that you are going to be above my head.

So, so I was quite concerned about that. You're going to be 175 feet. By the way, that drawing is very not to scale.

But I'm the daughter of a civil engineer. My father was a mayor. I understand the difficulty of a massive project of this nature, minimally, but it's very distressing to me that no one has experienced, to my knowledge, the boots on the ground reality of the people living in extreme proximity to these structures. I think the tower will be about 50, 75 feet in front of my face, and it will probably occupy half of my window.

That isn't worrying me. I was mostly worrying about gondolas passing in front of my window. I see by the plans that they won't.

So, my time is up. I wanted to just give you that inform --

Response PH198-2 Refer to Section 3.01, Aesthetics, and Appendix C, Visual Impact Assessment, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the aesthetic impacts of the proposed Project, which would be less than significant. Because visual impacts under the L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide are assessed based on changes to public views, description of resident viewer groups was provided only for informational purposes as private views from residential properties are not protected under the L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide.

Refer to Section 2.05, Proposed Project Alignment and Components, of Section 2.0, Project Description, with supporting data provided in Appendix Q, Proposed Alignment Plan and Profile, of the Draft EIR for discussion of how the proposed Project maximizes alignment along the public ROW and publicly owned property and minimizes aerial rights over private properties and includes the proposed Project's profile along the alignment. Refer to Topical Response M, Comparable Urban Aerial Transit Systems, discussing how, like the proposed Project, comparable aerial transit systems in cities around the world are integrated with their surrounding urban environments. In particular, comparable aerial transit systems in other locations demonstrate that such systems can operate safely, efficiently, and in concert with nearby residential and open space uses, including parks and other recreational facilities. The proposed Project would be located in a densely-populated, urban environment surrounded by a variety of commercial, industrial, and residential development types. In this type of environment, it is common for public transportation, such as Metro's light rail, to be located adjacent to residential uses and modern aerial transit systems in other cities, including Portland, Oregon and New York City, operate adjacent to residential uses. Refer to Topical Response J, Gondola Design and Operations and Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of how cabin windows can be equipped with privacy glass that can become opaque while adjacent to sensitive views, and the proposed Project would work with stakeholders adjacent to the proposed Project alignment to identify locations where the use of privacy glass would be warranted. Considerations as to the locations along the proposed Project alignment where the privacy glass could be activated include the subject adjacent sensitive views and the vertical and horizontal distance between the proposed Project cabins and the adjacent sensitive views.

Public Hearing Comment PH199 - Chris Hannan

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH199

Comment PH199-1 MR. HANNAN: Hello?

MS. SISCO: Yes.

MR. HANNAN: Hi. This is Chris Hannan with the Los Angeles-Orange Counties Building and Construction Trades Council, 1626 Beverly Boulevard, Los Angeles, California, here to speak in support of the project on behalf of 48 affiliate local unions and district councils representing over 140,000 members.

This project is not only going to create good jobs, but it's going to have a tremendous benefit to the Los Angeles Community by getting thousands of cars off the road and encouraging public transportation.

This is the second largest city in the country, and we need to have more access to public transportation, the last mile when we complete the trip on public transportation, and the Gondola Project is a fantastic project. It's going to get people off the roads and onto public transportation. It's going to be safe, and it's going to minimize the impact to the local community.

We've been in Los Angeles for over 119 years and strongly support the project. The project will be constructed with local community and the highest skilled membership in the world to make sure it's done as safe as possible.

Thank you very much.

Response PH199-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. The proposed Project will enter into a Project Labor Agreement and will work in coordination with the LA/OC Building and Construction Trades.

Public Hearing Comment PH200 - Peter Kwan

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH200

Comment PH200-1 MR. KWAN: Hi.

MS. SISCO: There we go.

MR. KWAN: Hi. Can you -- hi. Can you hear me?

MS. SISCO: Yes. Thank you.

MR. KWAN: All right, thank you.

This is Peter Kwan (phonetic). I am a born and raised Chinatown kid -- actually, born in Sacramento, but moved here when I was one. I am now 60. My family's been here for well over 59 years with our businesses in Chinatown, and I am calling in support of the project.

One of the things that we are lacking right now in Chinatown is commercial activity. We have no supermarkets. We have no stores, and I just took a walk around Chinatown today, and a lot of them were already closed by 3:00 p.m.

Chinatown is dying a slow death. You'll notice that commercial property owners are - - when they pass away, their heirs sell all their properties. Well, that's because there's no commercial activity. If the commercial activity was healthy, the buildings would be worth more than the land. Right now, it's the opposite. The land is worth more than the building, so they're all moving on. The old generations are dying, and the young generation won't come back.

I'm probably one of five businesses in Chinatown that has stayed, and we're making it work.

The other issue I'd like to address that people are concerned with is rising rents. Rents don't rise because of a gondola. The reason why rents rise because there's a lack of housing. And the reason some areas have more demand than others, people are moving in for the quality of schools, for the sick --

Response PH200-1 This comment is indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, discussing the proposed Project's potential partnerships with and benefits to local businesses in Chinatown. As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the proposed Project creates a first/last mile transit link for residents and businesses within Chinatown while unifying and connecting communities through transit mobility access. This new mode of transportation will expand rider access to the regional transit system by attracting

new visitors including Dodgers fans, and represents an opportunity for additional visitors along the proposed Project alignment, creating economic opportunities for local businesses, including shops and restaurants, through potential partnerships that drive customers to Chinatown and other businesses along the proposed Project alignment, which, consequently, adds revenues to these small businesses in the communities the proposed Project hopes to serve. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of how during construction, the Project Sponsor would create a Business and Community Support Program to assist local businesses affected by proposed Project construction activities. The proposed Project would provide numerous benefits to local businesses in El Pueblo, Chinatown, and other areas along the proposed Project alignment, including through potential partnerships with these businesses as well as by providing an accessible and affordable mobility option for employees and area residents. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan. Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not displace any housing.

Comment Letter PH201 - Gay Yuen

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH201

Comment PH201-1 MS. YUEN: Hello. You can hear me now, right?

MS. SISCO: Yes.

MS. YUEN: Thank you. My name's Gay Yuen. I was raised in Chinatown, taught in Chinatown, and still very active with the community there. On top of that, I'm the chair of the Chinese-American Museum, which is located at El Pueblo Historical Monument across from Union Station.

So, I'm intimately connected with the gondola in terms of the present design and proposal, and I've spoken several times in favor of the gondola because to me, it's a win-win, both for the El Pueblo Monument and also for Chinatown in terms of visitors coming in, visiting our vendors, eating in our restaurants, and visiting our public places.

Response PH201-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment PH201-2 So, I won't go into that as much as saying that my direct comment on the EIR is that I'm hoping, when we get to the point of community benefits, that there will be a concerted effort to include participants from Chinatown and from El Pueblo so that we can talk specifically about what the residents, what the merchants, and what all the others who are directly impacted by the gondola will be able to tell you what we want and what our community needs.

I think that I agree with Peter Kwan, that Chinatown can only survive if we infuse it with visitors who will come to our places of business. And, therefore, I urge that we continue to look at how to build the gondola with respect to what the needs of our communities are.

Thank you very much.

Response PH201-2 Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, Appendix A, Scoping Report, of the Draft EIR, and Topical C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project team's outreach efforts to neighborhoods along the proposed Project alignment and the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding community. Metro sought to engage with stakeholders in neighborhoods along the proposed Project alignment in each stage of the environmental review process. Input from the public, including local community stakeholders, led directly to the selection of the proposed Project alignment, including an intermediate station in Chinatown (the

Chinatown/State Park Station), as well as to the redesign of the proposed Project stations and junction and additional pedestrian enhancements including hardscape and landscape improvements. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding community, including but not limited to, sustainability features and open space enhancements, the Community Access Plan for fares, access to parks, mobility hubs, signage, utilization of local artists for site specific artwork at each station reflective of the unique neighborhood culture, design of each component of the proposed Project to complement and reflect the unique character of the surrounding neighborhood, the Business and Community Support Program during construction, and benefits to local businesses along the proposed Project alignment. The proposed Project would also provide numerous benefits to local businesses in El Pueblo, Chinatown, and other areas along the proposed Project alignment, including through potential partnerships with these businesses as well as by providing an accessible and affordable mobility option for employees and area residents. The proposed Project could partner, for example, with the Chinese American Museum to help in addressing visitor, educational, and customer access to the Museum. The Project Sponsor would convene stakeholder groups to coordinate on issues related to proposed Project features.

Comment Letter PH202 - Kris Chan

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH202

Comment PH202-1 MS. CHAN: Hi. I don't know why you need my full name, but fine. My name is Kris Chan. I am a member of the Chinatown community, and frankly, I am so frustrated that we continue to have these hearings without any public transparency.

Response PH202-1 Refer to Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's public outreach and opportunity for public testimony during the Draft EIR public review period. Refer to Appendix A, Scoping Report, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of outreach and community engagement during the Draft EIR scoping period. Metro sought to engage the community in each stage of the environmental review process. Metro engaged the public in decision making for the proposed Project beginning with the public scoping period for the Draft EIR in October 2020 to receive public comment on the proposed Project's scope of environmental review under CEQA. In June 2021, the Project Sponsor conducted two virtual public outreach meetings. The input from the public, including local community stakeholders, as well as from agencies, organizations, and interested parties, during this period led directly to changes to the proposed Project to incorporate public feedback. The Draft EIR was released on October 17, 2022, for a 60-day public review period, which Metro extended an additional 30 days for a 90-day public review period ending on January 17, 2023. Eight public meetings were held immediately preceding, during, and immediately following, the Draft EIR public review period, with four held in-person in the Project area at Los Angeles Union Station and Cathedral High School, and four held virtually via Zoom webinar. Project materials and information were provided at both the in-person meetings and on Metro's website in English, Spanish, Chinese (Traditional), and Chinese (Simplified). Interpretation was provided in English, Spanish, Mandarin, and Cantonese during the eight public meetings, with interpretation provided in Taishanese during the final two public meetings. Refer to Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's opportunities for public testimony during the Draft EIR public review period. During the public review period, comments on the Draft EIR could be submitted in writing via email or mail, by phone, and during the four public hearings. Comments on the Draft EIR could be submitted by email to LAART@metro.net, by mail to One Gateway Plaza, Mail Stop 99-22-6, Los Angeles, CA 90012, or over the phone by calling (213) 922-6913. Comments could also be submitted at each public hearing. At virtual public hearings, comments could be given verbally. In light of the disruptions at the January 12, 2023, public hearing, Metro provided a fourth public hearing by way of a virtual public hearing held on February 8, 2023. Verbal comments made at the virtual February 8, 2023 public hearing were deemed timely submitted for the purposes of the Draft EIR public review period. At the two public hearings held in person,

comments could be submitted either in writing on forms provided by Metro, or verbally to the court reporters who were set up at a “comment station” in the venue. Written comment forms provided instructions on how to comment on the Draft EIR in English, Spanish, and Chinese (Simplified). Interpretation was provided in English, Spanish, Mandarin, and Cantonese during all four public hearings, with interpretation provided in Taishanese during the final two public hearings.

Comment PH202-2 This is clearly a cosmetic project of Frank McCourt, and this will do nothing to benefit actually community members of Chinatown.

We -- you literally said it yourself. We need a market. We need a hospital, and yet, you think building a gondola will save Chinatown?

Chinatown is not dying because we lack visitors. We need real community needs. We need things to benefit the older generation of Chinatown. We need actual affordable housing, and we're trying to spend millions of taxpayer dollars on these fucking stupid fucks.

I am respectfully asking you all to think about what low income community needs. You all are just doing this garbage work that doesn't actually amount to anything.

Response PH202-2 Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project’s capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project’s capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the Draft EIR addresses environmental justice, how the proposed Project supports Metro’s goal of prioritizing equity opportunities and is designed to extend affordable, regional access and mobility options to the communities adjacent to the proposed Project alignment. Public outreach for the proposed Project was designed with environmental justice principles in mind. The proposed Project would not preclude development of uses including housing, grocery stores, and/or healthcare facilities in the surrounding communities, and would itself address a need for a permanent transit connection to one of the region’s most visited venues and would alleviate existing congestion on surrounding neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways, thereby reducing associated air pollution and improving safety. The proposed Project is also designed to be ADA compliant.

Comment PH202-3 How much of the construction will decrease the air quality? None of this makes any sense. How many years will it take to build the goddamn gondola?

We -- there's so many things going on right now. We're in a pandemic.

Response PH202-3 Refer to Section 3.03, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR for discussion of how the proposed Project would have less than significant impacts related to air quality.

Comment PH202-4 Rents are increasing because of this lack of affordable housing, and yet, we're all here sitting here listening to this as if Chinatown needs to be revitalized.

No. Chinatown community -- you all are just ignoring members who actually live there. They have been surviving, and they don't need a gondola. They need real community access, health care, hospital, market.

I don't know how many times we have to stress this: we don't need a gondola, and we're demanding that you get out.

Response PH202-4 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the proposed Project would not preclude development of uses including housing, grocery stores, and/or healthcare facilities in the surrounding communities, and would itself address a need for a permanent transit connection to one of the region's most visited venues, and would benefit the surrounding community by alleviating existing congestion on surrounding neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways, thereby reducing associated air pollution and improving safety. Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not exacerbate gentrification or result in displacement of residents in the surrounding neighborhoods and is consistent with Metro's considerations regarding gentrification and displacement. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, Appendix A, Scoping Report, of the Draft EIR, and Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project team's outreach efforts to neighborhoods along the proposed Project alignment and the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities. Metro sought to engage with stakeholders in neighborhoods along the proposed Project alignment in each stage of the environmental review process. Input from the public, including local community stakeholders, led directly to the selection of the proposed Project alignment, including an intermediate station in Chinatown (the Chinatown/State Park Station), as well as to the redesign of the proposed Project stations and junction and additional pedestrian enhancements including hardscape and landscape improvements. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities, including but not limited to, sustainability features and open space enhancements, the Community Access Plan for fares, access to parks, mobility hubs, signage,

utilization of local artists for site specific artwork at each station reflective of the unique neighborhood culture, design of each component of the proposed Project to complement and reflect the unique character of the surrounding neighborhood, the Business and Community Support Program during construction, and benefits to local businesses along the proposed Project alignment. The Project Sponsor would convene stakeholder groups to coordinate on issues related to proposed Project features.

Comment Letter PH203 - Eric Adams

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH203

Comment PH203-1 MR. ADAMS: Hello. Can you hear me?

MS. SISCO: Yes.

MR. ADAMS: Thank you.

This project is a master class in deception and defrauding of the people. Everyone getting paid to work on this boondoggle should feel a deep sense of shame.

Do you want to know more about this project? You're going to find dead ends and feel-good fantasies.

You want to know who's paying for it? Good luck. Because no one knows.

Response PH203-1 Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, Appendix A, Scoping Report, of the Draft EIR, and Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project team's outreach efforts to neighborhoods along the proposed Project alignment and the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefit to the surrounding community. Metro sought to engage with stakeholders in neighborhoods along the proposed Project alignment in each stage of the environmental review process. Input from the public, including local community stakeholders, led directly to the selection of the proposed Project alignment, including an intermediate station in Chinatown (the Chinatown/State Park Station), as well as to the redesign of the proposed Project stations and junction and additional pedestrian enhancements including hardscape and landscape improvements. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project.

Comment PH203-2 Want to know who's designing it? It's very vague, but we do know for sure it's not a gondola manufacturer. The reputable ones want nothing to do with this project.

Response PH203-2 There are two manufacturers of 3S gondola systems in the world, Doppelmayr USA and Leitner-Poma. Refer to Comment P43, Doppelmayr USA, and Comment P123, Leitner-Poma. Refer to Section 9.0, List of Preparers, of the Final EIR for information regarding RIOS, the design architect for the proposed Project.

Comment PH203-3 Want to know who's operating it? A non-profit climate change parasite group with zero experience operating an attraction or anything relating to the public. In fact, all they claim to do is partner with other orgs that are actually doing the work.

But, hey, public-private partnerships yield paychecks. Right?

Response PH203-3 Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project. ARTT LLC's donation of LA ARTT LLC and the proposed Project includes ARTT LLC's continued support of the proposed Project with financial support and expertise, including funding for consultant and technical work for the EIR. As set forth in Section 8.0, List of Preparers, of the Draft EIR, and Section 9.0, List of Preparers, of the Final EIR, consultant and technical work for the EIR includes analysis by a team of qualified experts, consultants, and engineers, including Fehr & Peers as to transportation; SCJ Alliance as to gondola systems; PCL Construction Services, Inc. as to construction; and Nabih Youssef Associates Structural Engineering as to structure engineering.

Comment PH203-4 Who's asking for this? That, we know concretely. Not the people of Los Angeles, not the residents of Chinatown and nearby communities, only the owners of the Chavez Ravine parking lots, so they can build the Dodgers Americana Grove Live. This is not public transit. It is an attraction.

Response PH203-4 Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at LAUS, Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Refer to Appendix A, Scoping Report, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of outreach and community engagement during the Draft EIR scoping period. Metro sought to engage the community in each stage of the environmental review process. Metro engaged the public, including local community stakeholders, as well as from agencies, organizations, and interested parties, in decision making for the proposed Project beginning with the public scoping period for the Draft EIR in October 2020 to receive public comment on the proposed Project's scope of environmental review under CEQA. In June 2021, the Project Sponsor conducted two virtual public outreach meetings. The public input during this period led directly to changes to the proposed Project to incorporate public feedback, including changes to the proposed Project alignment to include the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station, redesign of the proposed Project stations and junction and additional pedestrian enhancements including hardscape and landscape improvements. Refer to Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, for discussion of outreach and community engagement during the Draft EIR public review period and community engagement efforts during the preparation of the Final EIR.

Refer to Topical Response A, SB 44, for discussion of how the proposed Project is public transportation because it will be open to the general public for service at regular, scheduled operating times, operating daily to serve existing residents, workers, park users, and visitors to Los Angeles. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan. Refer to Response PH203-3 for discussion of the Project Sponsor. Refer to Topical Response G, No Improper Project Segmentation: The Proposed Project Is Intended to Create a Transit Connection from Metro's Union Station Transportation Hub via an Aerial Gondola System to the Dodger Stadium Property, for a discussion of how the proposed Project solely proposes an aerial gondola system.

Comment PH203-5 So, let's start the push on what we really need to do. Eminent domain, bringing the Chavez Ravine back to the people. Let's right a wrong decades in the making.

We will not go kicking and screaming this time, but we are keeping notes, and taking receipts and names. Shame on you all.

Response PH203-5 Refer to Section 5.0, Corrections and Additions, of this Final EIR, for a discussion of Chavez Ravine.

Comment Letter PH204 - Jon Christensen

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH204

Comment PH204-1 MR. CHRISTENSEN: Okay.

MS. SISCO: Yes.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Great.

My name is Jon Christensen. I teach and do research on environmental policy with a focus on equity and environmental justice in the Institute of the Environment and Sustainability, the Luskin Center for Innovation, and the Luskin Center for History and Policy at UCLA.

I'm deeply concerned about the lack of environmental justice and equity in this proposed project, as well as in the Draft Environmental Impact Report itself.

Environmental justice is defined by four important concepts: recognition justice, participatory or procedural justice, capabilities or capacity justice, and distribution justice.

Response PH204-1 Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how The Draft EIR analyzed the proposed Project's consistency with General Plan policies related to environmental justice, and the proposed Project is consistent with General Plan policies related to environmental justice, including by reinforcing or encouraging the establishment of a strong pedestrian orientation in the surrounding communities and facilitating multi-modal access to and from the stations with pedestrian network improvements, and by ensuring quality pedestrian access by facilitating multi-modal access to and from the stations with pedestrian network improvements. As discussed in Topical Response N, the proposed Project supports Metro's goal of prioritizing equity opportunities, and is designed to extend affordable, regional access and mobility options to the communities adjacent to the proposed Project alignment. Public outreach for the proposed Project was designed with environmental justice principles in mind. The proposed Project would not preclude development of uses including housing, grocery stores, and/or healthcare facilities in the surrounding communities, and would itself address a need for a permanent transit connection to one of the region's most visited venues and would alleviate existing congestion on surrounding neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways, thereby reducing associated air pollution and improving safety. The proposed Project is also designed to be ADA compliant.

Comment PH204-2 This project fails on all four fronts and the DEIR itself fails on three of the four.

First, the DEIR and the project have failed to adequately recognize the neighbors of this project who will bear the greatest brunt of its impact.

Response PH204-2 Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, Appendix A, Scoping Report, of the Draft EIR, and Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project team’s outreach efforts to neighborhoods along the proposed Project alignment and the proposed Project’s features to enhance and provide additional benefit to the surrounding community. Metro sought to engage with stakeholders in neighborhoods along the proposed Project alignment in each stage of the environmental review process. Input from the public, including local community stakeholders, led directly to the selection of the proposed Project alignment, including an intermediate station in Chinatown (the Chinatown/State Park Station), as well as to the redesign of the proposed Project stations and junction and additional pedestrian enhancements including hardscape and landscape improvements. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project’s features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities, including but not limited to, sustainability features and open space enhancements, the Community Access Plan for fares, access to parks, mobility hubs, signage, utilization of local artists for site specific artwork at each station reflective of the unique neighborhood culture, design of each component of the proposed Project to complement and reflect the unique character of the surrounding neighborhood, the Business and Community Support Program during construction, and benefits to local businesses along the proposed Project alignment. The Project Sponsor would convene stakeholder groups to coordinate on issues related to proposed Project features.

Comment PH204-3 Second, the DEIR process has been flawed from beginning to end. It has been designed and carried out as a dog and pony show promoting the project and gaslighting neighbors about its true impacts. Neighbors have not been given adequate opportunities to participate, to be heard and listened to.

No wonder they made their voices heard at your last meeting. That is a tried and true method of environmental justice when authorities refused to enable authentic participation in the process.

Response PH204-3 Refer to Appendix A, Scoping Report, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of outreach and community engagement during the Draft EIR scoping period. Metro sought to engage the community in each stage of the environmental review process. Metro engaged the public, including local community stakeholders, as well as from agencies, organizations, and interested parties, in decision making for the proposed Project beginning with the public scoping period for the Draft EIR in October 2020 to receive public comment on the proposed Project’s scope of environmental review under CEQA. In June 2021, the Project Sponsor conducted two virtual public outreach meetings. The public input during this period led directly to changes to the proposed Project to incorporate public feedback, including changes to the proposed Project

alignment to include the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station, redesign of the proposed Project stations and junction and additional pedestrian enhancements including hardscape and landscape improvements. Refer to Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, for discussion of outreach and community engagement during the Draft EIR public review period and community engagement efforts during the preparation of the Final EIR. The Draft EIR was released on October 17, 2022, for a 60-day public review period, which Metro extended an additional 30 days for a 90-day public review period ending on January 17, 2023. Eight public meetings were held immediately preceding, during, and immediately following, the Draft EIR public review period, with four held in-person in the Project area at Los Angeles Union Station and Cathedral High School, and four held virtually via Zoom webinar. Project materials and information were provided at both the in-person meetings and on Metro's website in English, Spanish, Chinese (Traditional), and Chinese (Simplified). Interpretation was provided in English, Spanish, Mandarin, and Cantonese during the eight public meetings, with interpretation provided in Taishanese during the final two public meetings. Refer to Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's opportunities for public testimony during the Draft EIR public review period. During the public review period, comments on the Draft EIR could be submitted in writing via email or mail, by phone, and in writing or verbally during the four public hearings. Interpretation was provided in English, Spanish, Mandarin, and Cantonese during all four public hearings, with interpretation provided in Taishanese during the final two public hearings. In light of the disruptions at the January 12, 2023, public hearing, Metro provided a fourth public hearing by way of a virtual public hearing held on February 8, 2023. This fourth, continued public hearing was provided for the sole purpose of receiving verbal public testimony on the Draft EIR for the proposed Project. Verbal comments made at the virtual February 8, 2023 public hearing were deemed timely submitted for the purposes of the Draft EIR public review period.

Comment PH204-4 Third, Frank McCourt and the other proponents of this project have done nothing to support the capacity and capability of disadvantaged neighbors to participate in this DEIR process or the planning that preceded it.

Response PH204-4 Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project. Refer to Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's public outreach and opportunity for public testimony during the Draft EIR public review period. Refer to Appendix A, Scoping Report, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of outreach and community engagement during the Draft EIR scoping period. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how public outreach for the proposed Project was designed with environmental justice principles in mind and the proposed Project provided translated materials in four different languages, and

interpretation services in five different languages, to reflect the surrounding community, and provided opportunities for in-person and virtual meetings with toll-free dial in options and ADA accessibility features.

Comment PH204-5 Fourth, this project is a classic case study of distribution injustice. The burden of the project would fall on disadvantaged neighbors, who would enjoy none of the supposed benefits of the project which, by the way, will not significantly reduce traffic and pollution around Dodger Stadium, and will be used by very, very few people locally to get around the neighborhood and visit El Pueblo, Chinatown, Los Angeles State Historic Park, and Elysian Park.

Response PH204-5 Refer to Response PH204-2 for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities. Refer to Section 3.03, Air Quality, Section 3.08, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 3.17, Transportation, Appendix D, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's ability to reduce vehicular travel, to improve air quality through reduced emissions, and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through reduced vehicular travel. Traffic congestion is not required to be analyzed under CEQA in the Draft EIR following the implementation of Senate Bill 743, which designated "vehicle miles traveled" as the method for assessing transportation impacts on the environment for CEQA projects. Refer to the Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit Project Non-CEQA Transportation Assessment, which found that there could be localized increases in traffic at the intersections closest to the proposed Project's Alameda Station and Chinatown/State Park Station due to some riders choosing to park and ride or take Uber/Lyft and recommended the proposed Project work with Metro to identify a transit partnership for the proposed Project riders to further encourage them to take transit, walk, or bike to the proposed Project's stations. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the Draft EIR addresses environmental justice by considering the proposed Project's ability to reduce congestion and emissions from on-road vehicles in an area disproportionately burdened by pollution, and including an analysis of the proposed Project's potential impacts to the surrounding community, concluding that the proposed Project could result in air quality benefits for the surrounding communities. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at LAUS, Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Dodger Stadium draws large regional crowds, with approximately 100 baseball games and other events each year, but there are no permanent transit connections to the venue. The vast majority of visitors drive their personal vehicles to access the venue. These vehicles create congestion on the surface streets leading up to and around Dodger

Stadium, including Sunset Boulevard/Cesar E. Chavez from LAUS and throughout the surrounding communities. Given the capacity of the proposed Project's system, approximately 20 percent of the fans could take aerial transit connected to Metro's regional transit system. This would reduce vehicular congestion in and around Dodger Stadium, on neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways during game and special event days. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition to providing service on game and special event days at Dodger Stadium and events at the Los Angeles State Historic Park, it is anticipated that the proposed Project would also provide daily service between 6:00am to 12:00am, for the surrounding communities, including Chinatown, Mission Junction, Elysian Park, Solano Canyon, and the Los Angeles State Historic Park. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game and the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the proposed Community Access Plan.

Comment PH204-6 I urge you to analyze and respond to these environmental justice concerns in this environmental impact review.

Response PH204-6 This comment provides a general conclusion to the comments raised in this letter. Responses to the comments contained in this letter are provided above in Responses PH204-1 through PH204-5.

Comment Letter PH205 - Maria Flores

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH205

Comment PH205-1 MS. SISCO: Yes.

MS. FLORES: Yes. Thank you.

Good evening. My name is Maria Flores. I am here in solidarity with the Chinatown Community for Equitable Development, an organization that builds grassroots community power that is based on the L.A. Chinatown area. They are all volunteer-run, and I am here because I am actually a resident of the South Central L.A. neighborhood.

Response PH205-1 This comment is noted and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Comment PH205-2 And something that we have in common is that our neighborhoods are both working class and immigrant family based, primarily. And we understand the struggles that happen in our neighborhoods when gentrification happens.

And I would just like for it to be clear to Metro and anybody supporting this project that we know, people in our community, the families, the students, the workers, know that all the projects coming into our primarily working class neighborhoods should be housing focused.

So, nothing comes into a neighborhood that is not directly benefitting a community, especially one that is primarily made up of Chinese immigrant families that have nowhere else to go.

We also have nowhere else to go, so I'm just here to make -- to let people know that we will stand with you, and that projects like these will stop happening because we will become united.

Response PH205-2 Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not exacerbate gentrification or result in displacement of residents in the surrounding neighborhoods and is consistent with Metro's considerations regarding gentrification and displacement. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the proposed Project would not preclude development of uses including housing, grocery stores, and/or healthcare facilities in the surrounding communities, and would itself address a need for a permanent transit connection to one of the region's most visited venues, and would benefit the surrounding community by

alleviating existing congestion on surrounding neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways, thereby reducing associated air pollution and improving safety. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities.

Comment PH205-3 And, you know, it's really unfortunate to see why Metro decides to prioritize a project that they know clearly will displace families. So, know that if it comes need to be, we will be there physically to prevent these kinds of projects happening in our neighborhoods.

We're tired. We have nowhere else to go, and we're going to take a stand. So, prepare to be disappointed.

Thank you.

Response PH205-3 Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not displace housing or prevent planned housing. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the proposed Project would not preclude development of uses including housing, grocery stores, and/or healthcare facilities in the surrounding communities.

Comment Letter PH206 - Pat Suzak

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH206

Comment PH206-1 MR. SUZAK: Hi. Good evening. Pat Suzak (phonetic) with CREED LA here.

First, I want to say that although there have been some people on the call that are opposed to the project, there are a lot of people that are excited about the project. And I think that you can look online and you can read a lot of the reviews, maybe a lot of the people that aren't on the call tonight, but most of what I'm seeing and understanding is there's a ton of people that are extremely excited about the project.

Response PH206-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment PH206-2 It does have a big environmental benefit for the people that are going to be riding the gondola, for the reduction of cars on the road, and the huge traffic benefit, and I think we'll see. We're going to see the difference, especially for Dodgers fans and congestion that sometimes takes place in the Dodger Stadium parking lots. So, you're going to see a noticeable benefit there.

There's a tourism benefit. We always want to make sure that we're continuing to promote Los Angeles as a city that's welcoming technological innovation and all of the things that benefit a city when it comes to how we present ourself. So, we want to continue to be right there on the bleeding edge of those kinds of innovations.

And continuing the benefit, the upgrade to Chinatown. There's some features and attractions that, obviously, once we get the gondola system going then there are going to be some other things that people are going to want to suggest, and there's going to be an additional attraction to that area.

Response PH206-2 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Section 3.03, Air Quality, Section 3.08, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 3.17, Transportation, Appendix D, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's ability to reduce vehicular travel, to improve air quality through reduced emissions, and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through reduced vehicular travel.

As discussed in the Technology Penetration Analysis, included in Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, of the Draft EIR, the proposed Project would exemplify how alternative transportation technology can be integrated into a city's transportation infrastructure and will show that new technology can successfully operate in concert with other existing modes of transportation.

Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, discussing the proposed Project's potential partnerships with and benefits to local businesses in Chinatown. As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, and Topical Response C, Project Features, the proposed Project creates a first/last mile transit link for residents and businesses in Chinatown while unifying and connecting communities through transit mobility access. This new mode of transportation will expand rider access to the regional transit system by attracting new visitors including Dodgers fans, and represents an opportunity for additional visitors along the proposed Project alignment, creating economic opportunities for local businesses, including shops and restaurants, through potential partnerships that drive customers to Chinatown and other businesses along the proposed Project alignment, which, consequently, adds revenues to these small businesses in the communities the proposed Project hopes to serve.

Comment PH206-3 There are people that are also seeing the vision of this project and thinking, you know, where else could it go? Crypto Arena, L.A. River Bike Path, Echo Park. So, people are becoming invested in this vision and deciding that they want to look at where that could expand to.

And so, all of that being said, CREED is absolutely in favor of this project. We think it's great, and we are in total support.

So, thank you for your time. Have a good evening. And God bless you.

Response PH206-3 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter PH207 - Sarah Harris

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH207

Comment PH207-1 MS. HARRIS: Yes. Hello. Thank you.

My name is Sarah Harris. I am calling on behalf of the Black Business Association in support of L.A. ART, the zero-emissions gondola for Union Station, from Union Station to Dodger Stadium.

Most importantly, the BBA supports the gondola and the 35 percent goal for local, and small, and diverse businesses.

So, we look forward to seeing that happen, and thank you very much.

Response PH207-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the Project Sponsor has committed to a goal of 35 percent utilization of minority business enterprises (MBE), women business enterprises (WBE), disadvantaged business enterprises (DBE), small business enterprise (SBE), disabled veteran business enterprises (DVBE), and LGBTQ-owned businesses during the proposed Project's construction phase.

Comment Letter PH208 - Mark McCrea

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH208

Comment PH208-1 MR. MCCREA: Hello there. My name is Mark McCrea, and my comments are twofold.

One, as a private citizen, I am totally against this project. It is an eyesore and would be a disruption to so much of the community. Everything Frank McCourt does is as a profiteer. He only wants money. I think it would be a very unfortunate thing for anyone around.

Response PH208-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Section 3.01, Aesthetics, and Appendix C, Visual Impact Assessment, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the aesthetic impacts of the proposed Project, which would be less than significant. Refer to Topical Response M, Comparable Urban Aerial Transit Systems, discussing how, like the proposed Project, comparable aerial transit systems in cities around the world are integrated with their surrounding urban environments. In particular, comparable aerial transit systems in other locations demonstrate that such systems can operate safely, efficiently, and in concert with nearby residential and open space uses. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at Los Angeles Union Station (LAUS), Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station.

Comment PH208-2 I do fear that there is going to be more drunkenness of the Dodger attendees, and when they get in the gondola, I am sure there is going to be violence. Would you want to be one of the two San Francisco fans in the gondola full of Dodgers? No.

Response PH208-2 Refer to Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR and Topical Response J, Gondola Design and Operations, of the Final EIR, for discussion of how the proposed Project is equipped with security features. For example, to provide added security to system passengers, each gondola cabin would have a security camera on board with a feed to the control room, as well as a “push to talk” button, which would open two-way communications with the control room. The control room would be able to address all cabins at once, or an individually selected cabin. Control room operators

would have the ability to contact local security, law enforcement or other emergency response agencies as needed.

Comment PH208-3 Secondly, I'm on the board of Friends of Elysian Park, which is an organization that has been protecting Elysian Park since 1965 from development.

We, as an organization, are completely opposed to this development. It is a destruction of views from Elysian Park, from the State Historic Park, from people in Chinatown, even Cathedral High School's athletic field. This will be disruptive to everything and visually horrible.

Response PH208-3 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Section 3.01, Aesthetics, and Appendix C, Visual Impact Assessment, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the aesthetic impacts of the proposed Project, which would be less than significant. Regarding scenic vistas, as analyzed in the Draft EIR, there are no designated scenic vistas present in the area of potential impact. However, the Project area provides views that are considered scenic by certain viewers, including views of the downtown Los Angeles skyline, LAUS, El Pueblo, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Arroyo Seco Parkway, Dodger Stadium, and the mountains that make up the Transverse Ranges, including the San Gabriel and San Bernardino Mountains. Specifically, as it pertains to Los Angeles State Historic Park, the open views of the Park, as well as the view of the downtown Los Angeles skyline, make the Park “visually memorable.” As discussed in Section 3.01, Aesthetics, and Appendix C, Visual Impact Assessment, views considered to be scenic locally would not be substantially impacted. In addition, while views from the Park toward the surrounding existing urban landscape exhibit various visual values, and the proposed Project would not substantially impact these views as shown in the simulated views. Therefore, the proposed Project would not block any designated scenic views, alter a designated scenic area, or block panoramic views, and impacts to scenic or panoramic views would be less than significant.

Comment PH208-4 There are obviously abilities to have more electric shuttles going up to the stadium and transport many more people than the gondola would. If you've ever gone to Mammoth Mountain, can you imagine how long it takes to get 500 people on the gondola? The lines would be immense.

Response PH208-4 Refer to Topical Response H, The Draft EIR Considered an Appropriate Range or Alternatives and Design Options, for discussion of how the Transportation Systems Management Alternative for an enhanced Dodger Stadium Express is unlikely to achieve the same level of ridership as the proposed Project, and otherwise fails to meet most of the Project Objectives which seek to achieve the proposed Project's underlying purpose of providing a permanent direct transit connection between LAUS and the Dodger Stadium property and improving connectivity for surrounding communities, including Chinatown, Mission Junction, Elysian Park, Solano Canyon,

and the Los Angeles State Historic Park. Electrification of the Dodger Stadium Express buses would not negate the operational issues associated with substantially expanding the Dodger Stadium Express. Improving the connection between LAUS and Dodger Stadium via the proposed Project would provide the quickest, most frequent, and highest capacity transit connection for the greatest number of riders traveling to Dodger Stadium to have the most travel time competitive transit trips from more locations in the region. Refer to Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR and Topical Response J, Gondola Design and Operations, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the safety features of the proposed Project and how the proposed Project would carry up to approximately 5,000 passengers per hour per direction. Refer to Topical Response B, Ridership Model; Queueing at Stations and Pre-game and Post-game Transportation, for discussion of the proposed Project's ridership model which is based on extensive data sources and assumptions validated by data, and the management of queueing at stations, and pre-game and post-game transportation.

Comment PH208-5 And this is also the development, you know, the first foray into a commercialization of the parking lot areas. It would bring more people and destruction into the pristine area of Elysian Park. Elysian Park means paradise, and we don't want to violate that with a Frank McCourt project that is a totally useless, ugly eyesore, and not good for us.

Response PH208-5 Refer to Section 3.16, Parks and Recreational Facilities, for discussion of the proposed Project's impacts on parks and recreational facilities, including Elysian Park, which would be less than significant. Refer to Topical Response G, No Improper Project Segmentation: The Proposed Project Is Intended to Create a Transit Connection from Metro's Union Station Transportation Hub via an Aerial Gondola System to the Dodger Stadium Property for a discussion of how the proposed Project solely proposes an aerial gondola system. The proposed Project does not include other development, and neither the Project Sponsor nor any other applicant has applied for other development unrelated to the existing stadium uses on the Dodger Stadium property. Refer to Topical Response M, Comparable Urban Aerial Transit Systems, discussing how, like the proposed Project, comparable aerial transit systems in cities around the world are integrated with their surrounding urban environments. In particular, comparable aerial transit systems in other locations demonstrate that such systems can operate safely, efficiently, and in concert with nearby residential and open space uses, including parks and other recreational facilities. Refer to Response P208-3 for discussion of the aesthetic impacts of the proposed Project, which would be less than significant. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of how the proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at LAUS, Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the

surrounding communities, including but not limited to sustainability features and open space enhancements, the Community Access Plan for fares, access to parks, mobility hubs, signage, utilization of local artists for site specific artwork at each station reflective of the unique neighborhood culture, design of each component of the proposed Project to complement and reflect the unique character of the surrounding neighborhood, the Business and Community Support Program during construction, and benefits to local businesses along the proposed Project alignment. The Project Sponsor would convene stakeholder groups to coordinate on issues related to proposed Project features. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project.

Comment Letter PH209 - Ted Green

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH209

Comment PH209-1 MR. GREEN: Thank you very much. I unmuted on my end. Can you hear me?

MS. SISCO: Yes, we can hear you.

MR. GREEN: Excellent. Thank you.

My name is Ted Green. I'm the legislative consultant for the Los Angeles LGBTQ Chamber of Commerce. The Los Angeles LGBTQ Chamber of Commerce strongly supports this project, and there are really three reasons why.

One, for what this project would mean for the utilization of Union Station and transportation coming into and out of Union Station. Union Station happens to be my favorite building in Los Angeles, and this would be terrific for its future.

Response PH209-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of how the proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at Los Angeles Union Station (LAUS), Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station.

Comment PH209-2 Number two, what this project would mean for tourism. Tourism underpins the Southern California economy and it's really important. A gondola would attract tourists to our area.

I've ridden the gondola in Spokane, Washington. It's wonderful. All due respect to Spokane, there aren't a whole lot of reasons to visit there, but the gondola is one, and that would be the case in Los Angeles as well.

Response PH209-2 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, discussing the proposed Project's potential partnerships with and benefits to local businesses. As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, and Topical Response C, Project Features, the proposed Project creates a first/last mile transit link for residents and businesses along the proposed Project alignment while unifying and connecting communities through transit mobility access. This new mode of transportation will expand rider access to the regional transit system by attracting new visitors including Dodgers fans, and represents an opportunity for additional visitors along the proposed Project

alignment, creating economic opportunities for local businesses, including shops and restaurants, through potential partnerships that drive customers to businesses along the alignment, which, consequently, adds revenues to these small businesses in the communities the proposed Project hopes to serve.

Comment PH209-3 And probably number three, it's because of the project developer's significant commitment to spend 35 percent of its money with diverse businesses, minority-owned, veteran-owned, LGBTQ-owned businesses.

Response PH209-3 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of how the Project Sponsor has committed to a goal of 35 percent utilization of minority business enterprises (MBE), women business enterprises (WBE), disadvantaged business enterprises (DBE), small business enterprise (SBE), disabled veteran business enterprises (DVBE), and LGBTQ-owned businesses during the proposed Project's construction phase.

Comment PH209-4 You know, how do you remedy historic and current discrimination, marginalization against certain communities? It's by projects like this spending good money with vendors from those communities. That funding lifts all boats and is worthy of our support.

MTA has said it's open to extraordinary innovation and private part --private-public partnerships. This project absolutely delivers that on a plate and is well deserving of our support and the MTA board's support.

Thank you very much.

Response PH209-4 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the Draft EIR addresses environmental justice by considering the proposed Project's ability to reduce congestion and emissions from on-road vehicles in an area disproportionately burdened by pollution, and including an analysis of the proposed Project's potential impacts to the surrounding community, concluding that the proposed Project could result in air quality benefits for the surrounding communities. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities, including potential partnerships with and benefits to local businesses.

Comment Letter PH210 - Omar Galindo

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH210

Comment PH210-1 MR. GALINDO: Good evening. My name is Omar Galindo on behalf of UA Plumbers No. 78 and our 2,000 members. I'm proud to be here in support of this project.

This project will reduce greenhouse gas emissions by reducing traffic around Dodger Stadium, as well as making the city more attractive to residents and tourists alike.

Response PH210-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Section 3.03, Air Quality, Section 3.08, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 3.17, Transportation, Appendix D, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's ability to reduce vehicular travel, to improve air quality through reduced emissions, and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through reduced vehicular travel.

Comment PH210-2 The developer has agreed to use responsible contractors, local hire, and livable wages, and that's a development that, in Los Angeles, most of us like.

Our local is encouraged by this project and eager to see it begin construction.

Thank you

Response PH210-2 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. The proposed Project will enter into a Project Labor Agreement and will work in coordination with the LA/OC Building and Construction Trades.

Comment Letter PH211 - Gus Torres

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH211

Comment PH211-1 MR. TORRES: Good evening, everybody. Can you hear me?

MS. SISCO: Yes, we can.

MR. TORRES: Yeah. My name is Gus Torres (phonetic), and I represent UA Local 255 Pipefitters, Welders, and Apprentices.

We're glad for the opportunity to speak tonight to support this project.

Response PH211-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment PH211-2 Nearly 5,000 people per hour per direction will be shuttled through these gondola routes, and the time between Union Station and Dodger Station will become approximately 7 minutes. This means a huge impact on our local traffic in that area.

Response PH211-2 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment PH211-3 I also support and applaud the gondola project's commitment to work with the building trades. We need more examples of projects like this which involve the building trades and their skilled and dedicated local workforce of eager men and women.

Thank you very much for your time, and God bless

Response PH211-3 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. The proposed Project will enter into a Project Labor Agreement and will work in coordination with the LA/OC Building and Construction Trades.

Comment Letter PH212 - Marianna Gatto

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH212

Comment PH212-1 MS. GATTO: Yes. Good evening, everyone. My name is Marianna Gatto. I am the director of the Italian American Museum of Los Angeles, which is located across from Union Station overlooking Olvera Street. I am also a native Angeleno whose family settled in Lincoln Heights back in 1947 when the neighborhood was one of the city's Little Italys.

I've been the Director of the Italian American Museum of Los Angeles since 2010, and have worked at El Pueblo since 2005.

We support this project and feel that this investment of private dollars will contribute to the vibrancy of the neighborhood and increase awareness of the city's birthplace, its history, and promote visitation to its various museums, businesses, and cultural sites, as well as their preservation.

Response PH212-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities, including but not limited to sustainability features and open space enhancements, the Community Access Plan for fares, access to parks, mobility hubs, signage, utilization of local artists for site specific artwork at each station reflective of the unique neighborhood culture, design of each component of the proposed Project to complement and reflect the unique character of the surrounding neighborhood, the Business and Community Support Program during construction, and benefits to local businesses along the proposed Project alignment. The Project Sponsor would convene stakeholder groups to identify unique ways to use the proposed Project to provide additional interpretation of the adjacent neighborhood culture and history.

Comment PH212-2 We also feel that this project will prove to enhance security in the neighborhood, which is sorely needed.

Thank you for your taking the time to listen.

Response PH212-2 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response M, Comparable Urban Aerial Transit Systems, for discussion of how comparable urban aerial transit systems have been shown to reduce violent crime in nearby areas. In addition to statistical studies, residents of cities with aerial transit systems have reported a greater sense of security when riding aerial transit relative to other modes of public transportation.

Comment Letter PH213 - Erica Garcia

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH213

Comment PH213-1 MS. GARCIA: Hi. My name is Erica Garcia (phonetic), and I am very excited to support the gondola project.

I was recently in Mexico City, and I was fortunate enough to ride the gondola. And I hope it comes to Los Angeles. It's a fantastic experience that I had in Mexico, and I would like to have the same transportation system here in Los Angeles.

Response PH213-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response M, Comparable Urban Aerial Transit Systems, for discussion of comparable aerial transit systems in cities around the world and their operations, integration with nearby residential and open space uses, community benefits, promotion of public art and collaborations with local artists, and evidence that such systems can reduce violent crime in nearby areas and promote a sense of security compared to other modes of public transportation.

Comment PH213-2 But I'm very upset at the protestors from the last meeting on January 12th. How dare they try to silence us and the supporters with their opinions? The protestors took the meeting and yelled profanities all night long, and Metro, you should be ashamed for allowing this to take place.

So, thank you for allowing me to share, and I hope the gondola project comes to life. It's a great project.

Thank you very much. Have a good night.

Response PH213-2 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's Draft EIR public review period, including the disruptions from certain attendees during the January 12, 2023, public hearing. In light of the disruptions at the January 12, 2023, public hearing, Metro provided a fourth public hearing by way of a virtual public hearing held on February 8, 2023. Verbal comments made at the virtual February 8, 2023 public hearing were deemed timely submitted for the purposes of the Draft EIR public review period.

Comment Letter PH214 - Alex Alvarez

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH214

Comment PH214-1 MR. ALVAREZ: Good afternoon. Can you hear me?

MS. SISCO: Yes.

MR. ALVAREZ: Okay. Good afternoon. My name is Alex Alvarez. I'm a lifetime Dodger fan, and we have to deal every single time with traffic around Dodger Stadium on game days, especially myself, that I have been going to Dodger games all my life. This gondola project could take 3,000 cars off the road, making it easier to get around, and reduce air pollution from cars.

In my case, and I believe most Dodger fans will agree, I support the gondola project because it will be great for Los Angeles, for the surrounding areas, for Dodger fans and, of course, for Dodger Stadium. And it will reduce the traffic, especially when we leave at game time at the end of the game.

So, please, consider this project. And I yield back, and thank you for the time.

Response PH214-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter PH215 - Roy Frank

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH215

Comment PH215-1 MR. FRANK: Hello.

MS. SISCO: Hello.

MR. FRANK: Hi. This is Ron Frank, and I'm calling because I'm very, very, very much opposed to the gondola.

Anyone who pays attention to how this is all proceeding can't help but notice how deceptive this all is. It's a scam to benefit just one person. And before this, what did Frank McCourt ever do to protect the environment? Here, he's only protecting his bank account, I believe.

As well, the lack of transparency and ever-shifting aspects of the project are incredibly concerning.

Response PH215-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at Los Angeles Union Station (LAUS), Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Refer to Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's public outreach and opportunity for public testimony during the Draft EIR public review period. Refer to Appendix A, Scoping Report, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of outreach and community engagement during the Draft EIR scoping period. Metro sought to engage the community in each stage of the environmental review process. The Draft EIR complied with the requirements of CEQA to provide an accurate, stable, and finite Project Description, disclosing that the proposed Project would operate daily for surrounding communities in addition to providing service to Dodger games and any special events at Dodger Stadium. The Draft EIR examined the potential environmental effects associated with implementation of the proposed Project on 20 environmental issue areas with detailed analysis based on Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR. The Draft EIR includes 7,877 pages of detailed analysis from experts in their respective fields, intended to provide the public and decision

makers the information that they need to meaningfully consider the proposed Project's potential environmental impacts, as well as a shorter executive summary that explains the analysis and conclusions in clean and simple language.

Comment PH215-2 It's bad whack-a-mole. This will not take cars off the road; it will just shift the traffic. It will not diminish pollution; in fact, the building of the gondola will only create more pollution, and there will be more pollution after Frank McCourt develops his half of the Dodger Stadium parking lot.

So, the things that they're putting forth are all lies, and it really is just bad whack-a-mole: the changing budget, the shifting developers under whose auspices this is proceeding under keeps changing, and even the reasons for building the gondola change all the time.

Response PH215-2 Refer to Section 3.03, Air Quality, Section 3.08, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 3.17, Transportation, Appendix D, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's ability to reduce vehicular travel, to improve air quality through reduced emissions, and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through reduced vehicular travel. Refer to Topical Response G, No Improper Project Segmentation: The Proposed Project Is Intended to Create a Transit Connection from Metro's Union Station Transportation Hub via an Aerial Gondola System to the Dodger Stadium Property for a discussion of how the proposed Project solely proposes an aerial gondola system. The proposed Project does not include other development, and neither the Project Sponsor nor any other applicant has applied for other development unrelated to the existing stadium uses on the Dodger Stadium property. Refer to Response P215-1 for discussion of how the Draft EIR complied with the requirements of CEQA to provide an accurate, stable, and finite Project Description disclosing that the proposed Project would operate daily for surrounding communities in addition to providing service to Dodger games and any special events at Dodger Stadium. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between

the regional transit system at LAUS, Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station.

Comment PH215-3 Unclear how much will it cost. Not \$125 million anymore. Last they said was \$300 million, and that was long ago, so I'm wondering what the cost is now. Must be getting close to half a billion dollars by now, I would think.

Response PH215-3 This comment is noted and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project.

Comment PH215-4 Let the taxpayers vote on whether or not this should go forward. That's why the public meetings are doing all they can possible to keep the public participants separate from each other at Union Station and at the high school. To have people give their comments to a stenographer behind the curtain makes you wonder, why hide us from each other?

It's clear the proponents have much to hide.

Stop the gondola, please.

Response PH215-4 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's opportunities for public testimony during the Draft EIR public review period. During the public review period, comments on the Draft EIR could be submitted in writing via email or mail, by phone, and during the four public hearings. Comments on the Draft EIR could be submitted by email to LAART@metro.net, by mail to One Gateway Plaza, Mail Stop 99-22-6, Los Angeles, CA 90012, or over the phone by calling (213) 922-6913. Comments could also be submitted at each of the four public hearings. At virtual public hearings, comments could be given verbally. In light of the disruptions at the January 12, 2023, public hearing, Metro provided a fourth public hearing by way of a virtual public hearing held on February 8, 2023. Verbal comments made at the virtual February 8, 2023 public hearing were deemed timely submitted for the purposes of the Draft EIR public review period. At the two public hearings held in person, comments could be submitted either in writing on forms provided by Metro, or verbally to the court reporters who were set up at a "comment station" in the venue. Written comment forms provided instructions on how to comment on the

Draft EIR in English, Spanish, and Chinese (Simplified). Interpretation was provided in English, Spanish, Mandarin, and Cantonese during all four public hearings, with interpretation provided in Taishanese during the final two public hearings.

Comment Letter PH216 - Casa Wilson

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH216

Comment PH216-1 MS. WILSON: Hello. Can you hear me?

MS. SISCO: Yes.

MS. WILSON: Okay. My name is Casa, C--A-S-A. My last name is Wilson. I live in the neighborhood.

I attended the last hearing at the high school. I had no problem leaving a public comment, despite the protests, and I talked to people who work on this project at length, and I'm even more against it now after that.

Let me run down the list:

Response PH216-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's opportunities for public testimony during the Draft EIR public review period. During the public review period, comments on the Draft EIR could be submitted in writing via email or mail, by phone, and during the four public hearings. Comments on the Draft EIR could be submitted by email to LAART@metro.net, by mail to One Gateway Plaza, Mail Stop 99-22-6, Los Angeles, CA 90012, or over the phone by calling (213) 922-6913. Comments could also be submitted at each of the four public hearings. At virtual public hearings, comments could be given verbally. In light of the disruptions at the January 12, 2023, public hearing, Metro provided a fourth public hearing by way of a virtual public hearing held on February 8, 2023. Verbal comments made at the virtual February 8, 2023 public hearing were deemed timely submitted for the purposes of the Draft EIR public review period.

Comment PH216-2 Light pollution. This thing's going to run until midnight every single day. Dodgers fans ruin our lives half the year. Now they're going to ruin it every day of the year.

Response PH216-2 The Draft EIR addressed impacts from light and glare, in Section 3.01, Aesthetics, and the Lighting Study, which is included in Appendix C, Visual Impact Assessment, of the Draft EIR. The Project area is urbanized and has a high level of existing ambient light. Project lighting would include low-level lighting for security and wayfinding purposes adjacent to and within the stations, junction, and towers, within cabins, at the vertical circulation, and areas for ticketing, fare checking, and queueing. In addition, low-level lighting to accent signage, architectural features, landscaping, adjacent pedestrian plazas, and mobility hubs would be installed at the stations, junction, and towers. Lighting would also be provided underneath the elevated stations and junction. As discussed in Section 3.01, Aesthetics, of the Draft EIR, at page 3.1-53, a Lighting Study

was conducted to determine the proposed Project's potential environmental impacts resulting from its lighting and illuminated signage program, evaluating impacts with respect to light trespass and glare. The Lighting Study concluded that operations of the proposed Project would result in a less than significant impact for light and glare.

Comment PH216-3 No parking. I guess we can't park on our streets anymore. One of the consultants told me that's not their problem.

Response PH216-3 Parking is not required to be analyzed under CEQA or the Transportation Assessment Guidelines ("TAG"). Nevertheless, the Parking Study was prepared to provide additional information to the community and decision makers about existing parking conditions and the proposed Project's potential to effect parking conditions around the Alameda Station and Chinatown/State Park Station. As recommended in the Parking Study, the Project Sponsor will prepare, in collaboration with the City, and with robust feedback from community stakeholders, a parking management plan. The City would implement any on-street parking management strategies identified.

Comment PH216-4 No transparency. Who's behind this? How much will the taxpayer have to pay for this? How much will these tickets cost? They couldn't even tell me.

Response PH216-4 Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of how the proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan.

Comment PH216-5 They're ripping up the park to put this hideous thing in, which is honestly just a tourist trap and gimmick. Part of the Angeles National Park is going to be ripped up where the farmer's market is, where people picnic, where they fly kites, to put in a private company's product to make money.

Response PH216-5 As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, Section 3.16, Parks and Recreational Facilities, and Section 5.0, Other CEQA Considerations, of the Draft EIR, the Chinatown/State Park Station would have a footprint of 2,195 square feet in the Los Angeles State Historic Park (~.1% of the total 32-acre park), and the station canopy would have an overhang of 9,320 square feet over the park. The proposed Project

alignment crosses over the westernmost edge of the Los Angeles State Historic Park, adjacent to the existing Metro L Line (Gold) and the associated overhead catenary system. The proposed Project's required aerial clearance would be located above approximately 59,470 square feet of the total 32-acre park, plus an Additional Separation Buffer. With the required clearances and the height at which the cabins would cross over the Los Angeles State Historic Park, the ability to use the vast majority of the Park for kite flying, special events (e.g., concerts, craft fairs, partnership events, 5K/10K runs, workshops, cultural festivals, and the farmers' market), and other passive recreational opportunities (e.g., picnicking, jogging, walking, and informal play) would not be affected by the proposed Project. Refer to Response S2-4 for additional discussion regarding the ability of uses to continue at the Park. Refer to Section 3.01, Aesthetics, and Appendix C, Visual Impact Assessment, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the aesthetic impacts of the proposed Project, which would be less than significant, including at the Park. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of how the proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at Los Angeles Union Station (LAUS), Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station.

Comment PH216-6 I find it curious not a single person has spoken up in favor of this project who isn't going to make money off of it -- or is a Dodgers fan, of course. But these aren't people who live here and have to live with this every single day.

Response PH216-6 Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, Appendix A, Scoping Report, of the Draft EIR, and Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project team's outreach efforts to neighborhoods along the proposed Project alignment and the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities, including Chinatown, Mission Junction, Elysian Park, Solano Canyon, and the Los Angeles State Historic Park. Metro sought to engage with stakeholders in neighborhoods along the proposed Project alignment in each stage of the environmental review process. Input from the public, including local community stakeholders, led directly to the selection of the proposed Project alignment, including an intermediate station in Chinatown (the Chinatown/State Park Station), as well as to the redesign of the proposed Project stations and junction and additional pedestrian enhancements including hardscape and landscape improvements.

Comment PH216-7 Also, one of the consultants for the project told me, when I asked him what the point of it is since there aren't Dodgers fans every day, said that they're going to put a

transit hub up at Dodger Stadium and provide shuttles and electric scooters all over Elysian Park. And I haven't really heard much about that, so I wonder if it's even true.

Response PH216-7 Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of how the proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at LAUS, Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Refer to Section 2.1, Overview of the Project, of the Draft EIR, discussing how the proposed Project would operate daily to serve existing residents, workers, park users, and visitors to Los Angeles. As discussed on page 2-42, in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the proposed Project would provide service to all pre-season, regular season, and post-season Los Angeles Dodger games and any special events (e.g., concerts, the Los Angeles Marathon) at the Dodger Stadium property. The proposed Project would also provide service to events at the Los Angeles State Historic Park. In addition to providing service on game and special event days at Dodger Stadium and events at the Los Angeles State Historic Park, it is anticipated that the proposed Project would also provide daily service between 6:00am to 12:00am, for the surrounding communities, including Chinatown, Mission Junction, Elysian Park, Solano Canyon, and the Los Angeles State Historic Park. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan. As discussed in Section 5.0, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR, the proposed Project would provide a mobility hub at the Dodger Stadium property to provide connectivity to Elysian Park, the City's second largest park, comprising 575 acres, and the surrounding communities. Outside of game day periods, passengers would be able to access a suite of first/last mile multi-modal options, such as a bike share program, and individual bike lockers to access Elysian Park and other nearby neighborhoods, including Solano Canyon.

Comment PH216-8 This is not a project for people that live here. This is not a project for people in Los Angeles.

You know, I guess we're all in our own echo chambers. I don't know a single person in favor of this. I haven't heard a single peep about someone who wants this and doesn't think it's an absurd waste of money, except Dodgers fans commenting on it on Instagram.

Response PH216-8 Refer to Responses P216-6 and P216-7 for discussion of how the proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at LAUS, Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station and for discussion of

the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities.

Comment PH216-9 And it's really nothing that adding more electric buses couldn't also do. This is a waste of money, and I hope you'll stop this ridiculous project.

Response PH216-9 Refer to Topical Response H, The Draft EIR Considered an Appropriate Range of Alternatives and Design Options, for discussion of how the Transportation Systems Management Alternative for an enhanced Dodger Stadium Express is unlikely to achieve the same level of ridership as the proposed Project, and otherwise fails to meet most of the Project Objectives which seek to achieve the proposed Project's underlying purpose of providing a permanent direct transit connection between LAUS and the Dodger Stadium property and improving connectivity for surrounding communities, including Chinatown, Mission Junction, Elysian Park, Solano Canyon, and the Los Angeles State Historic Park. Electrification of the Dodger Stadium Express buses would not negate the operational issues associated with substantially expanding the Dodger Stadium Express. Refer to Topical Response H, The Draft EIR Considered an Appropriate Range of Alternatives and Design Options, for discussion of how improving the connection between LAUS and Dodger Stadium via the proposed Project would provide the quickest, most frequent, and highest capacity transit connection for the greatest number of riders traveling to Dodger Stadium to have the most travel time competitive transit trips from more locations in the region.

Comment Letter PH217 - Katherine Norian (Chinatown Station Owner)

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH217

Comment PH217-1 MS. NORIAN: Can you hear me?

MS. SISCO: Yes.

MS. NORIAN: My name is Katherine Norian. I represent Chinatown Station Owner, which opposes the project.

Response PH217-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Comment PH217-2 Our client's December 16th letter identified the Draft EIR's many fundamental defects, including a project description that shifts from section to section and omits information critical to the impact analyses, impact analyses that are incomplete and rely on speculation, and significant conclusions based on defective mitigation measures.

Response PH217-2 This comment provides a general overview of the comments raised in this letter and Comment P140. Responses to the comments contained in this letter are provided below in Responses PH217-3 through PH217-6, and Responses to P140-1 through P140-56. As discussed in PH217-3 through PH217-6, and Responses to P140-1 through P140-56, the Draft EIR complied with the requirements of CEQA to provide an accurate, stable, and finite Project Description, disclosing that the proposed Project would operate daily for surrounding communities in addition to providing service to Dodger games and any special events at Dodger Stadium. The Draft EIR examined the potential environmental effects associated with implementation of the proposed Project on 20 environmental issue areas with detailed analysis based on Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR. The Draft EIR includes 7,877 pages of detailed analysis from experts in their respective fields, intended to provide the public and decision makers the information that they need to meaningfully consider the proposed Project's potential environmental impacts, as well as a shorter executive summary that explains the analysis and conclusions in clean and simple language. Moreover, as demonstrated in Section 7.0, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, and Table 7-1, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP), of the Final EIR, the MMRP will prescribe for agency enforcement of mitigation measures for the proposed Project, which will ensure supervision by the various responsible agencies. The MMRP designates which agencies are responsible for future enforcement of mitigation measures, based on the agency with the regulatory authority to enforce a given mitigation measure.

Comment PH217-3 But most critically, the Draft EIR analyzes only part of the true project. That true project is a two-phased project, all of which must be analyzed in the Draft EIR.

This project, Phase 1, provides transit to Dodger Stadium to reduce vehicle travel and thus the need for the parking lot, and therefore clears the way for the Phase 2 project to redevelop the parking lot with the offices, shops, and entertainment uses planned for only the Dodgers' parking lot lease.

The Draft EIR evidences the need for this Phase 1 project to both enable and support the Phase 2 redevelopment. For example, several sections narrow the focus of their analyses on how the project would reduce Dodger Stadium vehicle traffic.

Response PH217-3 Refer to Topical Response G, No Improper Project Segmentation: The Proposed Project Is Intended to Create a Transit Connection from Metro's Union Station Transportation Hub via an Aerial Gondola System to the Dodger Stadium Property for a discussion of how the proposed Project solely proposes an aerial gondola system. The proposed Project does not include other development, and neither the Project Sponsor nor any other applicant has applied for other development unrelated to the existing stadium uses on the Dodger Stadium property. The Dodger Stadium property is approved only for Dodger Stadium and ancillary uses and structures as set forth in the Conditional Use Permit for the Dodger Stadium property, with restrictive designations and zoning not consistent with the uses speculated by commenters. The independent utility of the proposed aerial gondola project – the first permanent transit connection to one of the region's most visited venues – has been well established.

Comment PH217-4 The project relies primarily on tourism, not game day and neighborhood ridership, for its projected 18-hour a day operation. So, why assume so many tourists would be drawn to an empty stadium and an unimpressive view unless a shopping and entertainment venue is planned at the redevelopment parking?

Response PH217-4 Refer to Response PH217-3 for a discussion of how the proposed Project solely proposes an aerial gondola system. Refer to Section 2.6, Ridership, of the Draft EIR for a discussion of how the proposed Project would be configured to operate based on the anticipated ridership for Dodger games and special events at Dodger Stadium, events at the Los Angeles State Historic Park, commuters and residents in adjacent neighborhoods, and visitors to Los Angeles. The proposed Project has the flexibility to operate at varying speeds and capacity depending on ridership. In addition to providing service on game and special event days at Dodger Stadium and events at the Los Angeles State Historic Park, it is anticipated that the proposed Project would also provide daily service between 6:00am to 12:00am, subject to operational changes in response to ridership demand. Refer to Section 3.17, Transportation, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR for a discussion of the proposed Project's ridership estimates considered how the proposed Project would serve the transit needs of a number of distinct market segments including: Dodger

Stadium game and event attendees, employees, tourists, neighborhood riders, and Los Angeles State Historic Park visitors and event attendees. The proposed Project would provide fixed route transit service to several neighborhoods including Chinatown, Mission Junction, Elysian Park and Solano Canyon, and to destinations around the Los Angeles State Historic Park. Ridership for neighborhood riders was estimated by calculating the working-age people and jobs within a half-mile walking-distance of each proposed station based on a street network analysis. Accordingly, the proposed Project may be configured to operate based on the anticipated ridership, inclusive of not only tourists or others who may want to ride the proposed Project, but visitors to the Los Angeles State Historic Park and Elysian Park, and commuters or residents in adjacent neighborhoods, including El Pueblo, Chinatown, Mission Junction, Elysian Park, and Solano Canyon. As detailed in Appendix N, tourism related ridership is estimated from an analysis prepared by HR&A, which determined the potential for the proposed Project to capture a share of the tourism attractions market in the County of Los Angeles.

Comment PH217-5 The Draft EIR also discredits any need for the project other than to serve Dodger Stadium: that is, to serve the underserved neighborhoods. Chinatown and Mission Junction are already served by the Gold Line and don't need the disruption of another stadium – or another station.

Response PH217-5 Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at Los Angeles Union Station (LAUS), Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. There are several reasons why neighborhood transit users may ride the proposed Project. The proposed Project provides access between the Dodger Stadium property, the surrounding communities, including Chinatown, Mission Junction, Elysian Park, and Solano Canyon, and the Los Angeles State Historic Park, to the regional transit system accessible at LAUS. The proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan. The proposed Project would provide active transportation connectivity along the proposed Project alignment through pedestrian access enhancements and first/last mile multi-modal options at the mobility hubs proposed for the Chinatown/State Park Station and the Dodger Stadium Station. Compared to the Metro L Line (Gold), accessible at the Chinatown Station, the proposed Project's Chinatown/State Park Station would be closer to the Los Angeles State Historic Park, the shorter headways would result in more frequent service, and the travel time would be less. Refer to Topical Response M, Comparable Urban Aerial Transit Systems, discussing how, like the proposed Project, comparable aerial transit systems in cities around the world are integrated with their surrounding urban environments. In particular, comparable aerial transit

systems in other locations demonstrate that such systems can operate safely, efficiently, and in concert with nearby residential and open space uses, including parks and other recreational facilities.

Comment PH217-6 And the project can't serve neighborhoods near Dodger Stadium because it doesn't have a first mile/last mile hub at the Stadium to serve the projected ridership from these neighborhoods.

Metro must reside --

Response PH217-6 As discussed in Section 5.0, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR, the proposed Project would provide a mobility hub at the Dodger Stadium property to provide connectivity to Elysian Park, the City's second largest park, comprising 575 acres, and the surrounding communities. Outside of game day periods, passengers would be able to access a suite of first/last mile multi-modal options, such as a bike share program, and individual bike lockers to access Elysian Park and other nearby neighborhoods, including Solano Canyon.

Comment Letter PH218 - Sunjana Supekar (The California Endowment (TCE))

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH218

Comment PH218-1 MS. SUPEKAR: Can you hear me?

MS. SISCO: Yes.

MS. SUPEKAR: Thank you. I'm Sunjana Supekar of Chatten-Brown, Carstens & Minter, and on behalf of the California Endowment, we wish to express our strong opposition to this unsolicited, private tourist attraction representing itself as public transportation.

We oppose this project because the community did not ask for it and does not want it. They want real public transportation solutions.

Response PH218-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response A, SB 44, for discussion of how the proposed Project is public transportation because it will be open to the general public for service at regular, scheduled operating times, operating daily to serve existing residents, workers, park users, and visitors to Los Angeles. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, Appendix A, Scoping Report, of the Draft EIR, and Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project team's outreach efforts to neighborhoods along the proposed Project alignment and the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities. Metro sought to engage with stakeholders in neighborhoods along the proposed Project alignment in each stage of the environmental review process. Input from the public, including local community stakeholders, led directly to the selection of the proposed Project alignment, including an intermediate station in Chinatown (the Chinatown/State Park Station), as well as to the redesign of the proposed Project stations and junction and additional pedestrian enhancements including hardscape and landscape improvements.

Comment PH218-2 The project will not reduce but actually displace traffic noise and pollution from Dodger Stadium to already impacted communities in and around Chinatown, disrupting businesses and services and accelerating gentrification.

Response PH218-2 Traffic congestion is not required to be analyzed under CEQA in the Draft EIR following the implementation of Senate Bill 743, which designated "vehicle miles traveled" as the method for assessing transportation impacts on the environment for CEQA projects. Refer to the *Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit Project Non-CEQA Transportation Assessment*, which found that there could be localized increases in traffic at the intersections closest to the proposed Project's Alameda Station and

Chinatown/State Park Station due to some riders choosing to park and ride or take Uber/Lyft and recommended the proposed Project work with Metro to identify a transit partnership for the proposed Project riders to further encourage them to take transit, walk, or bike to the proposed Project's stations. The proposed Project's ability to reduce vehicular travel, to improve air quality through reduced emissions, and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through reduced vehicular travel are discussed in Section 3.03, Air Quality, Section 3.08, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 3.17, Transportation, Appendix D, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by connecting Los Angeles Union Station (LAUS) to Dodger Stadium via an aerial gondola system, including an intermediate station at the southernmost entrance of the Los Angeles State Historic Park. Dodger Stadium draws large regional crowds, with approximately 100 baseball games and other events each year, but there are no permanent transit connections to the venue. Given the capacity of this system, approximately 20 percent of the fans could take aerial transit connected to Metro's regional transit system. This would reduce vehicular congestion in and around Dodger Stadium, on neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways during game and special event days, thereby reducing VMT and GHG emissions. Accordingly, the proposed Project would result in air quality benefits to the surrounding communities. The lifetime emissions of the proposed Project over its useful life would be a reduction of 166,653 MT CO₂e. The lifetime VMT reduction of the proposed Project would be a reduction of 129,629,500 VMT. Emissions are decreased through reducing vehicle miles travelled. The proposed Project would result in a net reduction in criteria pollutant emissions by reducing vehicle miles travelled.

Refer to Section 3.13, Noise, and Appendix M, Noise and Vibration Technical Report, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the construction and operational noise impacts from the proposed Project. As detailed therein, construction related noise impacts would be significant and unavoidable even with implementation of mitigation. Operational noise impacts would be less than significant. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the Draft EIR addresses environmental justice by considering the proposed Project's ability to reduce congestion and emissions from on-road vehicles in an area disproportionately burdened by pollution, and including an analysis of the proposed Project's potential impacts to the surrounding community, concluding that the proposed Project could result in air quality benefits for the surrounding communities. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, discussing the proposed Project's potential partnerships with and benefits to local businesses in Chinatown. As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, and Topical Response C, Project Features, the proposed Project creates a first/last mile transit link for residents and businesses within Chinatown while unifying and connecting communities through transit mobility

access. This new mode of transportation will expand rider access to the regional transit system by attracting new visitors including Dodgers fans, and represents an opportunity for additional visitors along the proposed Project alignment, creating economic opportunities for local businesses, including shops and restaurants, through potential partnerships that drive customers to Chinatown and other businesses along the proposed Project alignment, which, consequently, adds revenues to these small businesses in the communities the proposed Project hopes to serve. Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not exacerbate gentrification or result in displacement of residents in the surrounding neighborhoods and is consistent with Metro’s considerations regarding gentrification and displacement.

Comment PH218-3 This private project will require the use of public land, airspace, and likely public resources to be able to operate.

Response PH218-3 Refer to Section 2.5, Proposed Project Alignment and Components, with supporting data provided in Appendix Q, Proposed Alignment Plan and Profile, of the Draft EIR for discussion of how the proposed Project maximizes alignment along the public ROW and publicly owned property and minimizes aerial rights over private properties. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project’s capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project’s capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project.

Comment PH218-4 Finally, a superior, low emission public transportation option already exists by using electric buses to expand the already effective free Dodger Express Bus.

Response PH218-4 Refer to Topical Response H, The Draft EIR Considered an Appropriate Range of Alternatives and Design Options, and Section 4.0, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR, for a discussion of the Draft EIR’s consideration of a range of reasonable alternatives, properly identifying an “environmentally superior” alternative and analyzing a “No Project” alternative, pursuant to CEQA. The Transportation Systems Management Alternative for an enhanced Dodger Stadium Express is unlikely to achieve the same level of ridership as the proposed Project, and otherwise fails to meet most of the Project Objectives which seek to achieve the proposed Project’s underlying purpose of providing a permanent direct transit connection between LAUS and the Dodger Stadium property and improving connectivity for surrounding communities, including Chinatown, Mission Junction, Elysian Park, Solano Canyon, and the Los Angeles State Historic Park. Further, electrification of the Dodger Stadium Express buses would not negate the operational issues associated with substantially expanding the Dodger

Stadium Express. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game.

Comment PH218-5 The Draft EIR presents misleading and incomplete analysis to the detriment of the public who, instead of getting information, are given an infomercial.

We submitted two letters detailing the DEIR's deficiencies. Please carefully consider the points raised in those letters.

Response PH218-5 Refer to Responses GO17 and PH17 for responses to the letters referred to in this comment.

Comment PH218-6 We are also concerned because the proposed Alameda and Alpine towers are located in an earthquake liquefaction zone.

Response PH218-6 Refer to Section 3.07, Geology and Soils, and Appendix I, Geotechnical Document in Support of the Environmental Impact Report, of the Draft EIR and Appendix F, Memo on Structural Engineering, of the Final EIR, for discussion of how the proposed Project would have less than significant impacts related to geology and soils, including liquefaction, upon implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-A.

Comment PH218-7 We close by highlighting the numerous other public comment letters expressing concern about the project or opposition to it. These letters are from groups including Homeboy Industries; Gabrieleño/Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians; Playbold Park Association; Los Angeles Parks Alliance; California State Park Rangers Association; Natural Resources Defense Council; Sierra Club, Los Angeles Union Station Circle Society; SOCA Gondola, including but not limited to Phyllis Ling; L.A. River State Park Partners; Coalition for a Beautiful Los Angeles; State of California Natural Resources Agency, Department of Parks and Recreation, and the Department of Fish and Wildlife; City of L.A. City Administrative Officer; Los Angeles Conservancy; Land Protection Partners; S&R Partners, LLC, a revolving family company; Trust for Public Land; and Latino Outdoors.

There are better solutions for Metro and the City of L.A.'s actual public transportation needs. We ask that you please stop this gondola project now.

Response PH218-7 Refer to Responses GO15, S5, GO8, GO14, P511, P708, GO28, GO13, GO12, GO4, P700, P709, P710, PH24, GO21, GO18, S1, S2, L2, GO16, P701, GO27, and GO22 for responses to the letters referred to in this comment. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project.

Comment Letter PH219 - Jason Fujimoto

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH219

Comment PH219-1 MR. FUJIMOTO: Thank you. My name is Jason Fujimoto. I'm calling on behalf of the Los Angeles Chinatown Corporation. We are the founding organization of Chinatown when it was displaced.

Our family has been in Chinatown for well over 80 years. Most of our family and friends have owned businesses and currently still own businesses. A lot of our family members still live in Chinatown, and we support the gondola project general concept.

Response PH219-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment PH219-2 We definitely have concerns, as some of the others do, in terms of some of the environmental issues and impacts, but in general, we do support it.

Response PH219-2 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. As discussed in Sections 3.01, Aesthetics, 3.04, Biological Resources, 3.05, Cultural Resources, 3.06, Energy, 3.07, Geology and Soils, 3.09, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, 3.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, 3.11, Land Use and Planning, 3.13, Noise, 3.15, Public Services, 3.16, Parks and Recreational Facilities, 3.17, Transportation, 3.18, Tribal Cultural Resources, 3.19, Utilities and Service Systems, 3.20, Wildfire, and 5.0, Other CEQA Considerations, the proposed Project would have less than significant operational impacts, including to Los Angeles State Historic Park.

Comment PH219-3 So, we don't oppose it, and the reason we do is that we, as I think one speaker has mentioned, is that we need activity in Chinatown. Chinatown is dying, despite some of the other comments.

Speaking to the businesses, merchants, even family members, there is no tourism. There is no activity. There is no foot traffic in Chinatown, and with the concept of the gondola, it might help bring in people into the Chinatown community to help revitalize some of the businesses.

And so, some of those mom and pop businesses that we're trying to protect, hopefully, if we can bring in the tourism, we will help support and bring business to these mom and pop stores. And if we don't, then those mom and pop stores will close up, close down.

So, we, as a family, as an organization, we support, again, in concept. We don't oppose it, and we hope that all the different sides can come together to make it happen.

Response PH219-3 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the proposed Project represents an opportunity for additional visitors along the proposed Project alignment, creating economic opportunities for local businesses, including shops and restaurants, through potential partnerships that drive customers to businesses along the alignment, which, consequently, adds revenues to these small businesses in the communities the proposed Project hopes to serve. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of how during construction, the Project Sponsor would create a Business and Community Support Program to assist local businesses affected by proposed Project construction activities. The proposed Project would provide numerous benefits to local businesses in El Pueblo, Chinatown, and other areas along the proposed Project alignment, including through potential partnerships with these businesses as well as by providing an accessible and affordable mobility option for employees and area residents.

Comment Letter PH220 - Phyllis Ling

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH220

Comment PH220-1 MS. LING: Hi. I have five seniors here.

MS. SISCO: Oh, hold on.

MS. LING: I have five seniors here who would like to speak, and I hope that they can each be given 2 minutes. It's hard for them to join the meeting. That's why I'm here helping them with my computer.

So, is that okay?

MS. SISCO: Do you have a comment, Phyllis? Or is it the five seniors that are there with you?

MS. LING: I have a comment, but I'm also on another device listening in English. And I'm on this device, and they're with me, but we're listening in Cantonese on here.

So, I would make the comment I'm sharing another device with my sister. So, I'm logged in on another and have my hand raised on another.

MS. SISCO: Okay. Yeah, thank you.

So, let's take one comment for now and let me think about the logistics of taking five people, because we've generally been going in the order that the hands are raised.

So, let's do one comment now, and then we'll think about how to take the five additional comments. So, is there one of the individuals that are with you, Phyllis, that's prepared to provide a comment?

(Foreign language spoken.)

MS. SISCO: Phyllis.

MS. LING: Uh-huh?

MS. SISCO: I want to give the interpreter a chance to relay the comments. I'm not sure if that was two speakers or one.

MS. LING: It was two speakers.

MS. SISCO: Okay, so the interpreters are providing consecutive interpretation, so I want to give them a chance to relay the comments that were made, and then we can go to the other three individuals that wanted to provide comment.

Response PH220-1 Refer to Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's opportunities for public testimony during the Draft EIR public

review period. During the public review period, comments on the Draft EIR could be submitted in writing via email or mail, by phone, and during the four public hearings. Comments on the Draft EIR could be submitted by email to LAART@metro.net, by mail to One Gateway Plaza, Mail Stop 99-22-6, Los Angeles, CA 90012, or over the phone by calling (213) 922-6913. Comments could also be submitted at each public hearing. At virtual public hearings, comments could be given verbally. Interpretation was provided in English, Spanish, Mandarin, and Cantonese during all four public hearings, with interpretation provided in Taishanese during the final two public hearings.

Comment PH220-2 MS. P. LING: This is actually Phyllis Ling.

MS. SISCO: Okay.

MS. P. LING: I'm sharing the phone with my sister. Can I go first?

MS. SISCO: Yes.

MS. P. LING: Okay, could you please restart my time? Okay, thank you. Yes, so this is Phyllis Ling. I'm a resident under the route of the gondola directly across from the massive Broadway junction.

Response PH220-2 This comment is noted and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Comment PH220-3 First of all, the draft EIR is deficient and deceptive. It needs to be redone or, better yet, stop this project. If you must continue, I have these comments.

Response PH220-3 The Draft EIR includes 7,877 pages of detailed analysis from experts in their respective fields, intended to provide the public and decision makers the information that they need to meaningfully consider the proposed Project's potential environmental impacts, as well as a shorter executive summary that explains the analysis and conclusions in clean and simple language. Accordingly, the Draft EIR more than adequately complies with CEQA's requirements for a Draft EIR.

Comment PH220-4 The smart glass for privacy sounds like a lot of lip service to us residents.

There's no explanation as to how it would be implemented. We need to know where it would be activated.

There are a lot of residents along the route, so if the windows are fogged up 50 percent of the time, that doesn't sound like a good experience for tourists who are supposedly funding this project, and there's maintenance.

If the smart glass is malfunctioning, will the cabin be taken out of service? How would the operator know? Would they just be relying on residents to report malfunctions?

We don't think the measures to protect our privacy should be treated lightly or like a courtesy. This is an essential part of the system.

Response PH220-4 Refer to Topical Response M, Comparable Urban Aerial Transit Systems, discussing how, like the proposed Project, comparable aerial transit systems in cities around the world are integrated with their surrounding urban environments. In particular, comparable aerial transit systems in other locations demonstrate that such systems can operate safely, efficiently, and in concert with nearby residential and open space uses, including parks and other recreational facilities. The proposed Project would be located in a densely-populated, urban environment surrounded by a variety of commercial, industrial, and residential development types. In this type of environment, it is common for public transportation, such as Metro's light rail, to be located adjacent to residential uses and modern aerial transit systems in other cities, including Portland, Oregon and New York City, operate adjacent to residential uses. Nevertheless, as discussed in Topical Response J, Gondola Design and Operations and Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, cabin windows can be equipped with privacy glass that can become opaque while adjacent to sensitive views, and the proposed Project would work with stakeholders adjacent to the proposed Project alignment to identify locations where the use of privacy glass would be warranted. Considerations as to the locations along the proposed Project alignment where the privacy glass could be activated include the subject adjacent sensitive views and the vertical and horizontal distance between the proposed Project cabins and the adjacent sensitive views.. As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, and Topical Response J, Gondola Design and Operations, of the Final EIR, routine cabin maintenance, including maintenance of the cabin privacy glass, would be performed by the system operator. Refer to Response P702-16 for additional discussion of the reasonable expectation of privacy on private property.

Comment PH220-5 The maps on the alignment profiles don't show enough detail. How are the additional buffers treated legally? How low is it? You want to go over my property, would I have to cut back my avocado tree for the gondola? Would I be required to allow McCourt's people access to cut back my tree whenever they want? These are little details, but they matter.

Response PH220-5 Refer to Section 2.5, Proposed Project Alignment and Components, with supporting data provided in Appendix Q, Proposed Alignment Plan and Profile, of the Draft EIR for discussion of how the proposed Project maximizes alignment along the public ROW and publicly owned property and minimizes aerial rights over private properties. Figure 2-7 in Section 2.0, Project Description, shows the proposed Project's ANSI Requirements and Additional Separation Buffer. Section 3.4.6, Aerial Clearance, of Section 3.0, Project Description, of the Final EIR details the proposed Project's Additional Separation Buffer. As described throughout the Draft EIR, the proposed Project would require aerial easements for certain properties along the proposed Project (see Sections 2.5 of Section 2, Project Description and 3.11.1, Figure 6-12 of

Section 3.11, Land Use and Planning). How the Project Sponsor acquires the aerial rights for the proposed Project is beyond the scope of the Draft EIR. Refer to Appendix K.2, Avocado Tree Memo, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the avocado tree located at 451 Savoy Street as it pertains to the proposed Project. As discussed therein, based on review of photographs of the avocado tree it is between 30 and 40 feet in height, and the maximum height of any variety of avocado tree is 40 feet. Because the tree's trunk diameter is approximated at 20 to 24 inches, this indicates it is a mature tree and any increase in height would be negligible. The height of the bottom of the proposed Project's cabins adjacent to the avocado tree location is approximately 52 feet above the ground. Based on this information, the Avocado Tree Memo concludes that the proposed Project would have no above- or below-ground effect on the avocado tree, and because of the considerable distance from the tree to the cabin, no pruning would be necessary prior to construction or during proposed Project operations.

Comment PH220-6 Most of the route is on an earthquake liquefaction zone. The mitigation in EIR is to do mitigants or whatever that says. Well, if the mitigation is to drill deeper, that's more noise, vibration, more possibility of groundwater contamination, more damage to our homes and (audio interference) historic El Pueblo.

Response PH220-6 Refer to Section 3.07, Geology and Soils, and Appendix I, Geotechnical Document in Support of the Environmental Impact Report, of the Draft EIR and Appendix F, Memo on Structural Engineering, of the Final EIR for discussion of how the proposed Project would meet applicable standards, requirements, and building codes and would have less than significant impacts related to geology and soils, including liquefaction, upon implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-A. Refer to Section 3.09, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, of the Draft EIR for discussion of how the proposed Project would have less than significant impacts with implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-A and HAZ-B. Refer to Section 3.13, Noise, and Appendix M, Noise and Vibration Technical Report, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the construction and operational noise impacts from the proposed Project. As detailed therein, construction related noise impacts would be significant and unavoidable even with implementation of mitigation. Operational noise impacts would be less than significant. Refer to Section 3.13, Noise, and Appendix M, Noise and Vibration Technical Report, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the vibration impacts from construction of the proposed Project. Vibration impacts associated with the proposed Project were analyzed in the Draft EIR both for building damage and human annoyance. With implementation of Mitigation Measure VIB-A and VIB-B during construction of Alameda Station, vibration damage impacts at the Avila Adobe, the Old Winery, and El Grito Mural, would be less than significant. Construction of the proposed Project would result in significant and unavoidable human annoyance impacts during construction of the proposed Project.

Comment PH220-7 Why isn't -- oh, okay, so you know what? This project would be like a cable car freeway over a neighborhood which is already sliced and diced by Hill Street and Broadway. I'm sorry, but the people who are supporting this aren't looking beyond the marketing hype.

Response PH220-7 Refer to Section 2.5, Proposed Project Alignment and Components, with supporting data provided in Appendix Q, Proposed Alignment Plan and Profile, of the Draft EIR for discussion of how the proposed Project maximizes alignment along the public ROW and publicly owned property and minimizes aerial rights over private properties. Refer to Topical Response M, Comparable Urban Aerial Transit Systems, discussing how, like the proposed Project, comparable aerial transit systems in cities around the world are integrated with their surrounding urban environments. In particular, comparable aerial transit systems in other locations demonstrate that such systems can operate safely, efficiently, and in concert with nearby residential and open space uses, including parks and other recreational facilities. As discussed in Sections 3.01, Aesthetics, 3.04, Biological Resources, 3.05, Cultural Resources, 3.06, Energy, 3.07, Geology and Soils, 3.09, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, 3.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, 3.11, Land Use and Planning, 3.13, Noise, 3.15, Public Services, 3.16, Parks and Recreational Facilities, 3.17, Transportation, 3.18, Tribal Cultural Resources, 3.19, Utilities and Service Systems, 3.20, Wildfire, and 5.0, Other CEQA Considerations, the proposed Project would have less than significant operational impacts.

Comment PH220-8 This project is as sustainable as an EV Hummer, which is also zero emissions by their standards. It's bloated and completely wrong for the supposed purpose. Go back to the drawing board with this EIR or just stop the gondola. Thank you.

Response PH220-8 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of how the proposed Project would operate at zero emissions, with the electrical power for the proposed Project supplied by the City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) through the utility's Green Power Program, pursuant to GHG-PDF-A. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project.

Comment Letter PH221 – Speaker 1

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH221

Comment PH221-1 INTERPRETER: I oppose the Chinatown gondola project because Chinatown already has a lot of cars and the Go Line runs through Chinatown as well. I live in the Chinatown senior building, and that's for speaker one.

Response PH221-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project.

Comment Letter PH222 - Tan

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH222

Comment PH222-1 INTERPRETER: For speaker two, I also live in Chinatown. My last name is Tan. I am over 80 years old. I live near the railway station, and if we have the gondola in the future, this is going to affect our life because building a gondola will produce a lot of dust, noise, and it's going to be a safety issue as well, so I oppose this gondola project.

Response PH222-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Section 2.0, Project Description, and Appendix B, Construction Assumptions, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the construction of the proposed Project. Refer to Section 3.13, Noise, and Appendix M, Noise and Vibration Technical Report, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the construction and operational noise impacts from the proposed Project. As detailed therein, construction related noise impacts would be significant and unavoidable even with implementation of mitigation. Operational noise impacts would be less than significant. Refer to Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, and Topical Response J, Gondola Design and Operations, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's design and operations, including discussion of the safety, privacy, and operations features of the proposed Project.

Comment PH222-2 If we really need to develop Chinatown, we need to make sure to add more parking for cars that are coming in. This project is for wealthy individuals, and for the benefit of Chinatown, we need to make sure we have enough parking for the public. Thank you.

Response PH222-2 Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of how the proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of how the proposed Project would provide numerous benefits to local businesses in Chinatown, and other areas along the proposed Project alignment, including through potential partnerships with these businesses as well as by providing an accessible and affordable mobility option for employees and area residents. Parking is not required to be analyzed under CEQA or the Transportation Assessment Guidelines ("TAG"). Nevertheless, the Parking Study was prepared to provide additional information to the community and decision makers about existing parking conditions and the proposed Project's potential to effect parking conditions around the Alameda Station and Chinatown/State Park Station. As recommended in the Parking Study, the Project Sponsor will prepare, in collaboration with the City, and

with robust feedback from community stakeholders, a parking management plan. The City would implement any on-street parking management strategies identified.

Comment Letter PH223 – Speaker 3

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH223

Comment PH223-1 INTERPRETER: I live in the senior apartment near the Metro station. The address is 808 Spring Street and I personally live in apartment 909.

I have lived here for approximately ten years. A lot has changed over the past ten years. Over time in Chinatown, gradually we lost a hospital and some supermarket.

A lot of visitor going to Chinatown, they are just here to do the shopping, but a lot of them have gone currently, and Chinatown desperately needs the hospital to come back and more stores in Chinatown, and the government needs to think about the need of their people.

Even though I live here, I do most of my shopping, grocery shopping in Rosemead and San Gabriel because it's cheaper there and it's more convenient. I can do all of my shopping there all at once. There are a lot of street vendors in the streets in Chinatown. It's like a third world.

Response PH223-1 Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the proposed Project would not preclude development of uses including housing, grocery stores, and/or healthcare facilities in the surrounding communities, and would itself address a need for a permanent transit connection to one of the region's most visited venues, and would benefit the surrounding community by alleviating existing congestion on surrounding neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways, thereby reducing associated air pollution and improving safety.

Comment PH223-2 And Chinatown currently already has an electric bus that is running through Chinatown from the bus terminal, so we don't need the gondola anymore. Thank you.

Response PH223-2 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response H, The Draft EIR Considered an Appropriate Range of Alternatives and Design Options, for discussion of how the Transportation Systems Management Alternative for an enhanced Dodger Stadium Express is unlikely to achieve the same level of ridership as the proposed Project, and otherwise fails to meet most of the Project Objectives which seek to achieve the proposed Project's underlying purpose of providing a permanent direct transit connection between LAUS and the Dodger Stadium property and improving connectivity for surrounding communities, including Chinatown, Mission Junction, Elysian Park, Solano Canyon, and the Los Angeles State Historic Park. Electrification of the Dodger Stadium Express buses would not negate the operational issues associated with substantially expanding the Dodger Stadium

Express. Improving the connection between LAUS and Dodger Stadium via the proposed Project would provide the quickest, most frequent, and highest capacity transit connection for the greatest number of riders traveling to Dodger Stadium to have the most travel time competitive transit trips from more locations in the region. Refer to Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of how the proposed Project's intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station near the southernmost entrance to the Los Angeles State Historic Park would be located within a short walk to many Chinatown businesses and Metro's L Line (Gold), creating a stronger connection with the Metro L Line and enhancing transit access to the Los Angeles State Historic Park, Mission Junction, William Mead Homes, and the Los Angeles River. Compared to the Metro L Line (Gold), accessible at the Chinatown Station, the proposed Project's Chinatown/State Park Station would be closer to the Los Angeles State Historic Park, the shorter headways would result in more frequent service, and the travel time would be less.

Comment Letter PH224 - Ling Lee

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH224

Comment PH224-1 INTERPRETER: Thank you. My name is Ling Lee. I also live at 808 Spring Street and I have lived here for –

(Simultaneous speaking.)

Response PH224-1 This comment is noted and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Comment PH224-2 INTERPRETER: So sorry about that. My name is Ling Lee and I'm a senior citizen living in the senior apartments too. The address is 808 Spring Street and I have been living there for ten years and I'm 75 years old.

And every time I open my window in my apartment, so the bus line was running through outside, so it generates a lot of like noise and vibrations. It caused me like a headache and I couldn't sleep at night.

Response PH224-2 This comment is noted and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Comment PH224-3 So, you want another gondola outside of my building. That's going to basically kill me. So, you mentioned that it would bring more business.

Response PH224-3 Refer to Section 2.5, Proposed Project Alignment and Components, with supporting data provided in Appendix Q, Proposed Alignment Plan and Profile, of the Draft EIR for discussion of how the proposed Project maximizes alignment along the public ROW and publicly owned property and minimizes aerial rights over private properties. Refer to Section 3.13, Noise, and Appendix M, Noise and Vibration Technical Report, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the operational noise impacts from the proposed Project, which would be less than significant. Refer to Responses GO17-129 and GO17-130 for discussion of the proposed Project's less than significant impact on human health associated with hearing loss, hearing damage, and sleep disturbance. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the potential added benefits from the proposed Project, including potential partnerships with and benefits to local businesses.

Comment PH224-4 You can just invest on more shops in Chinatown.

Response PH224-4 Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the potential added benefits from the proposed Project, including potential partnerships with and benefits to local businesses in Chinatown. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the proposed Project would not displace businesses and represents an opportunity for additional visitors along the proposed Project alignment, creating economic opportunities for local businesses, including shops and restaurants, through potential partnerships that drive customers to businesses along the alignment, which, consequently, adds revenues to these small businesses in the communities the proposed Project hopes to serve. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of how during construction, the Project Sponsor would create a Business and Community Support Program to assist local businesses affected by proposed Project construction activities. The proposed Project would provide numerous benefits to local businesses in El Pueblo, Chinatown, and other areas along the proposed Project alignment, including through potential partnerships with these businesses as well as by providing an accessible and affordable mobility option for employees and area residents.

Comment PH224-5 And so, also the gondola is not, you know, would bring a lot of benefit to us as senior citizens, so, because it's hard for us to like go into the gondola or take the gondola.

And also, it also would cause us some like safety issues, some safety issue in our neighborhoods, so I'm strongly opposed to the gondola project. Thank you.

Response PH224-5 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR and Topical Response J, Gondola Design and Operations, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the safety features of the proposed Project and how the station boarding process and cabins would comply with all accessibility requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act (“ADA”). If needed, cabins could be either slowed or stopped in the station for boarding purposes. Station attendants would be located within each station to assure safe boarding and to execute stops for unloading or boarding purposes, if necessary. Attendants would also provide customer interaction and observation; if a passenger needs special assistance, an attendant may either further slow or stop a cabin. A separate operator would be stationed in a control booth monitoring screens, which would show activities in each cabin and station, as well as the system controls. Pathways to the boarding areas would be ADA compliant with redundant vertical circulation and appropriately sized passageways. The entry widths and interiors size of each cabin would comply with the requirements of the ADA. As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the cabins allow for sitting or standing, and would be fully ADA accessible, including accommodating wheelchairs. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project’s features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities. Additionally, refer to Topical Response M, Comparable Urban Aerial Transit Systems,

for discussion of comparable aerial transit systems in cities around the world that operate safely, efficiently, and in concert with nearby residential and open space uses, and for discussion of how comparable aerial transit systems in other cities and countries have brought benefits to their surrounding areas by connecting disparate neighborhoods, promoting commerce, and beautifying communities. Comparable urban aerial transit systems have been shown to reduce violent crime in nearby areas. In addition to statistical studies, residents of cities with aerial transit systems have reported a greater sense of security when riding aerial transit relative to other modes of public transportation.

Comment Letter PH225 – Speaker 4

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH225

Comment PH225-1 INTERPRETER: I am very much in opposition of this gondola project. You are talking about this gondola is going to reduce pollution and noise. That is not true. I am in so much opposition of it. A gondola is only used in not-so-developed countries and cities.

Look around us. Look at the world. Only very backwards cities and cities that are not so developed are still using gondola. Look at Beijing. Are they using gondolas? Look at all the very developed countries.

If you want to build a gondola here in Los Angeles, that means Los Angeles is a not-so-developed country. Is that what LA is?

Such way of transportation is obsolete. It's definitely going to bring a lot of negative impact to people. It's going to bring more pollution. It's bad for seniors' health.

Response PH225-1 Refer to Section 3.03, Air Quality, Section 3.08, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 3.17, Transportation, Appendix D, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's ability to reduce vehicular travel, to improve air quality through reduced emissions, and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through reduced vehicular travel. Refer to Section 3.13, Noise, and Appendix M, Noise and Vibration Technical Report, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the construction and operational noise impacts from the proposed Project. As detailed therein, construction related noise impacts would be significant and unavoidable even with implementation of mitigation. Operational noise impacts would be less than significant. Although forms of aerial transit technology have been available and utilized for the last 100 years, modern applications have seen the evolution of the technology as a feasible mode of urban rapid transit. Refer to Table 2-1, ART Precedents, in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, which provides examples of gondola systems in cities around the world. Refer to Topical Response M, Comparable Urban Aerial Transit Systems, discussing how, like the proposed Project, comparable aerial transit systems in cities around the world are integrated with their surrounding urban environments. In particular, comparable aerial transit systems in other locations demonstrate that such systems can operate safely, efficiently, and in concert with nearby residential and open space uses, including parks and other recreational facilities. As discussed in the Technology Penetration Analysis, included in Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, of the Draft EIR, a large capacity for a new mode of transportation in Los Angeles will allow passengers to see the potential for other emerging

innovations to be integrated into the public transit system, and the proposed Project would thus exemplify how alternative transportation technology can be integrated into a city's transportation infrastructure and will show that new technology can successfully operate in concert with other existing modes of transportation. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the Draft EIR addresses environmental justice by considering the proposed Project's ability to reduce congestion and emissions from on-road vehicles in an area disproportionately burdened by pollution, and including an analysis of the proposed Project's potential impacts to the surrounding community, concluding that the proposed Project could result in air quality benefits for the surrounding communities.

Comment PH225-2 And also, if you put a gondola right there above our window, above our building, the moment we open up our windows, they're able to see everything we're doing inside.

We are sacrificing or you are actually putting our privacy on the line. We would not have any more privacy. I firmly oppose the gondola project.

Response PH225-2 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response M, Comparable Urban Aerial Transit Systems, discussing how, like the proposed Project, comparable aerial transit systems in cities around the world are integrated with their surrounding urban environments. In particular, comparable aerial transit systems in other locations demonstrate that such systems can operate safely, efficiently, and in concert with nearby residential and open space uses, including parks and other recreational facilities. The proposed Project would be located in a densely-populated, urban environment surrounded by a variety of commercial, industrial, and residential development types. In this type of environment, it is common for public transportation, such as Metro's light rail, to be located adjacent to residential uses and modern aerial transit systems in other cities, including Portland, Oregon and New York City, operate adjacent to residential uses. Refer to Topical Response J, Gondola Design and Operations and Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of how cabin windows can be equipped with privacy glass that can become opaque while adjacent to sensitive views, and the proposed Project would work with stakeholders adjacent to the proposed Project alignment to identify locations where the use of privacy glass would be warranted. Considerations as to the locations along the proposed Project alignment where the privacy glass could be activated include the subject adjacent sensitive views and the vertical and horizontal distance between the proposed Project cabins and the adjacent sensitive views.

Comment Letter PH226 - Sophat Phea

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH226

Comment PH226-1 MR. PHEA: Hi, my name is Sophat Phea and I have lived in Chinatown for over 30 years and still live in Chinatown today. As there's been a rise of developments and gentrification in Chinatown, I fear this project will contribute to it and put my home more at risk.

Response PH226-1 Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not exacerbate gentrification or result in displacement of residents in the surrounding neighborhoods and is consistent with Metro's considerations regarding gentrification and displacement.

Comment PH226-2 Parking has been a huge barrier to the small businesses in Chinatown in thriving, including for my mom and her shop. They were told that it would bring businesses to Chinatown, but tell me how.

It is no doubt going to take up a lot of parking spaces in Chinatown where people are already having trouble finding. Even tenants living in Chinatown have trouble finding parking.

Response PH226-2 Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, discussing the proposed Project's potential partnerships with and benefits to local businesses. As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, and Topical Response C, Project Features, the proposed Project creates a first/last mile transit link for residents and businesses along the proposed Project alignment while unifying and connecting communities through transit mobility access. This new mode of transportation will expand rider access to the regional transit system by attracting new visitors including Dodgers fans, and represents an opportunity for additional visitors along the proposed Project alignment, creating economic opportunities for local businesses, including shops and restaurants, through potential partnerships that drive customers to businesses along the alignment, which, consequently, adds revenues to these small businesses in the communities the proposed Project hopes to serve. Parking is not required to be analyzed under CEQA or the Transportation Assessment Guidelines ("TAG"). Nevertheless, the Parking Study was prepared to provide additional information to the community and decision makers about existing parking conditions and the proposed Project's potential to effect parking conditions around the Alameda Station and Chinatown/State Park Station. As recommended in the Parking Study, the Project Sponsor will prepare, in collaboration with the City, and with robust feedback from community stakeholders, a parking management plan. The City would implement any on-street parking management strategies identified.

Comment PH226-3 I personally don't see myself using the gondola and would love the money and effort go toward what the community would actually use instead, such as our current public transportation.

Response PH226-3 Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities, including Chinatown. Refer to Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of how the proposed Project's intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station near the southernmost entrance to the Los Angeles State Historic Park would be located within a short walk to many Chinatown businesses and Metro's L Line (Gold), creating a stronger connection with the Metro L Line and enhancing transit access to the Los Angeles State Historic Park, Mission Junction, William Mead Homes, and the Los Angeles River. Compared to the Metro L Line (Gold), accessible at the Chinatown Station, the proposed Project's Chinatown/State Park Station would be closer to the Los Angeles State Historic Park, the shorter headways would result in more frequent service, and the travel time would be less. Refer to Topical Response H, The Draft EIR Considered an Appropriate Range of Alternatives and Design Options, for discussion of how improving the connection between LAUS and Dodger Stadium via the proposed Project would provide the quickest, most frequent, and highest capacity transit connection for the greatest number of riders traveling to Dodger Stadium to have the most travel time competitive transit trips from more locations in the region.

Comment PH226-4 How much does it cost to ride the gondola? Tell me why no one was able to answer.

Response PH226-4 Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of how the proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan.

Comment PH226-5 Money and effort could have been put into improving the parking situation and improving our public transportation instead. At the end of the day, who does it really benefit and who is being harmed? Thank you.

Response PH226-5 This comment provides a general summary of the comments raised in this letter. Responses to the comments contained in this letter are provided above in Responses PH266-1 through PH266-4.

Comment Letter PH227 - Ernest Lee

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH227

Comment PH227-1 MR. LEE: Can you hear me?

MS. SISCO: Yes.

MR. LEE: Okay, my name is Ernest Lee. I'm the President of the Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association in Chinatown. We're the oldest Chinese association in Chinatown, with over 130 years of history. We have 27 family associations affiliated with us and we have over 2,000 membership.

We strongly support of this gondola project because definitely it will bring benefit, commercial benefit to Chinatown and the small merchants. Chinatown, like the people said earlier, Chinatown is dying. We need the revitalization, so definitely, please bring on the gondola project. We need it. Thank you.

Response PH227-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, discussing the proposed Project's potential partnerships with and benefits to local businesses. As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the proposed Project creates a first/last mile transit link for residents and businesses within Chinatown while unifying and connecting communities through transit mobility access. This new mode of transportation will expand rider access to the regional transit system by attracting new visitors including Dodgers fans, and represents an opportunity for additional visitors along the proposed Project alignment, creating economic opportunities for local businesses, including shops and restaurants, through potential partnerships that drive customers to Chinatown and other businesses along the proposed Project alignment, which, consequently, adds revenues to these small businesses in the communities the proposed Project hopes to serve. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of how during construction, the Project Sponsor would create a Business and Community Support Program to assist local businesses affected by proposed Project construction activities. The proposed Project would provide numerous benefits to local businesses in El Pueblo, Chinatown, and other areas along the proposed Project alignment, including through potential partnerships with these businesses as well as by providing an accessible and affordable mobility option for employees and area residents. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan.

Comment Letter PH228 - Tany Ling

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH228

Comment PH228-1 MS. T. LING: Hey, Metro. My name is Tany and I'm a Chinatown resident who is against this project. Hey, Metro, if you are serious about making life better for Angelenos, you'd also be against this touristy sweetheart money grab for Frank McCourt.

Response PH228-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of how the proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at LAUS, Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Dodger Stadium draws large regional crowds, with approximately 100 baseball games and other events each year, but there are no permanent transit connections to the venue. The vast majority of visitors drive their personal vehicles to access the venue. These vehicles create congestion on the surface streets leading up to and around Dodger Stadium, including Sunset Boulevard/Cesar E. Chavez from LAUS and throughout the surrounding communities. Given the capacity of the proposed Project's system, approximately 20 percent of the fans could take aerial transit connected to Metro's regional transit system. This would reduce vehicular congestion in and around Dodger Stadium, on neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways during game and special event days. In addition to providing service on game and special event days at Dodger Stadium and events at the Los Angeles State Historic Park, it is anticipated that the proposed Project would also provide daily service between 6:00am to 12:00am, for the surrounding communities, including Chinatown, Mission Junction, Elysian Park, Solano Canyon, and the Los Angeles State Historic Park. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan.

Comment PH228-2 Metro, if you're serious about reducing traffic and pollution on game days, you would choose practical, cost-effective measures like providing safe pedestrian access to Dodger Stadium and expanding the Dodger Stadium Express by adding more electric

buses and dedicated bus lanes, and creating new boarding hubs in other parts of the city like Griffith Park, the Valley, and the West Side.

Response PH228-2 Refer to Section 3.03, Air Quality, Section 3.08, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 3.17, Transportation, Appendix D, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's ability to reduce vehicular travel, to improve air quality through reduced emissions, and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through reduced vehicular. Refer to Section 5.0, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR, for discussion of a Pedestrian Enhancement Alternative to the proposed Project in which the proposed Project would not be constructed and instead an enhanced pedestrian walkway and vertical circulation elements would be constructed to improve the safety, comfort, and accessibility of walking between the Metro L Line (Gold) Station and Dodger Stadium. While this alternative would provide improved pedestrian connections compared to existing conditions, the 25 minute plus travel time from the Metro L Line (Gold) Station to the location of the proposed Dodger Stadium Station would be at least nine times greater than the three minute travel time between those two locations with the proposed Project, and this alternative would be unlikely to attract substantially more people to walk to Dodger Stadium compared to existing conditions given the travel time and the physical exertion. This alternative was considered but dismissed from further detailed analysis because it did not meet most of the basic objectives of the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response H, The Draft EIR Considered an Appropriate Range of Alternatives and Design Options, for discussion of how the Transportation Systems Management Alternative for an enhanced Dodger Stadium Express is unlikely to achieve the same level of ridership as the proposed Project, and otherwise fails to meet most of the Project Objectives which seek to achieve the proposed Project's underlying purpose of providing a permanent direct transit connection between LAUS and the Dodger Stadium property and improving connectivity for surrounding communities, including Chinatown, Mission Junction, Elysian Park, Solano Canyon, and the Los Angeles State Historic Park. Electrification of the Dodger Stadium Express buses would not negate the operational issues associated with substantially expanding the Dodger Stadium Express As discussed in Topical Response H, a system of buses from numerous remote locations throughout the Los Angeles region to and from Dodger Stadium events would require a substantial increase in the number of buses which, similar to expanding the fleet for an expanded Dodger Stadium Express service, would result in a fleet of buses that would either be underutilized most of the time or regular Metro bus service that utilizes these vehicles would be disrupted every time a Dodger game or event at the stadium is held. Such a service would also incur substantial costs in paid time and mileage for driving empty buses out to the remote locations before a game and back from the remote locations after a game and paid idle time during the game. Buses from a variety of remote locations would also need to travel in rush hour congestion

to get to Dodger Stadium. With limited regional facilities that provide bus only lanes that these services could utilize, they would not materially improve transit travel time compared with driving. For example, the current Dodger Stadium Express service from South Bay serves a broad area of southern Los Angeles County at stations spread across eight miles, is free, and travels on a priority lane within the I-110 freeway median for most of its trip, but the South Bay Dodger Stadium Express carried an average of only 415 passengers per game in 2019, which is substantially lower than the ridership of 1,895 riders per game on the LAUS Dodger Stadium Express. Improving the connection between LAUS and Dodger Stadium via the proposed Project would provide the quickest, most frequent, and highest capacity transit connection for the greatest number of riders traveling to Dodger Stadium to have the most travel time competitive transit trips from more locations in the region.

Comment PH228-3 Metro, I support and actively use public transportation, but this gondola proposal is a scam masquerading as a free public service project.

Response PH228-3 Refer to Topical Response A, SB 44, for discussion of how the proposed Project is public transportation because it will be open to the general public for service at regular, scheduled operating times, operating daily to serve existing residents, workers, park users, and visitors to Los Angeles.

Comment PH228-4 You all forgot to include the residents and stakeholders when you and LA ART met behind closed doors during what was supposed to be the initial public planning period.

Response PH228-4 This comment raises issues that were litigated and decided in *The California Endowment v. Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority*, Case No. 22STCP01030 (Jan. 9, 2023, Order Denying Petition for Writ of Mandate). There, the Los Angeles Superior Court upheld Metro's sole source determination for the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, Appendix A, Scoping Report, of the Draft EIR, and Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project team's outreach efforts to neighborhoods along the proposed Project alignment and the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefit to the surrounding community. Metro sought to engage with stakeholders in neighborhoods along the proposed Project alignment in each stage of the environmental review process. Input from the public, including local community stakeholders, led directly to the selection of the proposed Project alignment, including an intermediate station in Chinatown (the Chinatown/State Park Station), as well as to the redesign of the proposed Project stations and junction and additional pedestrian enhancements including hardscape and landscape improvements.

Comment PH228-5 Then, you held in-person hearings where we could make so-called public comments, but only if we were secreted away in the corner behind a curtain talking only to a stenographer. Metro, I think you have a lot of explaining to do.

Response PH228-5 Refer to Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project’s opportunities for public testimony during the Draft EIR public review period. During the public review period, comments on the Draft EIR could be submitted in writing via email or mail, by phone, and during each of the four public hearings. Comments on the Draft EIR could be submitted by email to LAART@metro.net, by mail to One Gateway Plaza, Mail Stop 99-22-6, Los Angeles, CA 90012, or over the phone by calling (213) 922-6913. Comments could also be submitted at each of the four public hearings. At virtual public hearings, comments could be given verbally. In light of the disruptions at the January 12, 2023, public hearing, Metro provided a fourth public hearing by way of a virtual public hearing held on February 8, 2023. Verbal comments made at the virtual February 8, 2023 public hearing were deemed timely submitted for the purposes of the Draft EIR public review period. At the two public hearings held in person, comments could be submitted either in writing on forms provided by Metro, or verbally to the court reporters who were set up at a “comment station” in the venue. Written comment forms provided instructions on how to comment on the Draft EIR in English, Spanish, and Chinese (Simplified). Interpretation was provided in English, Spanish, Mandarin, and Cantonese during all four public hearings, with interpretation provided in Taishanese during the final two public hearings. Under CEQA, the purpose of a Final EIR is to respond to comments received on the Draft EIR during the public review period and incorporate changes to a proposed project in response to such comments. (CEQA Guidelines, § 15088). Consistent with CEQA, comments received on the Draft EIR were responded to in the Final EIR.

Comment Letter PH229 - Sakae Koyama

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH229

Comment PH229-1 MS. KOYAMA: Hi, can you hear me?

MS. SISCO: Yes.

MS. KOYAMA: Thank you. Hi, my name is Sakae Koyama, a born and raise lifelong Angeleno, and have lived in Echo Park/Elysian Park since 1975.

I'm also a board member of Friends of Elysian Park, who have helped protect and preserve Elysian Park from predatory developers since 1965. We have taken a firm stance of no on this project.

Response PH229-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address and environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Comment PH229-2 We remember our history, Chavez Ravine. We know what gentrification and displacement does to neighborhoods. This will not bring revitalization to Chinatown. They need supermarkets, hospitals, infrastructure. Elysian Park is not for sale.

Response PH229-2 Refer to Section 5.0, Corrections and Additions, of this Final EIR for a discussion of Chavez Ravine. Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not exacerbate gentrification or result in displacement of residents in the surrounding neighborhoods and is consistent with Metro's considerations regarding gentrification and displacement. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the proposed Project would not preclude development of uses including housing, grocery stores, and/or healthcare facilities in the surrounding communities, and would itself address a need for a permanent transit connection to one of the region's most visited venues, and would benefit the surrounding community by alleviating existing congestion on surrounding neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways, thereby reducing associated air pollution and improving safety. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the potential added benefits from the proposed Project, including potential partnerships with and benefits to local businesses in Chinatown. Refer to Topical Response M, Comparable Urban Aerial Transit Systems, for discussion of how comparable aerial transit systems in other locations demonstrate that such systems can operate safely, efficiently, and in concert with nearby residential and open space uses, including parks and other recreational facilities, and have brought benefits to their surrounding areas by

connecting disparate neighborhoods, promoting commerce, beautifying communities, and enhancing transit system rider safety.

Comment PH229-3 There's a reason that Frank McCourt kept the parking lot after he sold the Dodgers. He had dollar signs in his eyes. As he has steadily raised the parking rates, it has negatively affected the surrounding neighborhoods.

Response PH229-3 This comment is noted and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project.

Comment PH229-4 This is not public transit. To where? The parking lot when Dodgers are there seven to eight months of the year when a perfectly good bus system exists? This is only the first phase of McCourt's Disney-fication of Elysian Park, turning it into an amusement shopping center like Universal Citywalk.

Response PH229-4 Refer to Topical Response A, SB 44, for discussion of how the proposed Project is public transportation because it will be open to the general public for service at regular, scheduled operating times, operating daily to serve existing residents, workers, park users, and visitors to Los Angeles. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of how the proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at LAUS, Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Refer to Section 2.1, Overview of the Project, of the Draft EIR, discussing how the proposed Project would operate daily to serve existing residents, workers, park users, and visitors to Los Angeles. As discussed on page 2-42, in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the proposed Project would provide service to all pre-season, regular season, and post-season Los Angeles Dodger games and any special events (e.g., concerts, the Los Angeles Marathon) at the Dodger Stadium property. The proposed Project would also provide service to events at the Los Angeles State Historic Park. In addition to providing service on game and special event days at Dodger Stadium and events at the Los Angeles State Historic Park, it is anticipated that the proposed Project would also provide daily service between 6:00am to 12:00am, for the surrounding communities, including Chinatown, Mission Junction, Elysian Park, Solano Canyon, and the Los Angeles State Historic Park. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan. Refer to Topical Response G, No Improper Project Segmentation: The Proposed

Project Is Intended to Create a Transit Connection from Metro's Union Station Transportation Hub via an Aerial Gondola System to the Dodger Stadium Property for a discussion of how the proposed Project solely proposes an aerial gondola system. The proposed Project does not include other development, and neither the Project Sponsor nor any other applicant has applied for other development unrelated to the existing stadium uses on the Dodger Stadium property.

Comment PH229-5 It will ruin the natural beauty of the historic state park and the oldest city park since 1865, Elysian Park, and will ruin the scenic view of downtown. We adamantly oppose this project and it has no place in our community. Thank you.

Response PH229-5 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Section 3.01, Aesthetics, and Appendix C, Visual Impact Assessment, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the aesthetic impacts of the proposed Project, which would be less than significant, including at the Los Angeles State Historic Park and Elysian Park. Regarding scenic vistas, as analyzed in the Draft EIR, there are no designated scenic vistas present in the area of potential impact. However, the Project area provides views that are considered scenic by certain viewers, including views of the downtown Los Angeles skyline, LAUS, El Pueblo, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Arroyo Seco Parkway, Dodger Stadium, and the mountains that make up the Transverse Ranges, including the San Gabriel and San Bernardino Mountains. Specifically, as it pertains to Los Angeles State Historic Park, the open views of the Park, as well as the view of the downtown Los Angeles skyline, make the Park "visually memorable." As discussed in Section 3.01, Aesthetics, and Appendix C, Visual Impact Assessment, views considered to be scenic locally would not be substantially impacted. In addition, while views from the Park toward the surrounding existing urban landscape exhibit various visual values, and the proposed Project would not substantially impact these views as shown in the simulated views. Therefore, the proposed Project would not block any designated scenic views, alter a designated scenic area, or block panoramic views, and impacts to scenic or panoramic views would be less than significant.

Comment Letter PH230 - Andy

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH230

Comment PH230-1 PARTICIPANT: Hi, can you hear me?

MS. SISCO: Yes, we can.

PARTICIPANT: Hi, my name is Andy. I've been part of Chinatown for 20 years and I'm speaking against the gondola project.

Respectfully, everyone involved is fucking kidding themselves if you actually think this project does a community good. It's insulting and disrespectful to us if you think anybody living here actually believes this would help Chinatown without first being lied to.

Response PH230-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at LAUS, Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Dodger Stadium draws large regional crowds, with approximately 100 baseball games and other events each year, but there are no permanent transit connections to the venue. The vast majority of visitors drive their personal vehicles to access the venue. These vehicles create congestion on the surface streets leading up to and around Dodger Stadium, including Sunset Boulevard/Cesar E. Chavez from LAUS and throughout the surrounding communities. Given the capacity of the proposed Project's system, approximately 20 percent of the fans could take aerial transit connected to Metro's regional transit system. This would reduce vehicular congestion in and around Dodger Stadium, on neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways during game and special event days. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities including but not limited to sustainability features and open space enhancements, the Community Access Plan for fares, access to parks, mobility hubs, signage, utilization of local artists for site specific artwork at each station reflective of the unique neighborhood culture, design of each component of the proposed Project to complement and reflect the unique character

of the surrounding neighborhood, the Business and Community Support Program during construction, and benefits to local businesses along the proposed Project alignment. The Project Sponsor would convene stakeholder groups to coordinate on issues related to proposed Project features. Refer also to Topical Response M, Comparable Urban Aerial Transit Systems, for discussion of comparable aerial transit systems in cities around the world and their operations, integration with nearby residential and open space uses, community benefits, promotion of public art and collaborations with local artists, and evidence that such systems can reduce violent crime in nearby areas and promote a sense of security compared to other modes of public transportation.

Comment PH230-2 Chinatown is not dying. Chinatown is being killed by you people. Projects and corporate greed just like this are steamrolling over our homes just like Union Station in Old Chinatown, just like Dodger Stadium with La Loma, Bishop, and Palo Verde. Trickle-down economics didn't work then, why would it work now? Metro and McCourt clearly have no respect for us.

Your own presentations say that the most you should get out of this project is a merely 20 percent by 2040 in two decades. You won't be able to make a graph that shows how more foot traffic and congestion translates over to a better standard of living, housing, food, and health access.

I hope you all sleep terribly tonight. If your conscience isn't haunting you in your nightmares, it will surely haunt your careers because everybody can see this project is a fucking joke. Thank you.

Response PH230-2 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Section 5.0, Corrections and Additions, of this Final EIR for a discussion of Chavez Ravine. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not displace housing or prevent planned housing. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the proposed Project would not preclude development of uses including housing, grocery stores, and/or healthcare facilities in the surrounding communities, and would itself address a need for a permanent transit connection to one of the region's most visited venues, and would benefit the surrounding community by alleviating existing congestion on surrounding neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways, thereby reducing associated air pollution and improving safety. Refer to Response PH230-1 for an overview of the need for the proposed Project and the proposed Project's benefits to communities along the proposed Project's alignment. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for

discussion of how the Draft EIR addresses environmental justice by considering the proposed Project's ability to reduce congestion and emissions from on-road vehicles in an area disproportionately burdened by pollution, and including an analysis of the proposed Project's potential impacts to the surrounding community, concluding that the proposed Project could result in air quality benefits for the surrounding communities.

Comment Letter PH231 - Rick Garcia

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH231

Comment PH231-1 MR. GARCIA: Good evening. Can you hear me?

MS. SISCO: Yes.

MR. GARCIA: Okay, thank you. My name is Rick Garcia. I'm a sheet metal worker by trade and union organization with SMART Local 105 representing the sheet metal trades in Southern California.

All right, I'm here to support the LA ART gondola project and I'm not ashamed to say that. This project has been open for consideration since 2018 when it was first proposed to Metro's Office of Extraordinary Innovations, and since then, a great deal of traffic and pollution have plagued the area around Dodger Stadium.

LA ART and Metro's gondola project offers significant potential benefits by increasing access to public transit and reducing traffic congestion on local roads.

We are pleased with the changes coming to our city transit via the project and happy for the future of the area around Dodger Stadium. Thank you for your time.

Response PH231-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of how the proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan. Refer to Section 3.03, Air Quality, Section 3.08, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 3.17, Transportation, Appendix D, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's ability to reduce vehicular travel, to improve air quality through reduced emissions, and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through reduced vehicular travel. The proposed Project will enter into a Project Labor Agreement and will work in coordination with the LA/OC Building and Construction Trades.

Comment Letter PH232 - Juniper Wong

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH232

Comment PH232-1 MS. WONG: Hello, my name is Juniper Wong and I'm a community organizer in Chinatown with Power LA and Chinatown Community for Equitable Development, and I oppose this project.

Response PH232-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Comment PH232-2 This is supposed to relieve traffic and have zero emissions, but this gondola doesn't take anybody off the road, it just adds. By being a tourism destination, it will just redirect traffic and automobile emissions from Dodger Stadium to Chinatown and the downtown area.

Response PH232-2 Refer to Section 3.03, Air Quality, Section 3.08, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 3.17, Transportation, Appendix D, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's ability to reduce vehicular travel, to improve air quality through reduced emissions, and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through reduced vehicular travel. Traffic congestion is not required to be analyzed under CEQA in the Draft EIR following the implementation of Senate Bill 743, which designated "vehicle miles traveled" as the method for assessing transportation impacts on the environment for CEQA projects. Refer to the *Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit Project Non-CEQA Transportation Assessment*, which found that there could be localized increases in traffic at the intersections closest to the proposed Project's Alameda Station and Chinatown/State Park Station due to some riders choosing to park and ride or take Uber/Lyft and recommended the proposed Project work with Metro to identify a transit partnership for the proposed Project riders to further encourage them to take transit, walk, or bike to the proposed Project's stations.

Comment PH232-3 You also say this will improve connectivity for the city of LA. I fail to see that when the transit being proposed is just a mile and a half long. Fans come from all over the city. There's traffic in all directions.

There's traffic in LA all day, every day, but you choose to run this directly through and over one of the poorest areas of Los Angeles, making Chinatown residents suffer for your tragic idea.

Response PH232-3 Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at LAUS, Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Dodger Stadium draws large regional crowds, with approximately 100 baseball games and other events each year, but there are no permanent transit connections to the venue. The vast majority of visitors drive their personal vehicles to access the venue. These vehicles create congestion on the surface streets leading up to and around Dodger Stadium, including Sunset Boulevard/Cesar E. Chavez from LAUS and throughout the surrounding communities. Given the capacity of the proposed Project's system, approximately 20 percent of the fans could take aerial transit connected to Metro's regional transit system. This would reduce vehicular congestion in and around Dodger Stadium, on neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways during game and special event days. Refer to Section 3.03, Air Quality, Section 3.08, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 3.17, Transportation, Appendix D, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's ability to reduce vehicular travel, to improve air quality through reduced emissions, and to reduce greenhouse gases through reduced vehicular travel. Refer to Topical Response B, Ridership Model; Queueing at Stations and Pre-game and Post-game Transportation, for discussion of the proposed Project's ridership model which is based on extensive data sources and assumptions validated by data.

Comment PH232-4 Every parcel of land this project is slated for is on public land. That land should be used for public good. Chinatown has been deprived of services with no supermarket. You've already heard seniors say that they have to go to San Gabriel Valley to access our cultural goods and foods where there was just a devastating shooting.

Response PH232-4 Refer to Section 2.5, Proposed Project Alignment and Components, with supporting data provided in Appendix Q, Proposed Alignment Plan and Profile, of the Draft EIR for discussion of how the proposed Project maximizes alignment along the public ROW and publicly owned property and minimizes aerial rights over private properties. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the Draft EIR addresses environmental justice, how the proposed Project supports Metro's goal of prioritizing equity opportunities and is designed to extend affordable, regional access and mobility options to the communities adjacent to the proposed Project alignment. Public outreach for the proposed Project was designed with environmental justice principles in mind. The proposed Project would not preclude development of uses including housing, grocery stores, and/or healthcare facilities in the surrounding communities, and would itself address a need for a permanent transit connection to one of the region's most visited venues and would alleviate

existing congestion on surrounding neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways, thereby reducing associated air pollution and improving safety.

Comment PH232-5 The people of Chinatown are dangerously under-resourced. The median income is less than \$20,000, and like the rest of LA, is in an absolutely crisis for fair housing. Do you really think that when the right to live in one's home and stay off of the street, that the neighborhood's main concern is how flamboyantly they can get to a baseball game?

Response PH232-5 Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at LAUS, Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Refer to Response PH232-4 for discussion of how the proposed Project would not preclude development of uses including housing. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the Draft EIR addresses environmental justice by considering the proposed Project's ability to reduce congestion and emissions from on-road vehicles in an area disproportionately burdened by pollution, and including an analysis of the proposed Project's potential impacts to the surrounding community, concluding that the proposed Project could result in air quality benefits for the surrounding communities.

Comment PH232-6 Compare the less than \$20,000 a year median income with the cost of this project. After donating it to Climate Resolve, they disclosed that the budget will be even more than \$300 million. Who will be paying for that? Will it be taxpayer money?

Response PH232-6 This comment is noted and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project.

Comment PH232-7 You're telling us you have access to more than \$300 million to come into Chinatown and build whatever you want and you won't choose housing? You won't choose life-affirming services, direct stimulus to small businesses? You won't choose the people?

Response PH232-7 Refer to Responses PH232-4 through PH232-5 for discussion of how the Draft EIR addresses environmental justice, the Project Sponsor, and discussion as to the proposed Project's funding. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefit to the surrounding community, including but not limited to sustainability features and open space enhancements, the Community Access Plan for fares, access to parks, mobility hubs, signage, utilization of local artists for site specific artwork at each station reflective of the unique neighborhood culture, design of each component of the proposed Project to complement and reflect the unique character of the surrounding neighborhood, the Business and Community Support Program during construction, and benefits to local businesses along the proposed Project alignment. The Project Sponsor would convene stakeholder groups to coordinate on issues related to proposed Project features.

Comment PH232-8 In this draft EIR, you've also addressed alternatives to the gondola. You ruled out buses. There already exists a free shuttle for game days that could be expanded, but your reasoning for not doing that is that in order for buses to fulfill the 5,000 people an hour per direction the gondola would do, you need buses to run every 47 seconds, therefore, that's not an option.

Nobody is asking for buses that run every 47 seconds. We're asking for just some amount of additional buses. You're LA Metro. Why do you suddenly think buses will not work? Stop this project. Thanks.

Response PH232-8 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of how the proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan. Refer to Topical Response H, The Draft EIR Considered an Appropriate Range of Alternatives and Design Options, for discussion of how the Transportation Systems Management Alternative for an enhanced Dodger Stadium Express is unlikely to achieve the same level of ridership as the proposed Project, and otherwise fails to meet most of the Project Objectives which seek to achieve the proposed Project's underlying purpose of providing a permanent direct transit connection between LAUS and the Dodger Stadium property and improving connectivity for surrounding communities, including Chinatown, Mission Junction, Elysian Park, Solano Canyon, and the Los Angeles State Historic Park.

Comment Letter PH233 - Patrick Chen

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH233

Comment PH233-1 MR. CHEN: Hello, can you hear me?

MS. SISCO: Yes.

MR. CHEN: Hello, my name is Patrick Chen. I'm a resident of Chinatown and I am opposed to this project, and I believe that this draft EIR process has been a total sham.

You have been doing the bare minimum to, quote-unquote, engage the community, which has actually been sunny fantasies of revitalization to suffering Chinatown residents and small businesses, when in actuality, this is nothing more than a cash grab for Frank McCourt and, I guess, the consultants who are working on this project.

Response PH233-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's public outreach and opportunity for public testimony during the Draft EIR public review period. Refer to Appendix A, Scoping Report, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of outreach and community engagement during the Draft EIR scoping period. Metro sought to engage the community in each stage of the environmental review process. Metro engaged the public in decision making for the proposed Project beginning with the public scoping period for the Draft EIR in October 2020 to receive public comment on the proposed Project's scope of environmental review under CEQA. In June 2021, the Project Sponsor conducted two virtual public outreach meetings. The input from the public, including local community stakeholders, as well as from agencies, organizations, and interested parties, during this period led directly to changes to the proposed Project to incorporate public feedback. The Draft EIR was released on October 17, 2022, for a 60-day public review period, which Metro extended an additional 30 days for a 90-day public review period ending on January 17, 2023. Eight public meetings were held immediately preceding, during, and immediately after the Draft EIR public review period, with four held in-person in the Project area at Los Angeles Union Station and Cathedral High School, and four held virtually via Zoom webinar. Project materials and information were provided at both the in-person meetings and on Metro's website in English, Spanish, Chinese (Traditional), and Chinese (Simplified). Interpretation was provided in English, Spanish, Mandarin, and Cantonese during the eight public meetings, with interpretation provided in Taishanese during the final two public meetings.

Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities, including but not limited to, sustainability features and open space enhancements,

the Community Access Plan for fares, access to parks, mobility hubs, signage, utilization of local artists for site specific artwork at each station reflective of the unique neighborhood culture, design of each component of the proposed Project to complement and reflect the unique character of the surrounding neighborhood, the Business and Community Support Program during construction, and benefits to local businesses along the proposed Project alignment. The Project Sponsor would convene stakeholder groups to coordinate on issues related to proposed Project features. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the Draft EIR addresses environmental justice by considering the proposed Project's ability to reduce congestion and emissions from on-road vehicles in an area disproportionately burdened by pollution, and including an analysis of the proposed Project's potential impacts to the surrounding community, concluding that the proposed Project could result in air quality benefits for the surrounding communities.

Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project.

Comment PH233-2 Poor and working class tenants, the taxpayers of LA, including the constituents of many of these nonprofits that they claim to represent, will be left with the bill.

Response PH233-2 This comment is noted and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project.

Comment PH233-3 And some Chinatown legacy groups have claimed for over a decade that Chinatown is dying and needs big, flashy tourism to save it, when they could have been spending their political capital to build up community strength that can sustain itself instead of

begging for billionaires like Frank McCourt to leave them some spare change. This project is not good for Chinatown and I oppose it. Thank you. Thank you.

Response PH233-3 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, discussing the proposed Project's potential partnerships with and benefits to local businesses. As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, and Topical Response C, Project Features, the proposed Project creates a first/last mile transit link for residents and businesses within Chinatown while unifying and connecting communities through transit mobility access. This new mode of transportation will expand rider access to the regional transit system by attracting new visitors including Dodgers fans, and represents an opportunity for additional visitors along the proposed Project alignment, creating economic opportunities for local businesses, including shops and restaurants, through potential partnerships that drive customers to Chinatown and other businesses along the proposed Project alignment, which, consequently, adds revenues to these small businesses in the communities the proposed Project hopes to serve. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities, including but not limited to, sustainability features and open space enhancements, the Community Access Plan for fares, access to parks, mobility hubs, signage, utilization of local artists for site specific artwork at each station reflective of the unique neighborhood culture, design of each component of the proposed Project to complement and reflect the unique character of the surrounding neighborhood, the Business and Community Support Program during construction, and benefits to local businesses along the proposed Project alignment. The Project Sponsor would convene stakeholder groups to coordinate on issues related to proposed Project features. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project.

Comment Letter PH234 - Amy Ho

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH234

Comment PH234-1 MS. HO: Hello?

MS. SISCO: Yes?

MS. HO: Yes, can you hear me now?

MS. SISCO: Yes, we can. Go ahead.

Ms. Ho: Yes, hi, my name is Amy Ho.

I'm a resident of Chinatown for 42 years. Okay, the reason that I live here is because I love the freedom of this country they gave me. I'm one of the boat people who left Vietnam, went to a communist camp. I don't like that. That's why. I didn't like that. That's why I came to, you know, America.

And I thought that, you know, if I work hard, I can have the right to enjoy my life here, but I can't believe the rich. They're trying to, you know, take away the right of me to live at peace.

Okay, now those people who support his gondola, please, please think. Your enjoyment is built on the suffering of the resident people living here.

You know what? I worked hard when I was young. I'm 70, okay. I used to work hard, okay. I worked a full job with two part-time jobs just to get my feet on the ground, to start my life here, and I did that. I'm proud of that, but to think some of the rich people now are trying to take away from that for me.

Okay, I will support this program only if Dodger Stadium stops selling food or beverage in Dodger Stadium. You know what? It will not benefit Chinatown at all. Those fans will go to Dodger Stadium.

They go there, they watch the game, and they eat, they drink. So, why, would they go to Chinatown to drink and eat? No, I mean, they want just to, you know, see how it is, but I know exactly.

Response PH234-1 Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at Los Angeles Union Station (LAUS), Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities, including

potential partnerships with and benefits to local businesses in Chinatown. As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, and Topical Response C, Project Features, the proposed Project creates a first/last mile transit link for residents and businesses within Chinatown while unifying and connecting communities through transit mobility access. This new mode of transportation will expand rider access to the regional transit system by attracting new visitors including Dodgers fans, and represents an opportunity for additional visitors along the proposed Project alignment, creating economic opportunities for local businesses, including shops and restaurants, through potential partnerships that drive customers to Chinatown and other businesses along the proposed Project alignment, which, consequently, adds revenues to these small businesses in the communities the proposed Project hopes to serve. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project.

Comment PH234-2 So, this is to the benefit of, you know, Dodger Stadium, not for us, and besides, don't forget that they have only 82 games per year and only a few hours per day. How are they going to, you know (audio interference).

Response PH234-2 Refer to Section 2.1, Overview of the Project, of the Draft EIR, discussing how the proposed Project would operate daily to serve existing residents, workers, park users, and visitors to Los Angeles. As discussed on page 2-42, in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the proposed Project would provide service to all pre-season, regular season, and post-season Los Angeles Dodger games and any special events (e.g., concerts, the Los Angeles Marathon) at the Dodger Stadium property. The proposed Project would also provide service to events at the Los Angeles State Historic Park. In addition to providing service on game and special event days at Dodger Stadium and events at the Los Angeles State Historic Park, it is anticipated that the proposed Project would also provide daily service between 6:00am to 12:00am, for the surrounding communities, including Chinatown, Mission Junction, Elysian Park, Solano Canyon, and the Los Angeles State Historic Park. The proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan.

Comment Letter PH235 - Larry Jung

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH235

Comment PH235-1 MR. JUNG: Good evening. My name is Larry Jung. I've been involved with Chinatown since, and our family has been involved since, for the last 80 years. My great-grandfather was one of the original founders of New Chinatown, and I also represent the Chinese-American Museum in El Pueblo.

I support the project and I believe that the main idea and concept is valid. I believe that it will bring tourism into the El Pueblo and also into Chinatown.

I've ridden several gondolas in Pittsburgh, in Telluride, and Rio, and it is quite a tourist attraction. I believe that it will stimulate businesses, traffic for the small businesses around Chinatown and the Gold Line, so I am in support of the project. Thank you.

Response PH235-1 The comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the potential added benefits from the proposed Project, including potential partnerships with and benefits to local businesses.

Comment Letter PH236 - King Cheung

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH236

Comment PH236-1 MR. CHEUNG: My name is King Cheung and I oppose this gondola project because I believe it's not going to help small business and residents in Chinatown. If the gondola keeps running every day during the hour, it's going to disturb residents' sleep.

Response PH236-1 Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, discussing the proposed Project's potential partnerships with and benefits to local businesses in Chinatown. As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, and Topical Response C, Project Features, the proposed Project creates a first/last mile transit link for residents and businesses within Chinatown while unifying and connecting communities through transit mobility access. This new mode of transportation will expand rider access to the regional transit system by attracting new visitors including Dodgers fans, and represents an opportunity for additional visitors along the proposed Project alignment, creating economic opportunities for local businesses, including shops and restaurants, through potential partnerships that drive customers to Chinatown and other businesses along the proposed Project alignment, which, consequently, adds revenues to these small businesses in the communities the proposed Project hopes to serve. Refer to Section 3.13, Noise, and Appendix M, Noise and Vibration Technical Report, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the operational noise impacts from the proposed Project. Operational noise impacts would be less than significant. Refer to Responses GO17-129 and GO17-130 for discussion of the proposed Project's less than significant impact on human health associated with hearing loss, hearing damage, and sleep disturbance.

Comment PH236-2 And also, we need to be careful because when the gondola is running in the air, people in the gondola may be able to see residents who are taking a shower or using the restroom, so in that case, we don't need the gondola.

Response PH236-2 Refer to Topical Response M, Comparable Systems, discussing how, like the proposed Project, comparable aerial transit systems in cities around the world are integrated with their surrounding urban environments. In particular, comparable aerial transit systems in other locations demonstrate that such systems can operate safely, efficiently, and in concert with nearby residential and open space uses, including parks and other recreational facilities. The proposed Project would be located in a densely-populated, urban environment surrounded by a variety of commercial, industrial, and residential development types. In this type of environment, it is common for public transportation, such as Metro's light rail, to be located adjacent to residential uses and, as discussed in Topical Response M, Comparable Systems, modern aerial transit systems in other cities, including Portland, Oregon and New

York City, operate adjacent to residential uses. Refer to Topical Response J, Gondola Design and Operations and Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of how cabin windows can be equipped with privacy glass that can become opaque while adjacent to sensitive views, and the proposed Project would work with stakeholders adjacent to the proposed Project alignment to identify locations where the use of privacy glass would be warranted. Considerations as to the locations along the proposed Project alignment where the privacy glass could be activated include the subject adjacent sensitive views and the vertical and horizontal distance between the proposed Project cabins and the adjacent sensitive views.

Comment PH236-3 And I also agree with some of the people who call this gondola project as a scam, because if the Dodger Stadium has hotels, restaurants, Dodger fans will just go there and eat, watch the game, and go home. Why would they bother to go up to the slope and go to Chinatown? They won't.

Response PH236-3 Refer to Topical Response G, No Improper Project Segmentation: The Proposed Project Is Intended to Create a Transit Connection from Metro's Union Station Transportation Hub via an Aerial Gondola System to the Dodger Stadium Property for a discussion of how the proposed Project solely proposes an aerial gondola system. The proposed Project does not include other development, and neither the Project Sponsor nor any other applicant has applied for other development unrelated to the existing stadium uses on the Dodger Stadium property. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, discussing the proposed Project's potential partnerships with and benefits to local businesses in Chinatown. As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, and Topical Response C, Project Features, the proposed Project creates a first/last mile transit link for residents and businesses within Chinatown while unifying and connecting communities through transit mobility access. This new mode of transportation will expand rider access to the regional transit system by attracting new visitors including Dodgers fans, and represents an opportunity for additional visitors along the proposed Project alignment, creating economic opportunities for local businesses, including shops and restaurants, through potential partnerships that drive customers to Chinatown and other businesses along the proposed Project alignment, which, consequently, adds revenues to these small businesses in the communities the proposed Project hopes to serve.

Comment PH236-4 And if Dodger fans wants the traffic congestion to be improved, I suggest them to use the bus because there is a shuttle going from Union Station to the Dodger Stadium, but actually currently, not many people are using this bus and there are only two buses.

If they are not using this free shuttle, why would they bother to pay and use the gondola? So, I believe we don't need this gondola.

Response PH236-4 Refer to Topical Response H, The Draft EIR Considered an Appropriate Range of Alternatives and Design Options, for discussion of how the Transportation Systems Management Alternative for an enhanced Dodger Stadium Express is unlikely to achieve the same level of ridership as the proposed Project, and otherwise fails to meet most of the Project Objectives which seek to achieve the proposed Project's underlying purpose of providing a permanent direct transit connection between LAUS and the Dodger Stadium property and improving connectivity for surrounding communities, including Chinatown, Mission Junction, Elysian Park, Solano Canyon, and the Los Angeles State Historic Park. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of how the proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan.

Comment Letter PH237 - Dana Martinez

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH237

Comment PH237-1 MS. MARTINEZ: Hi, can you hear me?

MS. SISCO: Yes.

MS. MARTINEZ: Hi, good evening, everyone. My name is Dana Martinez (phonetic). And I wanted to say that when we talk about multimodal transit, we probably just think of a few clicks outside a bus, or a train, or a streetcar, maybe even a bicycle, but honestly, a gondola starts to get us in the air.

And, well, when I think of the future or other people think of the future, we might call it sci-fi, but the reality is that we need clean air, zero emission projects to be the first to break the in-city sky barrier.

And when other ideas become realizable, this measure will benefit the community, the traffic, the environment, while also taking into consideration specific populations and their transportation needs.

So, I wanted to say that I'm extremely encouraged by this and ready for the next step for the future of the Los Angeles transportation journey. Thank you.

Response PH237-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter PH238 - Charly Ligety

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH238

Comment PH238-1 MR. LIGETY: All right, great, thank you for hosting this dialogue. I am Charly Ligety. I am a resident of Echo Park, pretty adjacent to the stadium, and I own a home nearby, raising a family.

And, you know, I'm kind of thinking of this from the perspective of respecting all of the people that have come before me in this neighborhood and me only being here for, you know, a few years, but also thinking kind of long term of just where I want LA to grow and be more visionary about how to bring people together and move around this community or move in and out of this community.

I think the gondola is a great first step in that kind of vision. I support it because it reduces traffic. You know, with baseball, there's too many games, 80-plus games a year, and the most unfortunate thing is all of the cars.

Response PH238-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at LAUS, Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Dodger Stadium draws large regional crowds, with approximately 100 baseball games and other events each year, but there are no permanent transit connections to the venue. The vast majority of visitors drive their personal vehicles to access the venue. These vehicles create congestion on the surface streets leading up to and around Dodger Stadium, including Sunset Boulevard/Cesar E. Chavez from LAUS and throughout the surrounding communities. Given the capacity of the proposed Project's system, approximately 20 percent of the fans could take aerial transit connected to Metro's regional transit system. This would reduce vehicular congestion in and around Dodger Stadium, on neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways during game and special event days. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan.

Comment PH238-2 Beyond games, you know, I think the access the gondola will provide for park access to Elysian to millions of people just based on streamlining access between Union

Station and the park will be a huge kind of component that we're not even thinking about as a benefit beyond just Dodger access.

And, you know, it really elevates our medium of coming together and bringing a new class of people into the public transit world, especially here in Los Angeles. Gondolas are sexy. Buses are not.

Response PH238-2 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Response PH238-1 for discussion of how the proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region. In addition to providing service on game and special event days at Dodger Stadium and events at the Los Angeles State Historic Park, it is anticipated that the proposed Project would also provide daily service between 6:00am to 12:00am, for the surrounding communities, including Chinatown, Mission Junction, Elysian Park, Solano Canyon, and the Los Angeles State Historic Park. As discussed in Section 5.0, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR, the proposed Project would provide a mobility hub at the Dodger Stadium property to provide connectivity to Elysian Park, the City's second largest park, comprising 575 acres, and the surrounding communities. Outside of game day periods, passengers would be able to access a suite of first/last mile multi-modal options, such as a bike share program, and individual bike lockers to access Elysian Park and other nearby neighborhoods, including Solano Canyon. Refer to Topical Response M, Comparable Urban Aerial Transit Systems, for discussion of comparable aerial transit systems in cities around the world that operate safely, efficiently, and in concert with nearby residential and open space uses.

Comment PH238-3 You know, I come from ski town where many gondolas are located. They're quiet, they're comfortable, they're exciting. They cost \$10 million to \$15 million a mile, so they're not expensive. Hopefully, we'll probably inflate that a lot with all of the costs being in Los Angeles.

Response PH238-3 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project.

Comment PH238-4 But the couple of suggestions, I think there should be an affordable housing requirement with this either around the station or somewhere nearby to create sort of a gondola-oriented development incentive.

Response PH238-4 Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing, and Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for

discussion of how the proposed Project will not displace housing, prevent planned housing, or preclude development of uses including housing, grocery stores, and/or healthcare facilities in the surrounding communities. Refer to Topical Response G, No Improper Project Segmentation: The Proposed Project Is Intended to Create a Transit Connection from Metro's Union Station Transportation Hub via an Aerial Gondola System to the Dodger Stadium Property for a discussion of how the proposed Project solely proposes an aerial gondola system.

Comment PH238-5 And then better renderings, at least a satellite imagery, a shape file, and a Google Earth file would be great just to like sort of show this better of how it works, and then also pairing the gondola with street closures along Scott and other places so there's sort of a carrot and stick approach to getting people out of their cars and into the gondola so it actually guarantees reduced traffic. Thank you.

Response PH238-5 Refer to Section 3.01, Aesthetics, and Appendix C, Visual Impact Assessment, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the aesthetic impacts of the proposed Project, which would be less than significant. Key Observation Points (KOPs) critical or representative of the visual character of the area were identified within each Landscape Unit (LU) and utilized for before and after photorealistic and true to scale visual simulations and locations of sensitive viewers that potentially would be visually impacted by the proposed Project. Refer to Appendix C, Visual Impact Assessment, of the Draft EIR and Appendix H.2, Supplemental KOPs in Response to Comments, for additional visual simulations of the proposed Project. By providing efficient, high-capacity, and faster alternative access to Dodger Stadium for games and special events, however, overall vehicular congestion in and around Dodger Stadium, on neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways during game and special event days would be reduced by the proposed Project because of game/special event attendees shifting to riding public transit rather than driving to Dodger Stadium.

Comment Letter PH239 - Joe Rincon

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH239

Comment PH239-1 MR. RINCON: Hello and good evening, everyone. My name is Joe Rincon (phonetic). I want to talk a little bit about Chinatown.

Chinatown has a population of over 30,000 people, and considering the actual size, that's pretty dense, and whether people walk, take bikes, carpool, Uber, take trains, buses, subways, or cars, that's 37,000 people moving around at or below ground level, so it should be no problem for us to imagine transportation that gets everybody off the ground.

Response PH239-1 This comment is noted and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Comment PH239-2 And realistically, it's not just Chinatown. This project will impact the traffic and daily commute of Angelenos from the areas near Dodger Stadium, Mission Junction, Elysian Park, Solano Canyon, and the LA State Historic Park, not to mention traffic in and around Union Station itself.

We are sick and tired of super congested cities, and the people of not only Chinatown, but all over LA believe in the future of aboveground transit. LA, it's time to set our minds on things above. Thank you very much.

Response PH239-2 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at LAUS, Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Given the capacity of the proposed Project's system, approximately 20 percent of Dodgers fans could take aerial transit connected to Metro's regional transit system. This would reduce vehicular congestion in and around Dodger Stadium, on neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways during game and special event days.

Comment Letter PH240 - Melanie Bellomo

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH240

Comment PH240-1 MS. BELLOMO: Hi, thank you. My name is Melanie Bellomo. I am a resident of Lincoln Heights. I am here to say that we stand with the residents of Chinatown voicing strong opposition to this project. I echo the sentiments shared so bravely tonight.

Response PH240-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Comment PH240-2 I also want to point out that this furthers the harm on the descendants of La Loma, Palo Verde, and Bishop, otherwise known as Chavez Ravine. To further commercialize this area where there has been no moves toward reparations for these people who were forcibly removed from their homes and had their communities destroyed is wrong.

Response PH240-2 Refer to Section 5.0, Corrections and Additions, of this Final EIR for a discussion of Chavez Ravine.

Comment PH240-3 I also ask for a public apology for the false narrative being pushed regarding the initial meeting for so-called public comment. It was nothing of the sort, and the disruptions you referred to were people of this community taking their power back and making the public comment time they were promised.

This meeting is inequitable considering the advanced age and lack of access for comments from the majority of Chinatown residents.

Response PH240-3 Refer to Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's opportunities for public testimony during the Draft EIR public review period. During the public review period, comments on the Draft EIR could be submitted in writing via email or mail, by phone, and during each of the four public hearings. Comments on the Draft EIR could be submitted by email to LAART@metro.net, by mail to One Gateway Plaza, Mail Stop 99-22-6, Los Angeles, CA 90012, or over the phone by calling (213) 922-6913. Comments could also be submitted at each of the four public hearings. At virtual public hearings, comments could be given verbally. In light of the disruptions at the January 12, 2023, public hearing, Metro provided a fourth public hearing by way of a virtual public hearing held on February 8, 2023. Verbal comments made at the virtual February 8, 2023 public hearing were deemed timely submitted for the purposes of the Draft EIR public review period. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how public outreach for the proposed Project was designed with environmental

justice principles in mind and the proposed Project provided translated materials in four different languages, and interpretation services in five different languages, to reflect the surrounding community, and provided opportunities for in-person and virtual meetings with toll-free dial in options and ADA accessibility.

Comment PH240-4 Lastly, I want to point out that the man at the helm of this disaster, Frank McCourt, as we all know, everything he touches turns to shit while he makes a fortune. This project will be no exception.

Response PH240-4 This comment is noted and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project.

Comment Letter PH241 - Alejandro Campillo

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH241

Comment PH241-1 MR. CAMPILLO: Hello, my name is Alejandro Campillo and I'm talking in opposition of the gondola.

I'm going to be reiterating some points, but they're important, one of which is that this is not going to reduce the amount of pollution because there's still going to be people driving to Dodger Stadium, to Chinatown, and I think that this project is just a way to keep money in the hands of the rich and keep money outside of the hands of Chinatown residents.

Response PH241-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Section 3.03, Air Quality, Section 3.08, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 3.17, Transportation, Appendix D, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's ability to reduce vehicular travel, to improve air quality through reduced emissions, and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through reduced vehicular travel. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, discussing the proposed Project's potential partnerships with and benefits to local businesses. As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, and Topical Response C, Project Features, the proposed Project creates a first/last mile transit link for residents and businesses within Chinatown while unifying and connecting communities through transit mobility access. This new mode of transportation will expand rider access to the regional transit system by attracting new visitors including Dodgers fans, and represents an opportunity for additional visitors along the proposed Project alignment, creating economic opportunities for local businesses, including shops and restaurants, through potential partnerships that drive customers to Chinatown and other businesses along the proposed Project alignment, which, consequently, adds revenues to these small businesses in the communities the proposed Project hopes to serve.

Comment PH241-2 I also think that this is a waste of taxpayer dollars. If we're going to be using public land, it should be used for public good, right? And Chinatown needs so many other amenities such as a grocery store, a hospital, perhaps even better parking.

There's a long list and a gondola is definitely not something that is at the top of that list. In fact, it shouldn't even be on the list, so I stand against the gondola.

Response PH241-2 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities, including but not limited to sustainability features and open space enhancements, the Community Access Plan for fares, access to parks, mobility hubs, signage, utilization of local artists for site specific artwork at each station reflective of the unique neighborhood culture, design of each component of the proposed Project to complement and reflect the unique character of the surrounding neighborhood, the Business and Community Support Program during construction, and benefits to local businesses along the proposed Project alignment. The Project Sponsor would convene stakeholder groups to coordinate on issues related to proposed Project features. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the proposed Project would not preclude development of uses including housing, grocery stores, and/or healthcare facilities in the surrounding communities, and would itself address a need for a permanent transit connection to one of the region's most visited venues, and would benefit the surrounding community by alleviating existing congestion on surrounding neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways, thereby reducing associated air pollution and improving safety.

Comment PH241-3 And I just wanted to say about the previous meeting with public comment, the public comment was being held not as public comment, but there was literally -- it was in the corner of the gymnasium. There was a curtain. It was the antithesis of public comment.

So, I just wanted to say that I'm very disappointed in you guys for not allowing that, and I'm happy you had one today, but there should be more in the future so that people can actually voice their comments. I yield the rest of my time. Thank you.

Response PH241-3 Refer to Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's opportunities for public testimony during the Draft EIR public review period. During the public review period, comments on the Draft EIR could be submitted in writing via email or mail, by phone, and during the four public hearings. Comments on the Draft EIR could be submitted by email to LAART@metro.net, by mail to One Gateway Plaza, Mail Stop 99-22-6, Los Angeles, CA 90012, or over the phone by calling (213) 922-6913. Comments could also be submitted at each public hearing. At virtual public hearings, comments could be given verbally. At the two public hearings held in person, comments could be submitted either in writing on

forms provided by Metro, or verbally to the court reporters who were set up at a “comment station” in the venue. Written comment forms provided instructions on how to comment on the Draft EIR in English, Spanish, and Chinese (Simplified). Interpretation was provided in English, Spanish, Mandarin, and Cantonese during all four public hearings, with interpretation provided in Taishanese during the final two public hearings. Under CEQA, the purpose of a Final EIR is to respond to comments received on the Draft EIR during the public review period and incorporate changes to a proposed project in response to such comments. (CEQA Guidelines, § 15088). Consistent with CEQA, comments received on the Draft EIR were responded to in the Final EIR.

Comment Letter PH242 - Julie Rico

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH242

Comment PH242-1 MS. RICO: Hello, can you hear me?

MS. SISCO: Yes.

MS. RICO: Hi, my name is Julie Rico. I'm a real art person and an active resident in Chinatown. I'm vehemently opposed to the gondola project. The people that have spoken today in favor of this project do not live in Chinatown. I live here.

Response PH242-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Comment PH242-2 I know that the 3,000 cars that will be displaced from McCourt's parking lots will be sent down here to Chinatown where they'll be roaming around looking for parking spaces, trouncing around on our neighborhoods, spreading disease to our senior community, launching garbage all over the place, trouncing on our neighbors, disturbing the historic state park and the animals and the birds that are trying to live there.

Response PH242-2 Traffic congestion is not required to be analyzed under CEQA in the Draft EIR following the implementation of Senate Bill 743, which designated “vehicle miles traveled” as the method for assessing transportation impacts on the environment for CEQA projects. Refer to the *Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit Project Non-CEQA Transportation Assessment*, which found that there could be localized increases in traffic at the intersections closest to the proposed Project’s Alameda Station and Chinatown/State Park Station due to some riders choosing to park and ride or take Uber/Lyft and recommended the proposed Project work with Metro to identify a transit partnership for the proposed Project riders to further encourage them to take transit, walk, or bike to the proposed Project’s stations. Parking is not required to be analyzed under CEQA or the Transportation Assessment Guidelines (“TAG”). Nevertheless, the Parking Study was prepared to provide additional information to the community and decision makers about existing parking conditions and the proposed Project’s potential to effect parking conditions around the Alameda Station and Chinatown/State Park Station. The Parking Study determined that even with the addition of proposed Project vehicles parking in the area studied, publicly available parking on a game day would still be substantial, with an estimated 43 percent parking occupancy across the two half-mile station walksheds, and over 3,900 off-street parking spaces available to the community. The proposed Project would include a parking management plan prepared in collaboration with the City, who

would implement any on-street parking management strategies, and with robust feedback from community stakeholders to inform development of the plan. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the Draft EIR addresses environmental justice by considering the proposed Project's ability to reduce congestion and emissions from on-road vehicles in an area disproportionately burdened by pollution, and including an analysis of the proposed Project's potential impacts to the surrounding community, concluding that the proposed Project could result in air quality benefits for the surrounding communities.

Comment PH242-3 Yes, there are people excited about this project. They are talking with dollars in their eyes. We, in the community, are looking for elements to shore up our community with low-income housing, creative services, health and human services, a grocery store, and other benefits that will definitely benefit us.

I know a lot about business. This is what's going to happen. McCourt will build them all at the top of the hill, and the lots where he's displaced the 3,000 cars that will come down into Chinatown, and people will spend their disposable income not in Chinatown, but in McCourt's parking lot.

Chinatown will be devastated both socially and financially. It is a crying shame that anybody believes the lies coming from LA ART or anybody that wants to support this project. Thank you.

Response PH242-3 Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the potential added benefits from the proposed Project, including potential partnerships with and benefits to local businesses in Chinatown. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, Appendix A, Scoping Report, of the Draft EIR, and Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project team's outreach efforts to neighborhoods along the proposed Project alignment and the proposed project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the proposed Project would not preclude development of uses including housing, grocery stores, and/or healthcare facilities in the surrounding communities, and would itself address a need for a permanent transit connection to one of the region's most visited venues, and would benefit the surrounding community by alleviating existing congestion on surrounding neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways, thereby reducing associated air pollution and improving safety. Further, as discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, this new mode of transportation will expand rider access to the regional transit system by attracting new visitors including Dodgers fans, and represents an opportunity for additional visitors along the proposed Project alignment, creating economic opportunities for local businesses, including shops and restaurants, through potential partnerships that drive customers

to Chinatown and other businesses along the proposed Project alignment, which, consequently, adds revenues to these small businesses in the communities the proposed Project hopes to serve. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response G, No Improper Project Segmentation: The Proposed Project Is Intended to Create a Transit Connection from Metro's Union Station Transportation Hub via an Aerial Gondola System to the Dodger Stadium Property for a discussion of how the proposed Project solely proposes an aerial gondola system. The proposed Project does not include other development, and neither the Project Sponsor nor any other applicant has applied for other development unrelated to the existing stadium uses on the Dodger Stadium property.

Comment Letter PH243 - Iran Carranza

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH243

Comment PH243-1 MS. CARRANZA: There I am. Can you hear me?

MS. SISCO: Yes.

MS. CARRANZA: Okay, so for context, I grew up in Lincoln Heights in the '80s and '90s when LA State Historic Park was an ugly, empty field, and so I was so happy when I was able to buy my home in Boyle Heights in 2020 and I saw that now it's this beautiful public space.

And I absolutely love LA. I'm an Angeleno through and through. And I thought how wonderful that people have this with their families to enjoy, to exercise, to go to concerts, and it's right in our very own backyard.

I feel like we don't have enough beautiful green space like this and I would hate to see it ruined by an eyesore like this proposed gondola, so I am against the project. I feel like can we just have something nice and not allow private interests to ruin it for us?

Response PH243-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of how the proposed Project would provide open space enhancements, including at the Alameda Triangle, the Los Angeles State Historic Park, and along the pedestrian pathway connecting Dodger Stadium Station and Dodger Stadium. Refer to Section 2.0, Project Description, Section 3.16, Parks and Recreational Facilities, and Section 5.0, Other CEQA Considerations, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the footprint of the proposed Project in the Los Angeles State Historic Park. With the small footprint of the proposed Project's Chinatown/State Park Station, and the required clearances and the height at which the cabins would cross over the Park, the ability to use the vast majority of the Park would not be affected by the proposed Project. Refer to Response S2-4 for additional discussion regarding the ability of uses to continue at the Park. Refer to Section 3.01, Aesthetics, and Appendix C, Visual Impact Assessment, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of how the proposed project would have a less than significant impact to aesthetic and visual resources, including at the Park.

Comment PH243-2 I want to address some of the points that other commenters made. Gondolas as cutting edge, so aerial gondolas first appeared in the 1900s. There's nothing cutting edge about gondolas. It's not new technology. It's nothing, you know, cutting edge about it.

Gondolas as tourist attractions, LA has awe-inspiring tourist attractions already. Like, a gondola does not hold a candle to what we already have. Gondolas are for Disney World in Florida. It's tacky.

I can see why a place like Spokane might need gimmicks like gondolas to give people something to do, but LA has a lot more to offer. We have culture. We have history. We have a lot of attractions.

Response PH243-2 Although forms of aerial transit technology have been available and utilized for the last 100 years, modern applications have seen the evolution of the technology as a feasible mode of urban rapid transit. As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the proposed Project would have a maximum capacity of approximately 5,000 people per hour per direction, and the travel time from Los Angeles Union Station (LAUS) to Dodger Stadium would be approximately seven minutes. As in the Technology Penetration Analysis, included in Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, of the Draft EIR, a large capacity for a new mode of transportation in Los Angeles will allow passengers to see the potential for other emerging innovations to be integrated into the public transit system. The proposed Project would thus exemplify how alternative transportation technology can be integrated into a city's transportation infrastructure and will show that new technology can successfully operate in concert with other existing modes of transportation. Refer to Topical Response M, Comparable Urban Aerial Transit Systems, for discussion of comparable aerial transit systems in cities around the world and their operations, integration with nearby residential and open space uses, community benefits, promotion of public art and collaborations with local artists, and evidence that such systems can reduce violent crime in nearby areas and promote a sense of security compared to other modes of public transportation.

Comment PH243-3 The idea of the gondola as a public transportation solution and traffic congestion relief on game days, surprise, I'm a Dodger fan. I had season tickets last year and I took the Dodger bus. We're not all bad. So, I can tell you the people who are in cars now are going to stay in cars. A gondola is not going to change that.

The people who figured out how to get to Union Station and are already taking the Dodger shuttle are going to continue --

Response PH243-3 Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at LAUS, Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Dodger Stadium draws large regional crowds, with approximately 100 baseball games and other events each year, but there are no permanent transit connections to the venue. The vast majority of visitors drive their personal vehicles to access the venue. These vehicles create congestion on

the surface streets leading up to and around Dodger Stadium, including Sunset Boulevard/Cesar E. Chavez from LAUS and throughout the surrounding communities. Given the capacity of the proposed Project's system, approximately 20 percent of the fans could take aerial transit connected to Metro's regional transit system. This would reduce vehicular congestion in and around Dodger Stadium, on neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways during game and special event days. Refer to Topical Response B, Ridership Model; Queueing at Stations and Pre-game and Post-game Transportation, for discussion of the proposed Project's ridership model which is based on extensive data sources and assumptions validated by data, and the management of queuing at stations, and pre-game and post-game transportation. As detailed in Appendix N, Ridership Model Development Memorandum, of the Draft EIR, the model is based on the statistical relationship between cost and travel time, using data from a variety of sources including mode choice surveys for Angelenos traveling to sporting events in Downtown Los Angeles, travel time and cost to Dodger Stadium and LAUS for driving and transit, parking costs, value of time, mode of access intercept surveys of Dodger Stadium Express riders, and many other data. Many of the underlying factors that would influence pre-game/event and post-game/event travel conditions and ridership are built into the ridership model developed for the proposed Project based on extensive data sources and assumptions validated by data.

Comment Letter PH244 - Albert Holm

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH244

Comment PH244-1 MR. HOLM: Hi, this is Albert Holm, a born and raised Angeleno. I strongly oppose this project.

At its core, it is a personal pet project proposed by a white billionaire, Frank McCourt, who has a history of being scumbag, and it is a project that will negatively impact and has absolutely no benefits for the low-income, working class communities in and around Chinatown.

Response PH244-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at Los Angeles Union Station (LAUS), Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, discussing the proposed Project's potential partnerships with and benefits to local businesses in Chinatown. As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, and Topical Response C, Project Features, the proposed Project creates a first/last mile transit link for residents and businesses within Chinatown while unifying and connecting communities through transit mobility access. This new mode of transportation will expand rider access to the regional transit system by attracting new visitors including Dodgers fans, and represents an opportunity for additional visitors along the proposed Project alignment, creating economic opportunities for local businesses, including shops and restaurants, through potential partnerships that drive customers to Chinatown and other businesses along the proposed Project alignment, which, consequently, adds revenues to these small businesses in the communities the proposed Project hopes to serve.

Comment PH244-2 The very well-respected and objective UCLA Mobility Research Team recently published a report that concluded that a gondola would have virtually no impact on traffic on Dodger game days.

So, in return for destroying the lives and dignity of working class communities in and around Chinatown, in return for taking away green space from the LA Historic State

Park that's currently used and enjoyed by many every day, in return for building an ugly project that will ruin everyone's view of the skyline when they look up, you get a gondola that will have virtually no impact on traffic or carbon emissions.

Response PH244-2 Refer to Topical Response O, Response to UCLA Mobility Lab Study, for detailed responses to the items in the Mobility Lab Study. The Mobility Lab Study was not submitted by its authors at the Mobility Lab as a comment on the proposed Project's Draft EIR, and does not appear to have been prepared for that purpose. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of how the proposed Project would provide open space enhancements, including at the Alameda Triangle, the Los Angeles State Historic Park, and along the pedestrian pathway connecting Dodger Stadium Station and Dodger Stadium. Refer to Section 2.0, Project Description, Section 3.16, Parks and Recreational Facilities, and Section 5.0, Other CEQA Considerations, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the footprint of the proposed Project in the Los Angeles State Historic Park. With the small footprint of the proposed Project's Chinatown/State Park Station, and the required clearances and the height at which the cabins would cross over the Park, the ability to use the vast majority of the Park would not be affected by the proposed Project. Refer to Response S2-4 for additional discussion regarding the ability of uses to continue at the Park. Refer to Section 3.01, Aesthetics, and Appendix C, Visual Impact Assessment, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of how the proposed project would not have a significant impact to aesthetic and visual resources, including at the Park. Refer to Section 3.03, Air Quality, Section 3.08, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 3.17, Transportation, Appendix D, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's ability to reduce vehicular travel, to improve air quality through reduced emissions, and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through reduced vehicular travel.

Comment PH244-3 And you get to enrich the scumbag, Frank McCourt's, pocket, because we all know the point of the gondola is to spur development of retail and entertainment complexes on the Dodger Stadium parking lots that are owned by Frank McCourt.

If that happens, then Dodger Stadium will become a year-round destination which will just increase the amount of traffic and carbon emissions overall throughout the year, so instead of traffic for 82 days a year when the Dodgers are playing, you get traffic every day of the year, which will increase carbon emissions and increase pollution.

Anybody who believes otherwise is either being very disingenuous, very dishonest, very ignorant, or they don't live here, because they don't care what happens to other people.

Response PH244-3 Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit,

a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response G, No Improper Project Segmentation: The Proposed Project Is Intended to Create a Transit Connection from Metro's Union Station Transportation Hub via an Aerial Gondola System to the Dodger Stadium Property for a discussion of how the proposed Project solely proposes an aerial gondola system. The proposed Project does not include other development, and neither the Project Sponsor nor any other applicant has applied for other development unrelated to the existing stadium uses on the Dodger Stadium property.

Comment Letter PH245 - Liliana Cortez

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH245

Comment PH245-1 MS. CORTEZ: Yes, hi. Thank you for calling. The irony of when you called on me earlier is that I was on the bus and couldn't answer due to how crowded and noisy the bus was because it was running late.

I find it really funny to hear many of you talk about how this gondola project will bring public transportation to Chinatown and reduce traffic in the area, but really, how many of you are really willing to get out of your cars and ride public transportation and deal with the late schedules, overcrowding, rude bus drivers, and dirty buses and trains due to lack of cleaning and sanitation on a daily basis?

I ask because I'm also a cyclist and many of my friends and I ride our bicycles not just for fun like many of you might think, but as actual daily commuters who use these roads and streets to get from point A to point B, from home to work, to school, to running errands, always under the risk and threat of whether we'll make it home alive.

How many of you are willing to get out of your cars and deal with traffic noise, toxic exhaust fumes from vehicles, and traffic violence, or have you missed the news of continuous assaults that have led to hospitalization and death for us cyclists?

Of course, you're not. You're sitting here being hypocrites about the benefits of this project for public transportation and traffic. I call balderdash.

Response PH245-1 Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, and Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion how the proposed Project would address a need for a permanent transit connection to one of the region's most visited venues and would alleviate existing congestion on surrounding neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways, thereby reducing associated air pollution and improving safety. The proposed Project's ability to reduce vehicular travel, to improve air quality through reduced emissions, and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through reduced vehicular travel are discussed in Section 3.03, Air Quality, Section 3.08, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 3.17, Transportation, Appendix D, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR. Refer to Topical Response M, Comparable Urban Aerial Transit Systems, for discussion of comparable aerial transit systems in cities around the world and their operations, integration with nearby residential and open space uses, community benefits, promotion of public art and collaborations with local artists, and evidence that such systems can reduce violent crime in nearby areas and promote a sense of security compared to other modes of public transportation.

Comment PH245-2 The quiet streets that my friends and I used to ride our bicycles to enjoy the beautiful views of the Elysian Valley, Angel's Point, and the LA Historic State Park would be filled with entitled tourists and drivers who already use violence to push us off the streets with the racism and death machines.

Response PH245-2 Traffic congestion is not required to be analyzed under CEQA in the Draft EIR following the implementation of Senate Bill 743, which designated “vehicle miles traveled” as the method for assessing transportation impacts on the environment for CEQA projects. Refer to the Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit Project Non-CEQA Transportation Assessment, which found that there could be localized increases in traffic at the intersections closest to the proposed Project’s Alameda Station and Chinatown/State Park Station due to some riders choosing to park and ride or take Uber/Lyft and recommended the proposed Project work with Metro to identify a transit partnership for the proposed Project riders to further encourage them to take transit, walk, or bike to the proposed Project’s stations.

Comment PH245-3 But obviously, some of you here feel we are not entitled to this as residents and patrons of these green spaces, and this is why we are against this project. Metro can start by improving the existing transportation system because this gondola project is not even part of the solution.

Response PH245-3 Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project.

Comment PH245-4 The gondola in Mexico City was built for the white American colonizers invading the city because of how cheap it is, while outpricing locals with exorbitant rents. For the caller who was gushing over this, this is called gentrification and this is exactly what this project will bring to Chinatown and the surrounding communities.

Response PH245-4 Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not exacerbate gentrification or result in displacement of residents in the surrounding neighborhoods and is consistent with Metro’s considerations regarding gentrification and displacement. Refer to Topical Response M, Comparable Urban Aerial Transit Systems, for discussion of comparable aerial transit systems in cities around the world and their operations, integration with nearby residential and open space uses, community benefits, promotion of public art and collaborations with local artists, and evidence that such systems can reduce violent crime in nearby areas and promote a sense of security compared to other modes of public transportation.

Comment PH245-5 Chinatown is not dying. It's lacking real community investments and this gondola project is not one of them.

Long-term residents of Chinatown are mostly monolingual elders, seniors, and families with young children. They are immigrant, low-income, and facing continuous harassment and threats of eviction.

Response PH245-5 Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, discussing the proposed Project's potential partnerships with and benefits to local businesses. As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, and Topical Response C, Project Features, the proposed Project creates a first/last mile transit link for residents and businesses within Chinatown while unifying and connecting communities through transit mobility access. This new mode of transportation will expand rider access to the regional transit system by attracting new visitors including Dodgers fans, and represents an opportunity for additional visitors along the proposed Project alignment, creating economic opportunities for local businesses, including shops and restaurants, through potential partnerships that drive customers to Chinatown and other businesses along the proposed Project alignment, which, consequently, adds revenues to these small businesses in the communities the proposed Project hopes to serve. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the Draft EIR addresses environmental justice by considering the proposed Project's ability to reduce congestion and emissions from on-road vehicles in an area disproportionately burdened by pollution, and including an analysis of the proposed Project's potential impacts to the surrounding community, concluding that the proposed Project could result in air quality benefits for the surrounding communities.

Comment Letter PH246 - Jennifer Wong

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH246

Comment PH246-1 MS. WONG: Hi, my name is Jennifer Wong. I am a resident of Chinatown and I oppose this project.

I actually find it to be kind of racially traumatic that this is going on, that you are ignoring marginalized communities, the Asian-American community, thinking that we would just kind of take this without comment and sitting down, so I really hope you take that into consideration the next time that you propose ridiculous projects.

Response PH246-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how public outreach for the proposed Project was designed with environmental justice principles in mind and the proposed Project provided translated materials in four different languages, and interpretation services in five different languages, to reflect the surrounding community, and provided opportunities for in-person and virtual meetings with toll-free dial in options and ADA accessibility features.

Comment PH246-2 I don't feel like this will help with our traffic issues. I liked that idea where you need to have shuttles, not just going from Union Station, but other parts of the city. That makes sense to me.

Response PH246-2 Traffic congestion is not required to be analyzed under CEQA in the Draft EIR following the implementation of Senate Bill 743, which designated “vehicle miles traveled” as the method for assessing transportation impacts on the environment for CEQA projects. Refer to the *Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit Project Non-CEQA Transportation Assessment*, which found that there could be localized increases in traffic at the intersections closest to the proposed Project’s Alameda Station and Chinatown/State Park Station due to some riders choosing to park and ride or take Uber/Lyft and recommended the proposed Project work with Metro to identify a transit partnership for the proposed Project riders to further encourage them to take transit, walk, or bike to the proposed Project’s stations. Refer to Topical Response B, Ridership Model; Queueing at Stations and Pre-game and Post-game Transportation, for discussion of the proposed Project’s ridership model which is based on extensive data sources and assumptions validated by data. Refer to Topical Response H, The Draft EIR Considered an Appropriate Range of Alternatives and Design Options, for discussion of how the Transportation Systems Management Alternative for an enhanced Dodger Stadium Express is unlikely to achieve the same level of ridership as the proposed Project, and otherwise fails to meet most of the Project Objectives which seek to achieve the proposed Project’s underlying purpose of providing a

permanent direct transit connection between LAUS and the Dodger Stadium property and improving connectivity for surrounding communities, including Chinatown, Mission Junction, Elysian Park, Solano Canyon, and the Los Angeles State Historic Park. As discussed in Topical Response H, a system of buses from numerous remote locations throughout the Los Angeles region to and from Dodger Stadium events would require a substantial increase in the number of buses which, similar to expanding the fleet for an expanded Dodger Stadium Express service, would result in a fleet of buses that would either be underutilized most of the time or regular Metro bus service that utilizes these vehicles would be disrupted every time a Dodger game or event at the stadium is held. Such a service would also incur substantial costs in paid time and mileage for driving empty buses out to the remote locations before a game and back from the remote locations after a game and paid idle time during the game. Buses from a variety of remote locations would also need to travel in rush hour congestion to get to Dodger Stadium. With limited regional facilities that provide bus only lanes that these services could utilize, they would not materially improve transit travel time compared with driving. For example, the current Dodger Stadium Express service from South Bay serves a broad area of southern Los Angeles County at stations spread across eight miles, is free, and travels on a priority lane within the I-110 freeway median for most of its trip, but the South Bay Dodger Stadium Express carried an average of only 415 passengers per game in 2019, which is substantially lower than the ridership of 1,895 riders per game on the LAUS Dodger Stadium Express. Refer to Topical Response H, The Draft EIR Considered an Appropriate Range of Alternatives and Design Options, for discussion of how improving the connection between LAUS and Dodger Stadium via the proposed Project would provide the quickest, most frequent, and highest capacity transit connection for the greatest number of riders traveling to Dodger Stadium to have the most travel time competitive transit trips from more locations in the region.

Comment PH246-3 In terms of it bringing business into our community, I don't believe that's true. It would just bring businesses that are expensive and would not be affordable to the residents here.

What we need are things like a laundromat, a grocery store, and I don't believe tourists or people who would ride the gondola are going to be using any of those types of things, so it doesn't make any sense at all.

Response PH246-3 Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, discussing the proposed Project's potential partnerships with and benefits to local businesses in Chinatown. As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, and Topical Response C, Project Features, the proposed Project creates a first/last mile transit link for residents and businesses along the proposed Project alignment while unifying and connecting communities through transit mobility access. This new mode of transportation will expand rider access to the regional transit system by attracting new visitors including Dodgers fans, and represents an opportunity for additional

visitors along the proposed Project alignment, creating economic opportunities for local businesses, including shops and restaurants, through potential partnerships that drive customers to businesses along the alignment, which, consequently, adds revenues to these small businesses in the communities the proposed Project hopes to serve. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the proposed Project would not preclude development of uses including housing, grocery stores, and/or healthcare facilities in the surrounding communities, and would itself address a need for a permanent transit connection to one of the region's most visited venues and would benefit the surrounding community by alleviating existing congestion on surrounding neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways, thereby reducing associated air pollution and improving safety.

Comment PH246-4 I also really enjoy the state historic park and I don't want to see a gondola as I'm trying to experience nature, take walks, and enjoy my community. So, I really do hope you just do not go along with this project. Thank you.

Response PH246-4 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Section 3.01, Aesthetics, and Appendix C, Visual Impact Assessment, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the aesthetic impacts of the proposed Project, which would be less than significant, including at the Park.

Comment Letter PH247 - Fernanda Sanchez

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH247

Comment PH247-1 MS. SANCHEZ: Hello, my name is Fernanda Sanchez and I am a long-time community member of Lincoln Heights. I'm here in solidarity with the residents of Chinatown and I strongly oppose this disgraceful project.

Response PH247-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Comment PH247-2 The lack of transparency from these predatory projects will continue to be faced with opposition from all of our community members here. It is the residents of Chinatown that need to be heard because they are the ones that will be directly impacted.

Response PH247-2 Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, and Appendix A, Scoping Report, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project team's outreach efforts to neighborhoods along the proposed Project alignment. Metro sought to engage with stakeholders in neighborhoods along the proposed Project alignment in each stage of the environmental review process. Metro engaged stakeholders in neighborhoods along the proposed Project alignment in decision making for the proposed Project beginning with the public scoping period for the Draft EIR in October 2020 to receive public comment on the proposed Project's scope of environmental review under CEQA. In June 2021, the Project Sponsor conducted two virtual public outreach meetings. The input from stakeholders in neighborhoods along the proposed Project, including Chinatown, during this period led directly to changes to the proposed Project, including selecting the proposed Project's alignment and the location of Chinatown/State Park Station, as discussed in Section 5.0, Other CEQA Considerations, of the Draft EIR. Eight public meetings were held immediately preceding, during, and immediately following the Draft EIR public review period, with four held in-person in the Project area at Los Angeles Union Station and Cathedral High School, and four held virtually via Zoom webinar. Project materials and information were provided at both the in-person meetings and on Metro's website in English, Spanish, Chinese (Traditional), and Chinese (Simplified). Interpretation was provided in English, Spanish, Mandarin, and Cantonese during the eight public meetings, with interpretation provided in Taishanese during the final two public meetings. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the potential added benefits from the proposed Project, including potential partnerships with and benefits to local businesses in Chinatown.

Comment PH247-3 I can list a million other things our communities need and a gondola is not one of them. I want to also highlight the violent gentrification that is happening to our communities directly caused by USC and the Dodgers.

They have taken our parks, our neighborhoods, our homes, our lives. Gentrification is death. Our community continues to be targeted and it's time that we take our city back from the greedy hands of the top one percent who treat our communities like they're profitable playgrounds.

Response PH247-3 Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the Draft EIR addresses environmental justice by considering the proposed Project's ability to reduce congestion and emissions from on-road vehicles in an area disproportionately burdened by pollution, and including an analysis of the proposed Project's potential impacts to the surrounding community, concluding that the proposed Project could result in air quality benefits for the surrounding communities. The proposed Project would not preclude development of other uses in the surrounding communities and would itself address a need for a permanent transit connection to one of the region's most visited venues, and would also benefit the surrounding community by improving safety. Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not exacerbate gentrification or result in displacement of residents in the surrounding neighborhoods and is consistent with Metro's considerations regarding gentrification and displacement.

Comment PH247-4 I also want to mention that for those that are speaking in favor of this project, if you really believe that this gondola will improve traffic and reduce emissions, you are seriously confused for believing such a blatant lie and logical fallacy, or you are being paid to speak in favor. If you have a contract riding on this gondola and you're speaking in favor, you need to be transparent about that.

Response PH247-4 Refer to Section 3.03, Air Quality, Section 3.08, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 3.17, Transportation, Appendix D, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's ability to reduce vehicular travel, to improve air quality through reduced emissions, and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through reduced vehicular travel.

Comment PH247-5 Lastly, I want to comment on the community advocates and activists who spoke up during the last gondola hearing where there really wasn't any public comment because the developer did not want to listen to us.

I want to thank all of the brave voices and their efforts for giving us the opportunity for public comment and for the meeting today.

Response PH247-5 Refer to Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's opportunities for public testimony during the Draft EIR public

review period. During the public review period, comments on the Draft EIR could be submitted in writing via email or mail, by phone, and during the four public hearings. Comments on the Draft EIR could be submitted by email to LAART@metro.net, by mail to One Gateway Plaza, Mail Stop 99-22-6, Los Angeles, CA 90012, or over the phone by calling (213) 922-6913. Comments could also be submitted at each public hearing. At virtual public hearings, comments could be given verbally. At the two public hearings held in person, comments could be submitted either in writing on forms provided by Metro, or verbally to the court reporters who were set up at a “comment station” in the venue. Written comment forms provided instructions on how to comment on the Draft EIR in English, Spanish, and Chinese (Simplified). Interpretation was provided in English, Spanish, Mandarin, and Cantonese during all four public hearings, with interpretation provided in Taishanese during the final two public hearings. During the January 12, 2023, public hearing at Cathedral High School, attendees were provided with the opportunity to submit public comments either in writing on forms provided by Metro, or verbally to the court reporters at a comment station in the venue. Written comment forms provided instructions on how to comment on the Draft EIR in English, Spanish, and Chinese (Simplified). An estimated 143 attendees participated in the January 12, 2023, public hearing, and Metro received 31 verbal comments and 95 written comments on the Draft EIR. In light of the disruptions at the January 12, 2023, public hearing, Metro provided a fourth public hearing by way of a virtual public hearing held on February 8, 2023. Verbal comments made at the virtual February 8, 2023, public hearing were deemed timely submitted for the purposes of the Draft EIR public review period.

Comment PH247-6 I urge you to stop this project. Stop the gondola. Nobody here in these communities supports this project, and we will not accept developers to further exploit, destroy, and displace our communities. Thank you.

Response PH247-6 This comment provides a general conclusion regarding the comments raised in this letter. Responses to the comments contained in this letter are provided above in Responses PH247-1 through PH247-5.

Comment Letter PH248 - Cheng Yang & Yu Hang Tang

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH248

Comment PH248-1 MR. YANG: Hello.

MS. SISCO: Hi.

MR. YANG: Hi, this is Cheng Yang. I'm here at Cassia Manor. I have the President of Cassia Manor, Mr. Tyru Hung. He will be speaking on behalf of several residents.

MS. SISCO: Okay. Could you please ask him to move closer to the speaker, and we'll restart the clock?

MR. TANG: (Foreign language spoken.)

MR. YANG: Thank you.

MS. SISCO: Okay. We'll provide a moment for the interpretation of that comment.

INTERPRETER: Hi. My name is Yu Hang Tang (phonetic), and I am speaking here on behalf of ten other residents who are with me right now.

I live at 917 Cafe Manor. I have lived here for over 22 years. Besides me, there is also residents from Unit 402, Unit 604, Unit 610, Unit 112, as well as Unit 508.

We all believe we don't need this gondola. I live on the ninth floor.

Response PH248-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Comment PH248-2 If the gondola is going to fly over our home, the people on the gondola will be able to see us change, and for this reason, I oppose the gondola.

Response PH248-2 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response M, Comparable Urban Aerial Transit Systems, discussing how, like the proposed Project, comparable aerial transit systems in cities around the world are integrated with their surrounding urban environments. In particular, comparable aerial transit systems in other locations demonstrate that such systems can operate safely, efficiently, and in concert with nearby residential and open space uses, including parks and other recreational facilities. The proposed Project would be located in a densely populated, urban environment surrounded by a variety of commercial, industrial, and residential development types. In this type of environment, it is common for public transportation, such as Metro's light rail, to be

located adjacent to residential uses and modern aerial transit systems in other cities, including Portland, Oregon and New York City, operate adjacent to residential uses. Nevertheless, as discussed in Topical Response J, Gondola Design and Operations, and Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, cabin windows can be equipped with privacy glass that can become opaque while adjacent to sensitive views, and the proposed Project would work with stakeholders adjacent to the proposed Project alignment to identify locations where the use of privacy glass would be warranted. Considerations as to the locations along the proposed Project alignment where the privacy glass could be activated include the subject adjacent sensitive views and the vertical and horizontal distance between the proposed Project cabins and the adjacent sensitive views.

Comment PH248-3 We don't need the gondola. What we need is hospital, supermarket, and affordable housing.

Our community will not benefit from this gondola project. It will only bring harm.

So, I urge this project to be withdrawn. Please remove this gondola project.

Thank you.

Response PH248-3 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer also to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the proposed Project would not preclude development of uses including housing, grocery stores, and/or healthcare facilities in the surrounding communities, and would itself address a need for a permanent transit connection to one of the region's most visited venues and would alleviate existing congestion on surrounding neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways, thereby reducing associated air pollution and improving safety. Refer to Topical Response M, Comparable Urban Aerial Transit Systems, for discussion of how comparable aerial transit systems in cities around the world operate safely, efficiently, and in concert with nearby residential and open space uses, have brought benefits to their surrounding areas by connecting disparate neighborhoods, promoting commerce, beautifying communities, and enhancing transit system rider safety, and have been shown to reduce violent crime in nearby areas. Additionally, refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities, including but not limited to, sustainability features and open space enhancements, the Community Access Plan for fares, access to parks, mobility hubs, signage, utilization of local artists for site specific artwork at each station reflective of the unique neighborhood culture, design of each component of the proposed Project to complement and reflect the unique character of the surrounding neighborhood, the Business and Community Support Program during construction, and benefits to local businesses along the proposed

Project alignment. The Project Sponsor would convene stakeholder groups to coordinate on issues related to proposed Project features.

Comment Letter PH249- Edwin Li

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH249

Comment PH249-1 MR. LI: Hello. My name is Edwin Li. Can you guys hear me?

MS. SISCO: Yes.

MR. LI: All right, thank you.

My name is Edwin Li, and I'm a local resident of Chinatown. And I live near the proposed pivot point of the gondola, and I oppose this project.

I don't believe the gondola will help Chinatown businesses because the tourists would be flying over Chinatown, right into Frank McCourt's parking lots.

Response PH249-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, discussing the proposed Project's potential partnerships with and benefits to local businesses. As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, and Topical Response C, Project Features, the proposed Project creates a first/last mile transit link for residents and businesses within Chinatown while unifying and connecting communities through transit mobility access. This new mode of transportation will expand rider access to the regional transit system by attracting new visitors including Dodgers fans, and represents an opportunity for additional visitors along the proposed Project alignment, creating economic opportunities for local businesses, including shops and restaurants, through potential partnerships that drive customers to Chinatown and other businesses along the proposed Project alignment, which, consequently, adds revenues to these small businesses in the communities the proposed Project hopes to serve.

Comment PH249-2 I believe the Dodger Express, which is actually more practical and less invasive, will be a better solution. It also economically more responsible and doesn't destroy the neighborhood.

Response PH249-2 Refer to Topical Response H, The Draft EIR Considered an Appropriate Range of Alternatives and Design Options, for discussion of how the Transportation Systems Management Alternative for an enhanced Dodger Stadium Express is unlikely to achieve the same level of ridership as the proposed Project, and otherwise fails to meet most of the Project Objectives, which seek to achieve the proposed Project's

underlying purpose of providing a permanent direct transit connection between Los Angeles Union Station (LAUS) and the Dodger Stadium property and improving connectivity for surrounding communities, including Chinatown, Mission Junction, Elysian Park, Solano Canyon, and the Los Angeles State Historic Park. Improving the connection between LAUS and Dodger Stadium via the proposed Project would provide the quickest, most frequent, and highest capacity transit connection for the greatest number of riders traveling to Dodger Stadium to have the most travel time competitive transit trips from more locations in the region. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities, including but not limited to, sustainability features and open space enhancements, the Community Access Plan for fares, access to parks, mobility hubs, signage, utilization of local artists for site specific artwork at each station reflective of the unique neighborhood culture, design of each component of the proposed Project to complement and reflect the unique character of the surrounding neighborhood, the Business and Community Support Program during construction, and benefits to local businesses along the proposed Project alignment. The Project Sponsor would convene stakeholder groups to coordinate on issues related to proposed Project features. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project.

Comment PH249-3 I think it's wrong to use public funds to help a private company, especially Frank McCourt, and

Response PH249-3 This comment is noted and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project.

Comment PH249-4 I don't think it's safe to build objects that are flying over people in earthquake zone areas. And I think that's it for me. Thank you.

Response PH249-4 Refer to Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR and Topical Response J, Gondola Design and Operations, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's design and operations, including discussion of the safety, privacy, and operations features of the proposed Project. Refer to Section 3.07, Geology and Soils, and Appendix I, Geotechnical Document in Support of the Environmental Impact Report, of the Draft EIR, and Appendix F, Memo on Structural Engineering, of the Final EIR, for discussion of how the proposed Project would meet applicable standards, requirements, and building codes, including all standards addressing environmental factors such as seismic effects, and would have less than significant impacts related to geology and soils with implementation of Mitigation Measures GEO-A and GEO-B.

Comment Letter PH250 - Luis Guerrero

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH250

Comment PH250-1 MR. GUERRERO: Hello, can you hear me?

MS. SISCO: Yes.

MR. GUERRERO: Hello, my name is Luis Guerrero. My family is from the Williams Mead Projects, and we are calling support of the gondola.

Response PH250-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment PH250-2 We've seen that this is going to help alleviate the traffic in the neighborhoods, but I was actually calling as well because the last meeting I tried to go to to give a public comment, I got stopped by protestors, and I had, like, my family with me. I had little kids with me. They were cussing and, like, literally got in my face.

I didn't know if Metro had security there or what, but that was extremely disgraceful, especially considering that was at a school, and there was high schoolers and other kids just everywhere. That was just -- I was so ashamed of Metro and the city right there. That was awful, but thank you, guys.

Response PH250-2 Refer to Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's opportunities for public testimony during the Draft EIR public review period. During the January 12, 2023, public hearing at Cathedral High School, attendees were provided with the opportunity to submit public comments either in writing on forms provided by Metro, or verbally to the court reporters at a comment station in the venue. Written comment forms provided instructions on how to comment on the Draft EIR in English, Spanish, and Chinese (Simplified). Shortly after the public hearing started, a group of approximately 40 protestors with "Stop the Gondola" signs entered the meeting and began speaking with amplified bullhorns, using profanity. Due to this group's loud, prolonged protests, the court reporters and interpreters could not take verbal public comment. Metro requested that the protestors turn off their amplifier to enable the agency to continue to take verbal public comment. The protestors then began marching around the room, chanting and continuing to speak into the amplified bullhorns. Approximately 6 to 10 protestors then started to tear down poster boards, knock over easels and tables and throw materials. Metro and AECOM staff, subject matter experts, and the Project team expressed that they were physically intimidated and frightened by the damage done by the protestors, as discussed in greater detail in the February 10, 2023, memo submitted by the Project Sponsor and included as Attachment D to Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR. After the protestors left, Metro staff concluded the

meeting by talking to several remaining attendees. An estimated 143 attendees participated in the January 12, 2023, public hearing, and Metro received 31 verbal comments and 95 written comments on the Draft EIR. In light of the disruptions at the January 12, 2023, public hearing, Metro provided a fourth public hearing by way of a virtual public hearing held on February 8, 2023. Verbal comments made at the virtual February 8, 2023, public hearing were deemed timely submitted for the purposes of the Draft EIR public review period.

Comment Letter PH251 - Miguel Castellon

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH251

Comment PH251-1 MR. CASTELLON: Hello?

MS. SISCO: Hello. We can hear you.

MR. CASTELLON: All right, good evening. My name is Miguel Castellon and I am with the Ironworkers Local 433.

I love this project and appreciate that it will be built with partnership with labor. That means good paying jobs for our community and new, modern transportation for everyone.

We need more zero emissions and infrastructure in Los Angeles.

Thank you.

Response PH251-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. The proposed Project will enter into a Project Labor Agreement and will work in coordination with the LA/OC Building and Construction Trades.

Comment Letter PH252 - Richard Rojas

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH252

Comment PH252-1 MR. ROJAS: Good evening. My name is Richard Rojas. I currently serve on the Advisory Board for Latino Outdoors.

We're a national organization that connects youth and families with the outdoor space, including Los Angeles State Historic Park. Our organization vehemently opposes the project as we see it another environmental injustice in this community.

Response PH252-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. This comment provides a general summary of the comments raised in this letter. Responses to the comments contained in this letter are provided below in Responses PH252-2 through PH252-5.

Comment PH252-2 As currently proposed, the project is viewed by our community as an availed attempt to degrade the land that was hard fought and promised to be the Central Park of Los Angeles.

For seven generations of Californians and beyond, recognizing the need for green space in LAs urban area, three great environmental warriors dedicated their lives to finding a way to create this open space in the industrial-commercial wasteland of Northeast Los Angeles.

The work of the late Robert Garcia from the city project, Ted Jackson from California State Parks Operations, Ron Schaefer from the LA Parks District, now all deceased but not to be forgotten, but cherished, protected, and preserved.

Response PH252-2 Metro and the Project Sponsor acknowledge the more than 20 years of effort the community undertook to convert the closed rail yard at River Station to what is now the Los Angeles State Historic Park. Refer to Topical Response M, Comparable Urban Aerial Transit Systems, discussing how, like the proposed Project, comparable aerial transit systems in cities around the world are integrated with their surrounding urban environments. In particular, comparable aerial transit systems in other locations demonstrate that such systems can operate safely, efficiently, and in concert with nearby residential and open space uses, including parks and other recreational facilities. Refer also to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of how the proposed Project would provide open space enhancements, including at the Alameda Triangle, the Los Angeles State Historic Park, and along the pedestrian pathway connecting Dodger Stadium Station and Dodger Stadium. Refer to Response S2 regarding the Los Angeles State Historic Park.

Comment PH252-3 We want LA State Park for the viewshed and the experience for the community it provides. It took 20 years to be envisioned and developed, not to rely on the Draft Environmental Impact Report that the state park should change the general plan to accommodate this private venture.

Response PH252-3 Metro and the Project Sponsor acknowledge the more than 20 years of effort the community undertook to convert the closed rail yard at River Station to what is now the Los Angeles State Historic Park. Through collaboration with State Parks, the proposed Project has been designed to provide additional benefits to the Los Angeles State Historic Park, including pedestrian improvements between Metro's L Line (Gold) and the park, and integration of the Chinatown/State Park Station into the southern boundary of the park with hardscape and landscape enhancements, a mobility hub, and other park amenities including concessions, restrooms, and a breezeway connecting the concessions and restrooms. Refer to Section 2.0, Project Description, Section 3.16, Parks and Recreational Facilities, and Section 5.0, Other CEQA Considerations, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the footprint of the proposed Project in the Los Angeles State Historic Park. With the small footprint of the proposed Project's Chinatown/State Park Station, and the required clearances and the height at which the cabins would cross over the Park, the ability to use the vast majority of the Park would not be affected by the proposed Project. Refer to Response S2-4 for additional discussion regarding the ability of uses to continue at the Park. Refer to Section 3.01, Aesthetics, with supporting data provided in Appendix C, Visual Impact Assessment and Lighting Study of the Draft EIR, and Appendix H.1, Memo Regarding Preparation of KOPs, of this Final EIR, for discussion of how the proposed project would not have a significant impact to aesthetic and visual resources and how view simulations were prepared and analyzed. Refer to Section 3.11, Land Use and Planning, of the Draft EIR, for a discussion of the proposed Project's consistency with the Los Angeles State Historic Park General Plan. As discussed therein, State Parks has determined that the proposed Project would be inconsistent with the Los Angeles State Historic Park General Plan because the identified land uses in the General Plan's Preferred Park Concept Elements did not contemplate a transit station like the proposed Project's Chinatown/State Park Station. State Parks considers this inconsistency a potentially significant impact. Therefore, Mitigation Measure LUP-A would be implemented to require the proposed Project to obtain an amendment to the Los Angeles State Historic Park General Plan. The General Plan Amendment is subject to the review and approval by the State Park Commission, which retains its independent authority related to the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response F, Los Angeles State Historic Park, for a discussion of the Los Angeles State Historic Park General Plan Amendment.

Comment PH252-4 This is not public transportation. It seeks to get people to Dodger Stadium for a private interest, for a private profit.

Response PH252-4 Refer to Topical Response A, SB 44, for discussion of how the proposed Project is public transportation because it will be open to the general public for service at regular, scheduled operating times, operating daily to serve existing residents, workers, park users, and visitors to Los Angeles. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project.

Comment PH252-5 On behalf of the Latino community and current future park users, we urge you to instruct the project proponent to properly identify, analyze, and mitigate all park impacts required by law and not usurp the legal responsibility to provide a clear, thorough, and complete, defensible project in the Draft Environmental Impact Report.

Response PH252-5 This comment provides a general conclusion regarding the comments raised in this letter. Responses to the comments contained in this letter are provided above in Responses PH252-1 through PH252-4. As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, Section 3.16, Parks and Recreational Facilities, and Section 5.0, Other CEQA Considerations, of the Draft EIR, the Draft EIR clearly defines the potential requirements to implement the proposed Project's Chinatown/State Park Station, which would have a footprint of 2,195 square feet in the Los Angeles State Historic Park (~.1% of the total 32-acre park), and the station canopy would have an overhang of 9,320 square feet over the park. The proposed Project alignment crosses over the westernmost edge of the Los Angeles State Historic Park, adjacent to the existing Metro L Line (Gold) and the associated overhead catenary system. The proposed Project's required aerial clearance would be located above approximately 59,470 square feet of the total 32-acre park, plus an Additional Separation Buffer. With the required clearances and the height at which the cabins would cross over the Los Angeles State Historic Park, the ability to use the vast majority of the Park for kite flying, special events (e.g., concerts, craft fairs, partnership events, 5K/10K runs, workshops, cultural festivals, and the farmers' market), and other passive recreational opportunities (e.g., picnicking, jogging, walking, and informal play) would not be affected by the proposed Project. Refer to Response S2-4 for additional discussion regarding the ability of uses to continue at the Park. As discussed in Sections 3.01, Aesthetics, 3.04, Biological Resources, 3.05, Cultural Resources, 3.06, Energy, 3.07, Geology and Soils, 3.09, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, 3.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, 3.11, Land Use and Planning, 3.13, Noise, 3.15, Public Services, 3.16, Parks and Recreational Facilities, 3.17, Transportation, 3.18, Tribal Cultural Resources, 3.19, Utilities and Service Systems, 3.20, Wildfire, and 5.0, Other CEQA Considerations, the proposed Project would have less than significant operational impacts, including to Los Angeles State Historic Park. CEQA does not require extensive detail beyond that needed for evaluation and review of the proposed Project's environmental impact. (See, e.g., CEQA Guidelines § 15124.) The

Draft EIR provided sufficient information in order for the public and decisionmakers to meaningfully evaluate the proposed Project's potential environmental impacts.

Comment Letter PH253 - Dahma Cho

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH253

Comment PH253-1 MS. CHO: Hi. Can you hear me?

MS. SISCO: Yes.

MS. CHO: Okay. My name is Dahma Cho. I'm a resident of LA. I'm calling in solidarity with the Chinatown community in opposition to this gondola project.

Response PH253-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment PH253-2 This project is another case of profits being prioritized over the people, of private interests, of those more privileged being prioritized over the well-being of marginalized communities.

Response PH253-2 Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the Draft EIR addresses environmental justice, how the proposed Project supports Metro's goal of prioritizing equity opportunities, is designed to extend affordable, regional access and mobility options to the communities adjacent to the proposed Project alignment, how the public outreach for the proposed Project was designed with environmental justice principles in mind, how the proposed Project would not preclude development of uses including housing, grocery stores, and/or healthcare facilities in the surrounding communities, and would itself address a need for a permanent transit connection to one of the region's most visited venues and would alleviate existing congestion on surrounding neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways, thereby reducing associated air pollution and improving safety, and how the proposed Project is designed to be ADA compliant.

Comment PH253-3 Also, this project is an extension of the harm that Dodgers and Frank McCourt inflicted on the local communities, including the people of the Palo Verde, La Loma, and Bishop communities that the Dodgers corporation forcefully displaced.

Response PH253-3 Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project. Refer to Section 5.0, Corrections and Additions, of this Final EIR for a discussion of Chavez Ravine.

Comment PH253-4 This project just serves Dodgers fans and other parties who have some kind of profit to gain from this project, not the actual communities that this project would be impacting.

Previous speakers have mentioned the importance of tourism for the health of the economy, but I think the well-being of the actual community members is more important.

The aging, low income Chinatown community does not need Dodger fans and tourists coming into their communities. They need actual resources like affordable, accessible grocery stores, green spaces, safe, affordable housing, and this project would only contribute to ongoing gentrification of Chinatown.

The people and their needs have been neglected by Metro in this process.

Response PH253-4 Refer to Section 2.1, Overview of the Project, of the Draft EIR, discussing how the proposed Project would operate daily to serve existing residents, workers, park users, and visitors to Los Angeles. As discussed on page 2-42, in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the proposed Project would provide service to all pre-season, regular season, and post-season Los Angeles Dodger games and any special events (e.g., concerts, the Los Angeles Marathon) at the Dodger Stadium property. The proposed Project would also provide service to events at the Los Angeles State Historic Park. In addition to providing service on game and special event days at Dodger Stadium and events at the Los Angeles State Historic Park, it is anticipated that the proposed Project would also provide daily service between 6:00am to 12:00am, for the surrounding communities, including Chinatown, Mission Junction, Elysian Park, Solano Canyon, and the Los Angeles State Historic Park. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan. Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing, and Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not displace housing, prevent planned housing, or preclude development of uses including housing, grocery stores, and/or healthcare facilities in the surrounding communities, and would itself address a need for a permanent transit connection to one of the region's most visited venues, and would benefit the surrounding community by alleviating existing congestion on surrounding neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways, thereby reducing associated air pollution and improving safety. Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not exacerbate gentrification or result in displacement of residents in the surrounding neighborhoods and is consistent with Metro's considerations regarding gentrification and displacement.

Comment PH253-5 Regarding the environmental impact, it just seems to be moving traffic and air pollution from one place to another, not really -- and in that regard,

Response PH253-5 Refer to Section 3.03, Air Quality, Section 3.08, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 3.17, Transportation, Appendix D, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's ability to reduce vehicular travel, to improve air quality through reduced emissions, and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through reduced vehicular travel. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of the Draft EIR addresses environmental justice by considering the proposed Project's ability to reduce congestion and emissions from on-road vehicles in an area disproportionately burdened by pollution, and including an analysis of the proposed Project's potential impacts to the surrounding community, concluding that the proposed Project could result in air quality benefits for the surrounding communities. Traffic congestion is not required to be analyzed under CEQA in the Draft EIR following the implementation of Senate Bill 743, which designated "vehicle miles traveled" as the method for assessing transportation impacts on the environment for CEQA projects. Refer to the *Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit Project Non-CEQA Transportation Assessment*, which found that there could be localized increases in traffic at the intersections closest to the proposed Project's Alameda Station and Chinatown/State Park Station due to some riders choosing to park and ride or take Uber/Lyft and recommended the proposed Project work with Metro to identify a transit partnership for the proposed Project riders to further encourage them to take transit, walk, or bike to the proposed Project's stations.

Comment PH253-6 Climate Resolve and LA Art Metro all seem to be greenwashing this project, making it seem like it would be environmentally beneficial when it doesn't actually, it won't actually be.

Response PH253-6 Refer to Section 3.03, Air Quality, Section 3.08, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 3.17, Transportation, Appendix D, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's ability to reduce vehicular travel, to improve air quality through reduced emissions, and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through reduced vehicular travel. The lifetime emissions of the proposed Project over its useful life would be a reduction of 166,653 MT CO₂e. The lifetime VMT reduction of the proposed Project would be a reduction of 129,629,500 VMT. Emissions are decreased through reducing vehicle miles traveled. The proposed Project would result in a net reduction in criteria pollutant emissions by reducing vehicle miles traveled. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization

dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project.

Comment PH253-7 Metro, you all are not being transparent, and you're being very deceptive throughout this process. I think Metro should focus on getting rid of their fares, considering it also costs more for them to keep it running, than moving forward with a project like this that just isn't public transit. It does not meet the transportation needs of the Chinatown community.

Thank you.

Response PH253-7 Refer to Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's public outreach and opportunity for public testimony during the Draft EIR public review period. Refer to Appendix A, Scoping Report, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of outreach and community engagement during the Draft EIR scoping period. Refer to Topical Response A, SB 44, for discussion of how the proposed Project is public transportation because it will be open to the general public for service at regular, scheduled operating times, operating daily to serve existing residents, workers, park users, and visitors to Los Angeles. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at LAUS, Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan.

Comment Letter PH254 - Billy Yates

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH254

Comment PH254-1 MR. YATES: Hi, this is Billy Yates (phonetic). I am the former bilingual Mandarin and English civics instructor at the Chinatown Library, and I maintain a close relationship with a lot of my students who live and work in Chinatown.

I'm also a transit rider because I don't have a car. Everything is bike, bus, or Metro for me, and that's why I feel that this scam of a gondola is really deceptive.

And we want to talk about, oh, we should be respectful. Oh, we should do all these things. But public transit riders are disrespected every single day in this city. We are not thought of as actual people, and we know that because of the head wait times, and how dirty it is, and the lack of service, including, if we just get, you know -- taking on like a project like this when we already have so many existing problems with public transit in this city. It's like a glittery band-aid that we want to put on for all these little things, and it's just not a real solution.

What people need are frequent times to be able to move around in LA with public transit. People need free transit so that more people can use it because it takes more time, when the bus is already late, to go and add another person who's looking for change.

Response PH254-1 Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at Los Angeles Union Station (LAUS), Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan. Refer to Topical Response H, The Draft EIR Considered an Appropriate Range of Alternatives and Design Options, for discussion of how improving the connection between LAUS and Dodger Stadium via the proposed Project would provide the quickest, most frequent, and highest capacity transit connection for the greatest number of riders traveling to Dodger Stadium to have the most travel time competitive transit trips from more locations in the region. As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the proposed Project would require routine maintenance that would be performed by the system operator.

Comment PH254-2 You know, there's so many problems that we could be focusing on with all this money, and the fact that we're thinking about a toy gondola is just -- it really is not the best

of us. And I want LA Metro to do so much better because I know we can be a much better city if we really just prioritize the least among us and made it a public transit.

Response PH254-2 Refer to Topical Response A, SB 44, for discussion of how the proposed Project is public transportation because it will be open to the general public for service at regular, scheduled operating times, operating daily to serve existing residents, workers, park users, and visitors to Los Angeles. Refer to Section 2.01, Overview of the Project, of the Draft EIR, discussing how the proposed Project would operate daily to serve existing residents, workers, park users, and visitors to Los Angeles. As discussed on page 2-42, in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the proposed Project would provide service to all pre-season, regular season, and post-season Los Angeles Dodgers games and any special events (e.g., concerts, the Los Angeles Marathon) at the Dodger Stadium property. The proposed Project would also provide service to events at the Los Angeles State Historic Park. In addition to providing service on game and special event days at Dodger Stadium and events at the Los Angeles State Historic Park, it is anticipated that the proposed Project would also provide daily service between 6:00am to 12:00am, for the surrounding communities, including Chinatown, Mission Junction, Elysian Park, Solano Canyon, and the Los Angeles State Historic Park. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan.

Comment PH254-3 Not some dude over here from Colorado or whatever talking about buses are sexy and he comes from a ski town. That's not the community. Please, please, please let's focus on helping people as much as we can, and that starts with real public transit, and getting rid of this gondola, and focusing on what people need.

Response PH254-3 Refer to Response PH254-2 for discussion of how the proposed Project would operate daily to serve existing residents. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at LAUS, Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Dodger Stadium draws large regional crowds, with approximately 100 baseball games and other events each year, but there are no permanent transit connections to the venue. The vast majority of visitors drive their personal vehicles to access the venue. These vehicles create congestion on the surface streets leading up to and around Dodger Stadium, including Sunset Boulevard/Cesar E. Chavez from LAUS and throughout the surrounding communities. Given the capacity of the proposed Project's system, approximately 20 percent of the fans could take aerial transit connected to Metro's regional transit system. This would reduce vehicular congestion in and around Dodger

Stadium, on neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways during game and special event days.

Comment PH254-4 Thank you very much. There's a lot of other concerns with transparency and environmental pollution, but we don't even need to go there. Let's just start with the basics.

Thank you, and I know we can do better.

Response PH254-4 Refer to Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's public outreach and opportunity for public testimony during the Draft EIR public review period. Refer to Appendix A, Scoping Report, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of outreach and community engagement during the Draft EIR scoping period. Refer to Section 3.03, Air Quality, Section 3.08, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 3.17, Transportation, Appendix D, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's ability to reduce vehicular travel, to improve air quality through reduced emissions, and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through reduced vehicular travel.

Comment Letter PH255 - Camarillo

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH255

Comment PH255-1 MR. CAMARILLO: Hi. Thank you so much.

I just wanted to express my opinion and say that this gondola project is completely unnecessary and shameful. It's a luxury project designed by the privileged for tourists and outdated, parlor, aging Dodger fans.

Response PH255-1 Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at Los Angeles Union Station (LAUS), Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Dodger Stadium draws large regional crowds, with approximately 100 baseball games and other events each year, but there are no permanent transit connections to the venue. The vast majority of visitors drive their personal vehicles to access the venue. These vehicles create congestion on the surface streets leading up to and around Dodger Stadium, including Sunset Boulevard/Cesar E. Chavez from LAUS and throughout the surrounding communities. Given the capacity of the proposed Project's system, approximately 20 percent of the fans could take aerial transit connected to Metro's regional transit system. This would reduce vehicular congestion in and around Dodger Stadium, on neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways during game and special event days. Refer to Section 2.1, Overview of the Project, of the Draft EIR, discussing how the proposed Project would operate daily to serve existing residents, workers, park users, and visitors to Los Angeles. In addition to providing service on game and special event days at Dodger Stadium and events at the Los Angeles State Historic Park, it is anticipated that the proposed Project would also provide daily service between 6:00am to 12:00am, for the surrounding communities, including Chinatown, Mission Junction, Elysian Park, Solano Canyon, and the Los Angeles State Historic Park. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan.

Comment PH255-2 We can hear the desperate concerns of the local generations of the people who live in Chinatown. Listen to the seniors, listen to the families, and make their concerns valid. Provide value to the opinions of people who will be most affected by this money grab project.

And also, don't be foolish. Chinatown has had lowered foot traffic from tourists over the years, but this gondola project is just not the way to acquire more foot traffic. It's truly a scam. Invest in existing shops, invest in Chinatown's business, and invest in Chinatown itself.

Response PH255-2 Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, Appendix A, Scoping Report, of the Draft EIR, and Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project team's outreach efforts to neighborhoods along the proposed Project alignment and the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities. Metro sought to engage with stakeholders in neighborhoods along the proposed Project alignment in each stage of the environmental review process. Input from the public, including local community stakeholders, led directly to the selection of the proposed Project alignment, including an intermediate station in Chinatown (the Chinatown/State Park Station), as well as to the redesign of the proposed Project stations and junction and additional pedestrian enhancements including hardscape and landscape improvements. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, discussing the proposed Project's potential partnerships with and benefits to local businesses in Chinatown. As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, and Topical Response C, Project Features, the proposed Project creates a first/last mile transit link for residents and businesses within Chinatown while unifying and connecting communities through transit mobility access. This new mode of transportation will expand rider access to the regional transit system by attracting new visitors including Dodgers fans, and represents an opportunity for additional visitors along the proposed Project alignment, creating economic opportunities for local businesses, including shops and restaurants, through potential partnerships that drive customers to Chinatown and other businesses along the proposed Project alignment, which, consequently, adds revenues to these small businesses in the communities the proposed Project hopes to serve.

Comment PH255-3 By the way, how can Metro fully focus on the success of this gondola project when Metro cannot even clean their buses properly?

Response PH255-3 Refer to Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR and Topical Response J, Gondola Design and Operations, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's operations, including maintenance.

Comment PH255-4 This gondola project will not eliminate traffic, instead provide one of various existing ways for fans to see a baseball game.

Response PH255-4 Refer to Section 3.03, Air Quality, Section 3.08, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 3.17, Transportation, Appendix D, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's ability to reduce vehicular travel, to improve air quality through reduced emissions,

and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through reduced vehicular travel. The opportunities for more mobility choices through improved connections to additional public transit options created by the proposed Project are projected to increase the number of attendees of games or events at Dodger Stadium to ride public transportation.

Comment PH255-5 Stop valuing money and tourism over long-time Los Angelenos and our well-being. This gondola project is completely disingenuous and unnecessary.

Response PH255-5 This comment provides a general conclusion regarding the comments raised in this letter. Responses to the comments contained in this letter are provided above in Responses PH255-1 through PH255-4.

Comment Letter PH256- Monica

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH256

Comment PH256-1 PARTICIPANT: Yes, hi. My name is Monica, and on January 12, I attended the meeting at the Cathedral High School in LA and supported the gondola project.

And there were some protesters there, and they took over the meeting. I was so disappointed in how the meeting turned out. The protesters were shouting profanity and using bad language in front of the children attending the meeting, and most of all, it was in a Catholic school.

Protesters had no respect for the community nor the people attending the meeting. They were so loud and obnoxious that we were not able to provide public comments on the day of January the 12th. I felt scared and threatened by these -- by the way these protesters were acting.

Response PH256-1 Refer to Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's opportunities for public testimony during the Draft EIR public review period. During the public review period, comments on the Draft EIR could be submitted in writing via email or mail, by phone, and during the four public hearings. Comments on the Draft EIR could be submitted by email to LAART@metro.net, by mail to One Gateway Plaza, Mail Stop 99-22-6, Los Angeles, CA 90012, or over the phone by calling (213) 922-6913. Comments could also be submitted at each of the four public hearings. At virtual public hearings, comments could be given verbally. In light of the disruptions at the January 12, 2023, public hearing, Metro provided a fourth public hearing by way of a virtual public hearing held on February 8, 2023. Verbal comments made at the virtual February 8, 2023 public hearing were deemed timely submitted for the purposes of the Draft EIR public review period.

Comment PH256-2 Me and the community, we approve the gondola project. I believe it's a very perfect and new, exciting way to Chinatown -- to come, allow meaning. There's going to be more jobs, more profit for the community as well.

And like I said, I approve this project. Please, please approve it.

Response PH256-2 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, discussing the proposed Project's potential partnerships with and benefits to local businesses. As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, and Topical Response C, Project Features, the proposed Project creates a first/last mile transit link for residents and businesses within Chinatown while unifying and connecting communities through transit mobility access. This new mode of transportation will expand rider access to the regional

transit system by attracting new visitors including Dodgers fans, and represents an opportunity for additional visitors along the proposed Project alignment, creating economic opportunities for local businesses, including shops and restaurants, through potential partnerships that drive customers to Chinatown and other businesses along the proposed Project alignment, which, consequently, adds revenues to these small businesses in the communities the proposed Project hopes to serve.

Comment Letter PH257 - Bill

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH257

Comment PH257-1 PARTICIPANT: Hello?

MS. SISCO: Yes?

PARTICIPANT: Can you hear me okay?

MS. SISCO: Yes, we can.

PARTICIPANT: My name is Bill. Oh, excuse me. Yes. I live in the neighborhood, and I support the proposed gondola project. We need new transportation in our community that are good for the environment and that don't have emission problems.

So, please vote for it. I support the gondola project. Thank you very much.

Response PH257-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter PH258 - Angelica

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH258

Comment PH258-1 PARTICIPANT: Hello. My name is Angelica, and I support the gondola.

Response PH258-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment PH258-2 I also want to add that I'm really upset that the meeting on January 12 was so disrespectful to the community. We have no place in the community for profanity, threats, shouting at people, and disrespecting.

I protest something myself, but I didn't like that and I found it scary enough to attend another meeting because, just because a lady said that she was supporting the gondola, there was this man chasing her around with his hand raised up like he was going to slap her, just because she said that she supports the gondola. He told her, why are you supporting it? You can't be doing that.

I got scared. I wanted to get away from there. We can't let this happen again. I don't know if Metro -- why they allowed the protesters to take over the community meeting and create a terrible environment for other people that were there with their families. Also, I don't understand why they were jumping around the gym and, you know, trying to create panic to the people.

Like I said, I'm here to support the gondola, and thank you for listening

Response PH258-2 Refer to Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's opportunities for public testimony during the Draft EIR public review period. During the public review period, comments on the Draft EIR could be submitted in writing via email or mail, by phone, and during the four public hearings. Comments on the Draft EIR could be submitted by email to LAART@metro.net, by mail to One Gateway Plaza, Mail Stop 99-22-6, Los Angeles, CA 90012, or over the phone by calling (213) 922-6913. Comments could also be submitted at each public hearing. At virtual public hearings, comments could be given verbally. At the two public hearings held in person, comments could be submitted either in writing on forms provided by Metro, or verbally to the court reporters who were set up at a "comment station" in the venue. Written comment forms provided instructions on how to comment on the Draft EIR in English, Spanish, and Chinese (Simplified). Interpretation was provided in English, Spanish, Mandarin, and Cantonese during all four public hearings, with interpretation provided in Taishanese during the final two public hearings. During the January 12, 2023, public hearing at Cathedral High School attendees were provided with the opportunity to submit public comments either in writing on forms provided by Metro, or verbally to the court reporters at a comment

station in the venue. Written comment forms provided instructions on how to comment on the Draft EIR in English, Spanish, and Chinese (Simplified). Shortly after the public hearing started, a group of approximately 40 protesters with “Stop the Gondola” signs entered the meeting and began speaking with amplified bullhorns, using profanity. Due to this group’s loud, prolonged protests, the court reporters and interpreters could not take verbal public comment. Metro requested that the protestors turn off their amplifier to enable the agency to continue to take verbal public comment. The protestors then began marching around the room, chanting and continuing to speak into the amplified bullhorns. Approximately 6 to 10 protestors then started to tear down poster boards, knock over easels and tables and throw materials. Metro and AECOM staff, subject matter experts, and the Project team expressed that they were physically intimidated and frightened by the damage done by the protesters, as discussed in greater detail in the February 10, 2023, memo submitted by the Project Sponsor and included as Attachment D to Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR. After the protesters left, Metro staff concluded the meeting by talking to several remaining attendees. An estimated 143 attendees participated in the January 12, 2023, public hearing, and Metro received 31 verbal comments and 95 written comments on the Draft EIR. In light of the disruptions at the January 12, 2023, public hearing, Metro provided a fourth public hearing by way of a virtual public hearing held on February 8, 2023. Verbal comments made at the virtual February 8, 2023 public hearing were deemed timely submitted for the purposes of the Draft EIR public review period.

Comment Letter PH259 - Annie Shaw

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH259

Comment PH259-1 MS. SHAW: Hi. Can you hear me?

MS. SISCO: Yes.

MS. SHAW: Okay. You know what is scary? The violence of gentrification, when a white developer can come in and unleash an entire project on a poor community that is in need of the most basic, essential living.

This is a shameful project that will kill the remaining of Chinatown. It is truly shameful that in 2023, we still have organizations, unions, and museums who are willing to sacrifice poor peoples' survival in exchange for their own community benefits.

Let's be real: if this gondola was proposed in a wealthy, white neighborhood like Beverly Hills or Malibu, it would have ended yesterday. This is a racist, white elephant project that takes advantage of disenfranchised poor people who are fighting for their last survival.

Response PH259-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not exacerbate gentrification or result in displacement of residents in the surrounding neighborhoods and is consistent with Metro's considerations regarding gentrification and displacement. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the proposed Project would not preclude development of uses including housing, grocery stores, and/or healthcare facilities in the surrounding communities, and would itself address a need for a permanent transit connection to one of the region's most visited venues and would alleviate existing congestion on surrounding neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways, thereby reducing associated air pollution and improving safety. Refer to Topical Response M, Comparable Urban Aerial Transit Systems, for discussion of how comparable aerial transit systems in cities around the world operate safely, efficiently, and in concert with nearby residential and open space uses, have brought benefits to their surrounding areas by connecting disparate neighborhoods, promoting commerce, beautifying communities, and enhancing transit system rider safety, and have been shown to reduce violent crime in nearby areas. Additionally, refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities, including but not limited to, sustainability features and open space enhancements, the Community Access Plan for fares, access to parks, mobility hubs, signage, utilization of local artists for site

specific artwork at each station reflective of the unique neighborhood culture, design of each component of the proposed Project to complement and reflect the unique character of the surrounding neighborhood, the Business and Community Support Program during construction, and benefits to local businesses along the proposed Project alignment. The Project Sponsor would convene stakeholder groups to coordinate on issues related to proposed Project features. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project.

Comment PH259-2 Let me be clear. The gondola will not save Chinatown. Tourism has not saved Chinatown. New businesses that do not serve working class community will not save Chinatown.

Response PH259-2 Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, discussing the proposed Project's potential partnerships with and benefits to local Chinatown businesses. As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, and Topical Response C, Project Features, the proposed Project creates a first/last mile transit link for residents and businesses within Chinatown while unifying and connecting communities through transit mobility access. This new mode of transportation will expand rider access to the regional transit system by attracting new visitors including Dodgers fans, and represents an opportunity for additional visitors along the proposed Project alignment, creating economic opportunities for local businesses, including shops and restaurants, through potential partnerships that drive customers to Chinatown and other businesses along the proposed Project alignment, which, consequently, adds revenues to these small businesses in the communities the proposed Project hopes to serve.

Comment PH259-3 The gondola is a white elephant project that wastes valuable resources, gentrify community, increase pollution, and make parking and food and housing even more expensive. Stop imposing this project on the community when the community have said it again and again that we don't want this.

Response PH259-3 Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not exacerbate gentrification or result in displacement of residents in the surrounding neighborhoods and is consistent with Metro's considerations regarding gentrification and displacement. Also refer to Section 3.03, Air Quality, Section 3.08, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 3.17, Transportation, Appendix D, Air Quality/ Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's ability to reduce vehicular travel, to improve air quality through reduced emissions, and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through reduced vehicular travel. Parking is not required to be analyzed under CEQA or the

Transportation Assessment Guidelines (“TAG”). Nevertheless, the Parking Study was prepared to provide additional information to the community and decision makers about existing parking conditions and the proposed Project’s potential to effect parking conditions around the Alameda Station and Chinatown/State Park Station. The proposed Project would include a parking management plan prepared in collaboration with the City, who would implement any on-street parking management strategies, and with robust feedback from community stakeholders to inform development of the plan.

Comment PH259-4 Entire community of seniors protested your recent hearing. And how dare you? You raised their concerns by calling it a disruption when you are actually disrupting their homes and ignoring their voice of concern.

Response PH259-4 Refer to Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project’s opportunities for public testimony during the Draft EIR public review period. During the public review period, comments on the Draft EIR could be submitted in writing via email or mail, by phone, and during the four public hearings. Comments on the Draft EIR could be submitted by email to LAART@metro.net, by mail to One Gateway Plaza, Mail Stop 99-22-6, Los Angeles, CA 90012, or over the phone by calling (213) 922-6913. Comments could also be submitted at each public hearing. At virtual public hearings, comments could be given verbally. At the two public hearings held in person, comments could be submitted either in writing on forms provided by Metro, or verbally to the court reporters who were set up at a “comment station” in the venue. Written comment forms provided instructions on how to comment on the Draft EIR in English, Spanish, and Chinese (Simplified). Interpretation was provided in English, Spanish, Mandarin, and Cantonese during all four public hearings, with interpretation provided in Taishanese during the final two public hearings. During the January 12, 2023, public hearing at Cathedral High School attendees were provided with the opportunity to submit public comments either in writing on forms provided by Metro, or verbally to the court reporters at a comment station in the venue. Written comment forms provided instructions on how to comment on the Draft EIR in English, Spanish, and Chinese (Simplified). An estimated 143 attendees participated in the January 12, 2023, public hearing, and Metro received 31 verbal comments and 95 written comments on the Draft EIR. In light of the disruptions at the January 12, 2023, public hearing, Metro provided a fourth public hearing by way of a virtual public hearing held on February 8, 2023. Verbal comments made at the virtual February 8, 2023, public hearing were deemed timely submitted for the purposes of the Draft EIR public review period. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project’s features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities, including how the Project Sponsor would convene stakeholder groups to coordinate on issues related to proposed Project features.

Comment PH259-5 Right now, everyone is facing evictions and horrifying living conditions in Chinatown. This money can be used so much more constructively for peoples' lives in Chinatown, for their survival, instead of creating a project that a community can't even afford to participate.

Response PH259-5 Refer to Response PH259- 1 for discussion of how the proposed Project would not preclude development of uses including housing, grocery stores, and/or healthcare facilities in the surrounding communities, and would itself address a need for a permanent transit connection to one of the region's most visited venues and would alleviate existing congestion on surrounding neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways, thereby reducing associated air pollution and improving safety. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan.

Comment PH259-6 Once again, residents of Chinatown do not need these boxes above their heads and they do not need their neighborhood to be.

Response PH259-6 Refer to Topical Response M, Comparable Urban Aerial Transit Systems, discussing how, like the proposed Project, comparable aerial transit systems in cities around the world are integrated with their surrounding urban environments. In particular, comparable aerial transit systems in other locations demonstrate that such systems can operate safely, efficiently, and in concert with nearby residential uses, including parks and other recreational facilities. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the potential added benefits from the proposed Project, including potential partnerships with and benefits to local businesses in Chinatown, as well as providing an accessible and affordable mobility option for employees and area residents.

Comment Letter PH260 - Maria Cervantes

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH260

Comment PH260-1 MS. CERVANTES: Hi, my name is Maria Cervantes (phonetic). Can you guys hear me?

MS. SISCO: Yes. Sorry about that. Yes, we can.

MS. CERVANTES: My neighborhood has some of the worst traffic and pollution in the LA County. We want to -- we're deserving, we want cleaner air, less traffic, and more zero emission transportation opportunities.

This project is about less cars, less pollution, and safe and healthy -- safety and health of the neighborhood. I support the project stated gondola.

Response PH260-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter PH261 - Edgar

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH261

Comment PH261-1 PARTICIPANT: Okay. Hi, my name is Edgar. I'm a local resident, and I just wanted to say that I support the gondola project.

I think, like some others have said, it is definitely one of the ways we go into the future with transportation, just provide different modes of transportation to different areas of the city.

This will connect the local parks and hopefully relieve some of the traffic to get into Dodger Stadium.

It's zero emission, no electricity. So, I think it'd be, you know, a nice way to get up to that area. I support the gondola project and ask the council to do the same.

Thank you.

Response PH261-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter PH262 - Lynn Dwyer

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH262

Comment PH262-1 MS. DWYER: Okay, I think I'm here now.

MS. SISCO: Yes, you are.

MS. DWYER: My name is Lynn Dwyer (phonetic). I would like to document my concerns that the project will have long-term, negative environmental impacts to parks, historic sites, and residents.

The gondola system will have a negative impact on some of Los Angeles' most iconic views, including streetscapes, historic sites like Union Station in El Pueblo, and parks, including the Legion Park and LA Historic Park.

The project will negatively impact the environment during construction with air pollution, traffic, and noise.

Response PH262-1 As discussed in Sections 3.01, Aesthetics, 3.04, Biological Resources, 3.05, Cultural Resources, 3.06, Energy, 3.07, Geology and Soils, 3.09, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, 3.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, 3.11, Land Use and Planning, 3.13, Noise, 3.15, Public Services, 3.16, Parks and Recreational Facilities, 3.17, Transportation, 3.18, Tribal Cultural Resources, 3.19, Utilities and Service Systems, 3.20, Wildfire, and 5.0, Other CEQA Considerations, the proposed Project would have less than significant operational impacts. The Draft EIR fully analyzed and addressed the proposed Project's potential impacts to historic resources in Section 3.05, Cultural Resources, with supporting data provided in Appendix G, Historical Resource Technical Report for the Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit Project (HRTR). As discussed in Section 3.5, the Draft EIR's analysis concludes that all potential impacts related to historical resources would be less than significant. Refer to Section 3.01, Aesthetics, and Appendix C, Visual Impact Assessment, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the aesthetic impacts of the proposed Project, which would be less than significant. Refer to Section 3.03, Air Quality, Section 3.08, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 3.17, Transportation, Appendix D, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's ability to reduce vehicular travel, to improve air quality through reduced emissions, and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through reduced vehicular travel. Refer to Section 3.13, Noise, and Appendix M, Noise and Vibration Technical Report, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the construction and operational noise impacts from the proposed Project. As detailed therein, construction related noise impacts would be significant and unavoidable even with implementation of mitigation. Operational noise impacts would be less than significant.

Comment PH262-2 The ongoing operation of the gondola will disrupt park users and residents with noise, trash, and visual distractions.

There will be an invasion of privacy.

I believe a better solution would be safe pedestrian access to Dodger Stadium.

Thank you.

Response PH262-2 Refer to Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR and Topical Response J, Gondola Design and Operations, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's design and operations, including discussion of the safety, privacy, and operations features of the proposed Project. Refer to Section 2.0, Project Description, Section 3.16, Parks and Recreational Facilities, and Section 5.0, Other CEQA Considerations, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the footprint of the proposed Project in the Los Angeles State Historic Park. With the small footprint of the proposed Project's Chinatown/State Park Station, and the required clearances and the height at which the cabins would cross over the Park, the ability to use the vast majority of the Park would not be affected by the proposed Project. Refer to Response S2-4 for additional discussion regarding the ability of uses to continue at the Park. Refer to Topical Response M, Comparable Urban Aerial Transit Systems, discussing how, like the proposed Project, comparable aerial transit systems in cities around the world are integrated with their surrounding urban environments. In particular, comparable aerial transit systems in other locations demonstrate that such systems can operate safely, efficiently, and in concert with nearby residential and open space uses, including parks and other recreational facilities. The proposed Project would be located in a densely populated, urban environment surrounded by a variety of commercial, industrial, and residential development types. In this type of environment, it is common for public transportation, such as Metro's light rail, to be located adjacent to residential uses and modern aerial transit systems in other cities, including Portland, Oregon and New York City, operate adjacent to residential uses. Nevertheless, as discussed in Topical Response J, Gondola Design and Operations and Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, cabin windows can be equipped with privacy glass that can become opaque while adjacent to sensitive views. Refer to Section 5.0, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR, for discussion of a Pedestrian Enhancement Alternative to the proposed Project in which the proposed Project would not be constructed, and instead an enhanced pedestrian walkway and vertical circulation elements would be constructed to improve the safety, comfort, and accessibility of walking between the Metro L Line (Gold) Station and Dodger Stadium. This alternative was considered but dismissed from further detailed analysis because it did not meet most of the basic objectives of the proposed Project.

Comment Letter PH263 - Valerie Morishige

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH263

Comment PH263-1 MS. MORISHIGE: Hello. My name is Valerie Morishige (phonetic), and I just want to say thank you to everyone that's been providing public comment here. It's been very illuminating, since what's been going on in the press about this has been green washing and kind of astroturfing at best.

So, when I first heard about this project, I thought it was dumb, and now that I'm hearing from community members, I realize how heinous it actually is.

So, they're trying to sow class division to shove this through, and we're just supposed to stand by and not listen to the community? It's absolutely ludicrous.

Tourism is not going to save us, and we see how up and down that tourism can be, especially since the COVID-19 pandemic. So, that -- I don't think we should be trying to rely on that as a stable source of income for folks.

Response PH263-1 This comment indicating opposition to the Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Section 3.03, Air Quality, Section 3.08, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 3.17, Transportation, Appendix D, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's ability to reduce vehicular travel, to improve air quality through reduced emissions, and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through reduced vehicular travel. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, discussing the proposed Project's potential partnerships with and benefits to local businesses. As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, and Topical Response C, Project Features, the proposed Project creates a first/last mile transit link for residents and businesses within Chinatown while unifying and connecting communities through transit mobility access. This new mode of transportation will expand rider access to the regional transit system by attracting new visitors including Dodgers fans, and represents an opportunity for additional visitors along the proposed Project alignment, creating economic opportunities for local businesses, including shops and restaurants, through potential partnerships that drive customers to Chinatown and other businesses along the proposed Project alignment, which, consequently, adds revenues to these small businesses in the communities the proposed Project hopes to serve. In addition to providing service on game and special event days at Dodger Stadium and events at the Los Angeles State Historic Park, it is anticipated that the proposed Project would also provide daily service between 6:00am to 12:00am, for the surrounding communities, including Chinatown, Mission Junction, Elysian Park,

Solano Canyon, and the Los Angeles State Historic Park. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan. As detailed in Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR, tourism related ridership is estimated from an analysis prepared by HR&A, which determined the potential for the proposed Project to capture a share of the tourism attractions market in the County of Los Angeles.

Comment PH263-2 And regarding the quality of life issues, I think that takes precedence over trying to build, like, another LA Live that -- or, like, a super-mall that's on top of a hill that only out-of-towners are going to go to. And it's not going to help any of our community members at all.

So, I say, down with the gondola. It's dumb, and thank you very much for everyone that's here and providing comment.

Response PH263-2 This comment indicating opposition to the Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at LAUS, Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Dodger Stadium draws large regional crowds, with approximately 100 baseball games and other events each year, but there are no permanent transit connections to the venue. The vast majority of visitors drive their personal vehicles to access the venue. These vehicles create congestion on the surface streets leading up to and around Dodger Stadium, including Sunset Boulevard/Cesar E. Chavez from LAUS and throughout the surrounding communities. Given the capacity of the proposed Project's system, approximately 20 percent of the fans could take aerial transit connected to Metro's regional transit system. This would reduce vehicular congestion in and around Dodger Stadium, on neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways during game and special event days. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan. Refer to Topical Response G, No Improper Project Segmentation: The Proposed Project Is Intended to Create a Transit Connection from Metro's Union Station Transportation Hub via an Aerial Gondola System to the Dodger Stadium Property, for discussion of how the proposed Project does not include other development, and neither the Project Sponsor nor any other applicant has applied for other development unrelated to the existing stadium uses on the Dodger Stadium property.

Comment Letter PH264 - Paul Des Marais

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH264

Comment PH264-1 MR. DES MARAIS: Hello, can you hear me?

MS. SISCO: Yes.

MR. DES MARAIS: Hi. My name is Paul Des Marais, and I'm a resident of Lincoln Heights and a former resident of Solana Canyon, and I'm speaking today in opposition of the gondola.

Response PH264-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Comment PH264-2 It is a horrible idea, and as someone who is primarily a pedestrian, transit rider, and cyclist, getting to Elysian Park, LA State Historic Park, and around the Chinatown area is very difficult.

There are barely any bicycle lanes in Elysian Park, there are barely any bicycle lanes to get to LA State Historic Park, and like previous speakers have said, bus waiting times and Metro waiting times are insane.

Response PH264-2 Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at Los Angeles Union Station (LAUS), Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of how the proposed Project would include several sustainability features and open space enhancements, including pedestrian enhancements and drought tolerant landscaping, open space enhancements, including at the Alameda Triangle, the Los Angeles State Historic Park, and along the pedestrian pathway connecting Dodger Stadium Station and Dodger Stadium, and improved access to Los Angeles State Historic Park and Elysian Park. As discussed in Section 5.0, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR, the proposed Project would provide a mobility hub at the Dodger Stadium property to provide connectivity to Elysian Park, the City's second largest park, comprising 575 acres, and the surrounding communities. Outside of game day periods, passengers would be able to access a suite of first/last mile multi-modal options, such as a bike share program, and individual bike lockers to access Elysian Park and other nearby neighborhoods, including Solano Canyon.

Comment PH264-3 This project does not prioritize the residents of Chinatown. It does not prioritize the residents of surrounding neighborhoods. It's just a cash grab, and I believe that Metro should be spending their time, resources, and dollars on improving existing public transportation networks.

Response PH264-3 Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at LAUS, Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, and Topical Response C, Project Features, the proposed Project creates a first/last mile transit link for residents and businesses within Chinatown while unifying and connecting communities through transit mobility access. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities, including potential partnerships with and benefits to local businesses in Chinatown. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project.

Comment PH264-4 There needs to be more Dodger Express buses to the park, to Elysian Park, and if you look at any game day, or any day, really, in Elysian Park, it is a playground for cars. It is not a playground for people.

It's difficult to walk around Elysian Park without having cars speeding past you, speeding to get to the games, and there are barely any bike lanes. And just recently, the main road to get into the stadium was repaved. Not a single bike lane was added to that road. It's disgraceful.

Response PH264-4 This comment is noted and will be provided to the decision. Refer to Topical Response H, The Draft EIR Considered an Appropriate Range of Alternatives and Design Options, for discussion of how the Transportation Systems Management Alternative for an enhanced Dodger Stadium Express is unlikely to achieve the same level of ridership as the proposed Project, and otherwise fails to meet most of the Project Objectives which seek to achieve the proposed Project's underlying purpose of providing a permanent direct transit connection between LAUS and the Dodger Stadium property and improving connectivity for surrounding communities, including Chinatown, Mission Junction, Elysian Park, Solano Canyon, and the Los Angeles State Historic Park. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of how the proposed Project would include several sustainability features and open space

enhancements, including pedestrian enhancements and drought tolerant landscaping, open space enhancements, including at the Alameda Triangle, the Los Angeles State Historic Park, and along the pedestrian pathway connecting Dodger Stadium Station and Dodger Stadium, and improved access to Los Angeles State Historic Park and Elysian Park. As discussed in Section 5.0, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR, the proposed Project would provide a mobility hub at the Dodger Stadium property to provide connectivity to Elysian Park, the City's second largest park, comprising 575 acres, and the surrounding communities. Outside of game day periods, passengers would be able to access a suite of first/last mile multi-modal options, such as a bike share program, and individual bike lockers to access Elysian Park and other nearby neighborhoods, including Solano Canyon.

Comment PH264-5 Thank you very much, and I stand in solidarity with previous commenters.

Thank you.

Response PH264-5 This comment is noted and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Comment Letter PH265 - Vincent Montago

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH265

Comment PH265-1 MR. MONTAGO: Hello, can you hear me?

MS. SISCO: Yes, we can.

MR. MONTAGO: Hi. My name is Vincent Montago (phonetic). I am the son of Adele Montago (phonetic) and the grandson of Adele and John Denava (phonetic), former residents of the three communities of Palo Verde, La Loma, and Bishop that were violently destroyed by the Dodgers and the City of Los Angeles. I come before you today in full support of the Chinatown residents opposing the gondola.

For far too long, corporations and city entities have taken advantage of poor, brown, and black communities to benefit their own good. And the deal with the taking of our homes, the land was supposed to be taken away for housing, and instead was given to the Dodgers to build their empire that they have today on the backs of the poor people of Los Angeles. This must stop.

This led me into my position of today, which is an elected office, as I stand also from that point of view in opposition of it as Chinatown is being killed. It is not a dying industry.

The plans were put into place 20 years ago for most of our communities to be attacked, and they're being implemented today. And this is a tragedy, that public agencies like Metro would participate in the destructions of our communities when they are supposed to be here to uplift and support local community businesses and residents.

There has never been, in all the years of our families' trauma history, looking at over a 100 years of history with the city and public entities,

Response PH265-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Section 5.0, Corrections and Additions, of this Final EIR for a discussion of Chavez Ravine. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the Draft EIR addresses environmental justice, how the proposed Project supports Metro's goal of prioritizing equity opportunities and is designed to extend affordable, regional access and mobility options to the communities adjacent to the proposed Project alignment. Public outreach for the proposed Project was designed with environmental justice principles in mind. The proposed Project would not preclude development of uses including housing, grocery stores, and/or healthcare facilities in the surrounding communities, and would itself address a need for a permanent transit connection to one of the region's most visited venues and would alleviate

existing congestion on surrounding neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways, thereby reducing associated air pollution and improving safety. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities, including but not limited to sustainability features and open space enhancements, the Community Access Plan for fares, access to parks, mobility hubs, signage, utilization of local artists for site specific artwork at each station reflective of the unique neighborhood culture, design of each component of the proposed Project to complement and reflect the unique character of the surrounding neighborhood, the Business and Community Support Program during construction, and benefits to local businesses along the proposed Project alignment. As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, and Topical Response C, Project Features, the proposed Project creates a first/last mile transit link for residents and businesses within Chinatown while unifying and connecting communities through transit mobility access. This new mode of transportation will expand rider access to the regional transit system by attracting new visitors including Dodgers fans, and represents an opportunity for additional visitors along the proposed Project alignment, creating economic opportunities for local businesses, including shops and restaurants, through potential partnerships that drive customers to Chinatown and other businesses along the proposed Project alignment, which, consequently, adds revenues to these small businesses in the communities the proposed Project hopes to serve. The Project Sponsor would convene stakeholder groups to coordinate on issues related to proposed Project features. Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not exacerbate gentrification or result in displacement of residents in the surrounding neighborhoods and is consistent with Metro's considerations regarding gentrification and displacement.

Comment PH265-2 no good has ever come between the deal between the Dodgers and the City of LA.

In fact, we find that these are backdoor corrupt deals that don't benefit the public but benefit people like Frank McCourt, who has owned the parking lot and the stadium at one point in time. And that's their invested interest. So we strongly support the Chinatown residents and all the local --

Response PH265-2 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Section 5.0, Corrections and Additions, of this Final EIR for a discussion of Chavez Ravine. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project. This comment raises issues that were litigated and decided in *The California Endowment v. Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority*, Case No. 22STCP01030

(Jan. 9, 2023, Order Denying Petition for Writ of Mandate). There, the Los Angeles Superior Court upheld Metro's sole source determination for the proposed Project.

Comment Letter PH266 - Melissa Archiga

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH266

Comment PH266-1 MS. ARECHIGA: Hello?

MS. SISCO: Hi. We can hear you.

MS. ARECHIGA: Okay. All right, here we go.

My name is Melissa Archiga, and I am here today before you as a representative of the surviving families that were violently evicted from Palo Verde, La Loma, and Bishop, three Mexican indigenous communities that were destroyed to build the Dodgers Stadium.

Response PH266-1 Refer to Section 5.0, Corrections and Additions, of this Final EIR for a discussion of Chavez Ravine.

Comment PH266-2 I am here today to oppose the gondola project from Union Station to Dodger Stadium. While this may be exciting to film, it is a sign of change and change that is not inclusive to all, specifically people of color.

The Dodgers Corporation and the City of Los Angeles have a long partnership together working to destroy and exploit communities of color. The gondola represents gentrification, the destruction of not only our communities, but the environment and our beloved wildlife.

Response PH266-2 Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not exacerbate gentrification or result in displacement of residents in the surrounding neighborhoods and is consistent with Metro's considerations regarding gentrification and displacement. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the Draft EIR addresses environmental justice. Refer to Section 5.0, Corrections and Additions, of this Final EIR, for a discussion of Chavez Ravine. As discussed in Sections 3.01, Aesthetics, 3.04, Biological Resources, 3.05, Cultural Resources, 3.06, Energy, 3.07, Geology and Soils, 3.09, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, 3.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, 3.11, Land Use and Planning, 3.13, Noise, 3.15, Public Services, 3.16, Parks and Recreational Facilities, 3.17, Transportation, 3.18, Tribal Cultural Resources, 3.19, Utilities and Service Systems, 3.20, Wildfire, and 5.0, Other CEQA Considerations, the proposed Project would have less than significant operational impacts.

Comment PH266-3 The gondola project is no different than the deal that was made to take away our families' generational wealth by destroying the three communities to build Dodgers Stadium.

Response PH266-3 Refer to Section 5.0, Corrections and Additions, of this Final EIR for a discussion of Chavez Ravine.

Comment PH266-4 The Dodgers and the Los Angeles City Council set to build the gondola in the middle of our communities, and this would only benefit the Los Angeles Dodgers. Our residents and small business owners will suffer with this so-called revitalization project that is gentrification and a long-term that leaves our most valuable community members displaced with no benefits.

Response PH266-4 Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not exacerbate gentrification or result in displacement of residents in the surrounding neighborhoods and is consistent with Metro's considerations regarding gentrification and displacement. Also refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of how the Project Sponsor would create a Business and Community Support Program to assist local businesses financially affected by proposed Project construction activities. The proposed Project would provide numerous benefits to local businesses in El Pueblo, Chinatown, and other areas along the proposed Project alignment, including through potential partnerships with these businesses as well as by providing an accessible and affordable mobility option for employees and area residents. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project.

Comment PH266-5 The history between the Los Angeles Dodgers and the Los Angeles City Council has left our communities in worse condition from the deals of the 1950s, when our homes and the three communities were destroyed. And the lies that were told to the public of building public housing today leave us with the current conditions of our unhoused and affordability crisis that affect us all today.

It is a win-win for the Dodgers, and that has been since Black Friday, May 8, 1959, when our families were dragged out. It's time to put a stop the Dodgers Corporation of exploiting the people of Los Angeles.

I strongly urge that everyone in the public and elected officials oppose this project, as it will damage -- have damaging effects that will last for generations on generations.

Response PH266-5 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Response PH266-2 through PH266-4 for discussion of how the proposed Project will not exacerbate gentrification or result in displacement of residents in the surrounding neighborhoods and would provide benefits to local communities.

Comment Letter PH267- Rafael.pdf

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH267

Comment PH267-1 PARTICIPANT: Can you hear me?

MS. SISCO: Yes, we can.

PARTICIPANT: Hi. I'm Rafael. I'm bred and born Los Angeles and long-time Dodger fan.

Like, I would love to get to Dodger Stadium, like, fast and, you know, not deal with traffic, and it be environmentally friendly, and I've taken the Metro Express. However, I don't think that this gondola is the best way of going about it.

Response PH267-1 This comment provides a general introduction to the comments raised in this letter. Responses to the comments contained in this letter are provided below in Responses P267-2 through P267-4.

Comment PH267-2 Number one, you know, besides all the comments that have already been said by people of the community, the one thing for me is this is a pet project and, you know, a way for Frank McCourt to make money off Dodger fans after he, you know, badly, you know, managed the Dodger organization.

Response PH267-2 This comment is noted and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project.

Comment PH267-3 Number two, I don't think this is going to be safe at all, and I'm not talking about earthquakes or anything like that. I mean, those who have been to Dodger games, especially if you sit in the, you know, right and left of the pavilion, you know people get drunk. There's been fights after games.

You put them in a gondola, that one fight in a gondola, I mean, how is that going to get broken up, you know, when you're stuck in midair for, what, seven minutes? Or maybe three and a half, if you go from Dodger Stadium to Chinatown and -- or Union Station? That's a long time to wait for security.

Response PH267-3 Refer to Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR and Topical Response J, Gondola Design and Operations, for discussion of how the proposed Project would be equipped with security features and the Emergency Operations Plan for the proposed

Project would include emergency response protocols and safety procedures developed in conjunction with the operator, system provider, and local authorities.

Comment PH267-4 I oppose this, and I think Metro can look into other resources of getting people into Dodger Stadium.

That's all I have.

Response PH267-4 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response H, The Draft EIR Considered an Appropriate Range of Alternatives and Design Options and Section 4.0, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR, for a discussion of the Draft EIR's consideration of a range of reasonable alternatives pursuant to CEQA.

Comment Letter PH268 - Ray

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH268

Comment PH268-1 PARTICIPANT: Good evening, everyone. My name is Ray, and I'm with Anchor Church of DTLA.

First, I just want to say, go Dodgers. We have the best baseball franchise in LA history, and now that we've settled that, I want to be clear on something else.

A lot of people are under the impression that the churches as a whole aren't concerned with climate change. However, any Bible based church knows that God cares deeply about our climate.

For instance, Revelation, Section 11, verse 18 reads, the nations are very angry and your wrath has come. And the time of the dead, they should be judged, and you should reward your servants, the prophets and the saints and those who fear your name, small and great, and should destroy those who destroy the earth.

We want to see development at the civic level that endorses positive climate change and zero emission. Public transit shows people at this city not only have the -- not only have great baseball, by the way, and the greatest sports franchise in all of baseball, great people and a great God, but genuine care for this earth. Because after all, this is His earth, too.

Thank you and God bless you.

Response PH268-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Section 3.03, Air Quality, Section 3.08, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 3.17, Transportation, Appendix D, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's ability to reduce vehicular travel, to improve air quality through reduced emissions, and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through reduced vehicular travel.

Comment Letter PH269 - Carlos Gomez

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH269

Comment PH269-1 MR. GOMEZ: Hello, hi. My name is Carlos Gomez. Thank you for taking my call.

So, I've thought about this long and hard. I am a Dodgers season ticket holder, but, you know, I am a consumer of Chinatown and surrounding areas, and, you know, I've got a chance to talk to locals and some friends about this.

But the reality is, LA's a city of champions. It's, you know, filled with championship in every single major sport. You know, we're going to be the home to the 2026 World Cup, the 2028 Olympics. You know, let that sink in. We're not your typical city.

We're LA. We deserve the absolute best. Most stadiums have some form of train or some form of trams or some, you know, for transportation to the stadium.

Response PH269-1 This comment is noted and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address and environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Comment PH269-2 We have two buses that leave from Union Station that depart every 15 minutes. Dodger Stadium is iconic, right? It's a rich culture that's bigger than just Chinatown. It represents us as a whole. Right?

We, you know, we owe it to Dodger fans and even visiting guests to provide them with, you know, best possible game experience which, you know, obviously, includes less traffic. This gondola project will set us apart from basically the rest and makes us that much better.

Response PH269-2 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response M, Comparable Urban Aerial Transit Systems, for discussion of comparable aerial transit systems in cities around the world and their operations, integration with nearby residential and open space uses, community benefits, promotion of public art and collaborations with local artists, and evidence that such systems can reduce violent crime in nearby areas and promote a sense of security compared to other modes of public transportation.

Comment PH269-3 On another note, you know, Dodger Stadium is no longer just a baseball stadium. You know, we've had the Fluffy Show, the concert, Elton John.

You know, I am a Chinatown consumer, and the reality is that outside of a few breweries and a few restaurants in the neighborhood, it's sad, but Chinatown's a ghost town. You know, it's filled with small shops that come and go.

I really believe this project would rejuvenate the city, eliminate traffic, and really, you know, keep LA at the very top of the sports industry.

Response PH269-3 Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities, including potential partnerships with and benefits to local businesses in Chinatown.

Comment PH269-4 You know, like it, love it, it's coming. You know, I support this gondola project 1,000 percent. Go Dodgers.

Response PH269-4 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter PH270 - Tom Savio

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH270

Comment PH270-1 MR. SAVIO: Okay, can you hear me?

MS. SISCO: Yes, we can.

MR. SAVIO: Okay. I'm Tom Savio, Executive Director of the Los Angeles Union Station Historical Society. This is our opinion.

We oppose billionaire Frank McCourt's racist gondola real estate scheme because it's obviously a Metro sweetheart deal after McCourt paid millions of dollars to Metro's political campaigns, this according to state records.

Response PH270-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project.

Comment PH270-2 Metro's Cory Zelmer and company falsified the gondola's Draft Environmental Report by not mentioning that the world's busiest helicopter airport is just a half a mile from the gondola's Union Station terminal, which is –should the 13-story towers and cable be struck by a helicopter, many of Union Station's historical architecture and its trains and passengers could be harmed.

Response PH270-2 The Draft EIR addresses potential airport hazards in Section 3.09 Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 5.5.5, Heliports, in Section 5.0, Other CEQA Considerations, and in Appendix O, Airspace Analysis Technical Memo. The determination on page 3.9-30 of the Draft EIR – that the proposed Project alignment is not in an area covered by an airport land use plan nor located within two miles of a “public airport” – is based on facts and the specific language of CEQA’s thresholds of significance for this issue. This threshold is stated in the Draft EIR under Impact HAZ-5, which asks the question: “For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard...?” The Draft EIR concludes that the proposed Project alignment is not within two miles of a “public use airport” as that term is defined under CEQA. Regardless of any distinction between heliports and airports, the Draft EIR immediately follows this conclusion with a clear disclosure that the city-owned Jay Stephen Hooper Heliport is within 0.38 miles of the proposed

Project. According to the LAPD and AirNav.com¹, the Hooper Heliport is a city-owned, private use facility. As a private use facility, it does not meet the “public use airport” description in the CEQA threshold. Note that the determination is based on the distinction between public and private facilities, not the definition of “airport.” Thus, comparison to federal or state case law or regulations relying on a different definition of “airport” is irrelevant to the analysis required by CEQA. The analysis in Appendix O, Airspace Analysis Technical Memo, of the Draft EIR, is based on FAA analysis standards, concludes with substantial evidence that construction and operation of the proposed Project is clear of the airspace associated with the existing heliports, including the Hooper Heliport, in the proposed Project’s vicinity. As such, no adverse effects related to aeronautical hazards are predicted based on these findings, and no notification is required for the proposed Project construction unless the FAA makes a specific request to the Project Sponsor. In addition, refer to Appendix I, Firefighting Helicopter Response Memo, of this Final EIR, for discussion of how helicopter flight paths would not be impeded as a result of the proposed Project.

Comment PH270-3 Union Station architecture will also be negatively impacted by the gondola's modernistic carnival ride architecture that's in front of Union Station.

Response PH270-3 Refer to Section 3.01, Aesthetics, and Appendix C, Visual Impact Assessment, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the aesthetic impacts of the proposed Project, which would be less than significant. Refer to Appendix H.1, Memo Regarding Preparation of KOPs, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the methodology used to prepare the visual simulations included in Appendix C, Visual Impact Assessment, of the Draft EIR. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, discussing how the proposed Project’s design takes cues from the immediate neighborhood culture, including how each component of the proposed Project would be designed to complement and reflect the unique character of the surrounding area. As discussed in Section 3.01, Aesthetics, of the Draft EIR, the Alameda Station’s platform and canopy would include a light color scheme and warm tones, which has been designed to complement and reflect the materiality of the existing mix of adobe buildings, large Victorian commercial blocks, and Spanish Revival style buildings within the El Pueblo and Olvera Street area. In addition, the “shell” roof design provides a visual lightness with an integrated perforation pattern motif based upon the arched forms that mark openings and entries to Union Station, Pico House, and other historic buildings within El Pueblo. The proposed Project would also integrate physical and visual connections between the proposed Alameda Station and existing adjacent development, such as the new pedestrian plaza at El Pueblo. The new pedestrian plaza at El Pueblo would be open to the public and would extend view corridors between the proposed Alameda Station and existing development in a way that creates an observed visual unity.

Comment PH270-4 We believe the real purpose of the gondola is to allow McCourt to build a high-end real estate development on Dodger Stadium's parking lots that he still controls, thus

putting the local, low income minority community out of their homes by raising rents through gentrification.

Response PH270-4 Refer to Section 2.1, Overview of the Project, of the Draft EIR, discussing how the proposed Project would operate daily to serve existing residents, workers, park users, and visitors to Los Angeles. As discussed on page 2-42, in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the proposed Project would provide service to all pre-season, regular season, and post-season Los Angeles Dodger games and any special events (e.g., concerts, the Los Angeles Marathon) at the Dodger Stadium property. The proposed Project would also provide service to events at the Los Angeles State Historic Park. Refer to Topical Response G, No Improper Project Segmentation: The Proposed Project Is Intended to Create a Transit Connection from Metro's Union Station Transportation Hub via an Aerial Gondola System to the Dodger Stadium Property, for discussion of how the proposed Project solely proposes an aerial gondola system. The proposed Project does not include other development, and neither the Project Sponsor nor any other applicant has applied for other development unrelated to the existing stadium uses on the Dodger Stadium property. Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not exacerbate gentrification or result in displacement of residents in the surrounding neighborhoods and is consistent with Metro's considerations regarding gentrification and displacement.

Comment PH270-5 Part and parcel of the gondola project is Metro's plan to use \$20 million in federal funds to build a water fountain next to the gondola's Union Station terminal to cool riders while they wait for their gondola rides in the hot season. It's crazy for a new water fountain to be built when LA is experiencing its worst drought in history, which probably will go on for decades.

Response PH270-5 Refer to Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of Metro's LAUS Forecourt and Esplanade Improvements Project, which is not part of the proposed Project. The proposed Project does not include a water fountain in the planned LAUS Forecourt. As described in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, page 2-49, the proposed Project includes several sustainability and water efficiency measures, including drought tolerant landscaping and use of reclaimed water for irrigation where available.

Comment PH270-6 Furthermore, McCourt's gondola will trample Los Angeles State Historic Park.

Response PH270-6 As discussed in Sections 3.01, Aesthetics, 3.04, Biological Resources, 3.05, Cultural Resources, 3.06, Energy, 3.07, Geology and Soils, 3.09, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, 3.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, 3.11, Land Use and Planning, 3.13, Noise, 3.15, Public Services, 3.16, Parks and Recreational Facilities, 3.17, Transportation, 3.18, Tribal Cultural Resources, 3.19, Utilities and Service Systems, 3.20, Wildfire, and 5.0, Other CEQA Considerations, the proposed Project would have

less than significant operational impacts, including to Los Angeles State Historic Park. Refer to Section 2.0, Project Description, Section 3.16, Parks and Recreational Facilities, and Section 5.0, Other CEQA Considerations, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the footprint of the proposed Project in the Los Angeles State Historic Park. With the small footprint of the proposed Project's Chinatown/State Park Station, and the required clearances and the height at which the cabins would cross over the Park, the ability to use the vast majority of the Park would not be affected by the proposed Project. Refer to Response S2-4 for additional discussion regarding the ability of uses to continue at the Park. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project.

Comment Letter PH271 - Lisa Duardo

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH271

Comment PH271-1 MS. DUARDO: Hi. My name is Lisa Duardo, and I'm born in raised in Los Angeles.

I responded to the Draft EIR earlier via letter back on January the 17th, and I would like to add on to the public record these other points that the Draft EIR either dismisses or omitted.

Response PH271-1 This comment provides a general introduction to the comments raised in this letter. Responses to the comments contained in this letter are provided below in Responses PH271-2.

Comment PH271-2 The Rim of the Valley Corridor Preservation Act was passed by Congress, the 117th Congress. Adam Schiff introduced the bill, and he just spoke about it at P22's Celebration Life at the Greek theater this past weekend.

What the Rim of the Valley Corridor Preservation Act does is it preserves open space for people and for wildlife from the Santa Monica mountains, which include Griffith Park and Elysian Valley Park, to the foothills of the San Gabriel Mountains, which are the Repetto Hills around Highland Park through South Pasadena, Pasadena, connects to the San Gabriel Mountains and the National Angeles Mountains, the Verdugo Mountains, which then connect to the Pacific Rim, which go to Canada and Mexico.

It creates a green wildlife corridor for animals so that they can coexist in our LA environment, and one of the lines on the points of this Congressional Act is that the Rim of the Valley unit would include habitat for iconic wildlife such as the mountain lion, the bobcat, the fox badger, the coyote, and the deer, as well as some endangered species of our area.

The LA Rim --

Response PH271-2 In response to comments regarding the Rim of the Valley Trail Corridor, an addition to the Draft EIR has been provided for the Rim of the Valley Trail Corridor Master Plan. Refer to Section 5.0, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the Rim of the Valley Trail Corridor Master Plan. As noted therein, while the proposed Project is located within the boundaries of the Rim of the Valley Trail Corridor, the proposed Project would have no impact on the Rim of the Valley Trail, which is located north of Elysian Park, across Interstate I-5. The proposed Project would provide access to and connectivity between El Pueblo, Los Angeles State Historic Park, and Elysian Park.

Comment Letter PH272 - Michael Calareza

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH272

Comment PH272-1 MR. CALAREZA: Hello?

MS. SISCO: Hi.

MR. CALAREZA: Hi, yes. My name is Michael Calareza (phonetic). I'm a resident of Lincoln Heights, a stakeholder in this project.

I frequent the state park often. I go to Dodger games, and North Broadway is continually impacted by traffic on Dodger days. However, if Metro wanted to be pedestrian friendly, it would do more.

Metro is not pedestrian friendly. It placates to the political powers or, in this case, the money, pro quid pro -- quid pro quo, I guess, is what's going on from McCourt and his political contributions.

Response PH272-1 Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of how the proposed Project would include several sustainability features and open space enhancements, including pedestrian enhancements and drought tolerant landscaping, open space enhancements, including at the Alameda Triangle, the Los Angeles State Historic Park, and along the pedestrian pathway connecting Dodger Stadium Station and Dodger Stadium, and improved access to Los Angeles State Historic Park and Elysian Park. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project.

Comment PH272-2 So, this is the fast track for him to take advantage of public funds for his commercial interests at the expense of public transportation needs.

Response PH272-2 Refer to Response PH272-1 for discussion of the Project Sponsor and the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding. Refer to Topical Response G, No Improper Project Segmentation: The Proposed Project Is Intended to Create a Transit Connection from Metro's Union Station Transportation Hub via an Aerial Gondola System to the Dodger Stadium Property for a discussion of how the proposed Project solely proposes an aerial gondola system.

Comment PH272-3 There should be a sidewalk and stairs that gets people from North Broadway up into Dodger Stadium. Simple, common sense things for pedestrians, like safe sidewalks.

Response PH272-3 Refer to Section 5.0, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR, for discussion of a Pedestrian Enhancement Alternative to the proposed Project in which the proposed Project would not be constructed, and instead an enhanced pedestrian walkway and vertical circulation elements would be constructed to improve the safety, comfort, and accessibility of walking between the Metro L Line (Gold) Station and Dodger Stadium. While this alternative would provide improved pedestrian connections compared to existing conditions, the 25 minute plus travel time from the Metro L Line (Gold) Station to the location of the proposed Dodger Stadium Station would be at least nine times greater than the three minute travel time between those two locations with the proposed Project, and this alternative would be unlikely to attract substantially more people to walk to Dodger Stadium compared to existing conditions given the travel time and the physical exertion. This alternative was considered but dismissed from further detailed analysis because it did not meet most of the basic objectives of the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response B, Ridership Model; Queueing at Stations and Pre-game and Post-game Transportation, for discussion of how while there are some game attendees who currently choose to walk to and from Dodger Stadium, the walk would take approximately five to eight times as long as the ride on the proposed Project, and the path would be on a steep downward grade which does not meet Americans with Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines, and would be challenging for children, seniors, or people with limited physical mobility.

Comment PH272-4 Transportation should be 21st Century transportation. Gondolas? What's the capacity of a gondola ride? How long is it going to take? How many dozens of people are you expecting to stand in line to take a gondola ride? Drunk after a Dodger game? Before a Dodger game? Come on, where's the common sense? This lacks it.

Response PH272-4 Although forms of aerial transit technology have been available and utilized for the last 100 years, modern applications have seen the evolution of the technology as a feasible mode of urban rapid transit. As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the proposed Project would have a maximum capacity of approximately 5,000 people per hour per direction, and the travel time from LAUS to Dodger Stadium would be approximately seven minutes. Also refer to Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR and Topical Response J, Gondola Design and Operations, for discussion of how the proposed Project would be equipped with security features and the Emergency Operations Plan for the proposed Project would include emergency response protocols and safety procedures developed in conjunction with the operator, system provider, and local authorities. As discussed in Appendix D of Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, of the Draft EIR, a large capacity for a new mode of transportation in Los Angeles will allow passengers to see the potential for other emerging innovations to be integrated into the public transit system. The proposed Project would thus exemplify how alternative

transportation technology can be integrated into a city's transportation infrastructure and will show that new technology can successfully operate in concert with other existing modes of transportation. Refer to Topical Response B, Ridership Model; Queueing at Stations and Pre-game and Post-game Transportation, for discussion of the proposed Project's ridership model which is based on extensive data sources and assumptions validated by data, and the management of queueing at stations, and pre-game and post-game transportation. Post-game queues at Dodger Stadium were estimated based on assumptions about the departure patterns and estimates of walk times from the various seating areas within the stadium. Those seated the furthest away from the Dodger Stadium Station would take more time to arrive at the Station, much like how it is currently for passengers riding the Dodger Stadium Express. In addition, passengers who would rather not join the line immediately to board the proposed Project in the post-game period could visit some of the entertainment amenities at the stadium, including at the Centerfield Plaza. The post-game/event queue for the proposed Project would be constantly moving as cabins would depart every 23 seconds.

Comment PH272-5 It's political. It stinks of corruption. There should be no public funds for this. Shame on Metro for even putting this in front of people and trying to fast track it.

Response PH272-5 Refer to Response PH272-1 for discussion of the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding. . This comment raises issues that were litigated and decided in *The California Endowment v. Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority*, Case No. 22STCP01030 (Jan. 9, 2023, Order Denying Petition for Writ of Mandate). There, the Los Angeles Superior Court upheld Metro's sole source determination for the proposed Project. Refer to Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's public outreach and opportunity for public testimony during the Draft EIR public review period. Refer to Appendix A, Scoping Report, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of outreach and community engagement during the Draft EIR scoping period. Metro sought to engage the community in each stage of the environmental review process.

Comment Letter PH273 - Brenda Miramontes

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH273

Comment PH273-1 Can anyone hear me?

MS. SISCO: Yes.

MS. MIRAMONTES: Okay, hi.

I am in today to support the gondola project. I am a resident of the community, and I am also a big Dodger fan.

Response PH273-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment PH273-2 I believe that we're all talking about everything but the pollution. And I believe that that is the most important thing because right now, we have buses and, you know, cars, and all that, and that's just affecting our pollution even more, so why not try anything new?

Response PH273-2 Refer to Section 3.03, Air Quality, Section 3.08, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 3.17, Transportation, Appendix D, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's ability to reduce vehicular travel, to improve air quality through reduced emissions, and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through reduced vehicular travel.

Comment PH273-3 We are already a city of tourism, so it's not going to affect other -- make any, like, anything worse. I think it's just going to make it better for the Chinatown community. Also, like, we're going to get more tourists, you know, to come in and shop more for them, and it's going to benefit them at the end. So, I'm all in for it.

Thank you. Good night.

Response PH273-3 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter PH274 - Maria Manzanilla

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH274

Comment PH274-1 MS. MANZANILLA: Hello? Hello, can you hear me?

MS. SISCO: Hi, yes.

MS. MANZANILLA: Yes? This is Maria Sanchez Manzanilla, and I'm calling just to say that I oppose this gondola very, very strongly.

And I am talking for my community, William Mead, and all the community surrounding the park, LA State Historic Park. And all the communities, William Mead, Chinatown, Solana Canyon, Lincoln Heights, Highland Park, and all of us oppose this horrible gondola. This project is not good for our communities.

Response PH274-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at LAUS, Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Dodger Stadium draws large regional crowds, with approximately 100 baseball games and other events each year, but there are no permanent transit connections to the venue. The vast majority of visitors drive their personal vehicles to access the venue. These vehicles create congestion on the surface streets leading up to and around Dodger Stadium, including Sunset Boulevard/Cesar E. Chavez from LAUS and throughout the surrounding communities. Given the capacity of the proposed Project's system, approximately 20 percent of the fans could take aerial transit connected to Metro's regional transit system. This would reduce vehicular congestion in and around Dodger Stadium, on neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways during game and special event days. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan.

Comment PH274-2 And we know that billionaire Frank McCourt is going to get his money back when, after he raise \$300,000 -- \$300 million and leases that there because he didn't even ask the communities for doing this horrible gondola.

And I think this community, this serves them some kind of, you know -- they just deserve some respect because he didn't ask us for, you know, for anything. He just said he was going to start this project, and we oppose it.

Response PH274-2 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project.

Comment PH274-3 We are opposed to this gondola because it's not good for us. It will destroy our park, LA State Historic Park, and a lot of very bad things will happen to our communities in downtown LA.

Response PH274-3 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at LAUS, Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, Section 3.16, Parks and Recreational Facilities, and Section 5.0, Other CEQA Considerations, of the Draft EIR, the Chinatown/State Park Station would have a footprint of 2,195 square feet in the Los Angeles State Historic Park (~.1% of the total 32-acre park), and the station canopy would have an overhang of 9,320 square feet over the park. The proposed Project alignment crosses over the westernmost edge of the Los Angeles State Historic Park, adjacent to the existing Metro L Line (Gold) and the associated overhead catenary system. The proposed Project's required aerial clearance would be located above approximately 59,470 square feet of the total 32-acre park, plus an Additional Separation Buffer. With the required clearances and the height at which the cabins would cross over the Los Angeles State Historic Park, the ability to use the vast majority of the Park for kite flying, special events (e.g., concerts, craft fairs, partnership events, 5K/10K runs, workshops, cultural festivals, and the farmers' market), and other passive recreational opportunities (e.g., picnicking, jogging, walking, and informal play) would not be affected by the proposed Project. Refer to Response S2-4 for additional discussion regarding the ability of uses to continue at the Park.

Comment PH274-4 And all this is only lies because what happens if one of these gondolas falls on top of the head of people who is running in the park?

Response PH274-4 Refer to Topical Response M, Comparable Urban Aerial Transit Systems, discussing how, like the proposed Project, comparable aerial transit systems in cities around the world are integrated with their surrounding urban environments. In particular, comparable aerial transit systems in other locations demonstrate that such systems can operate safely, efficiently, and in concert with nearby residential and open space uses, including parks and other recreational facilities. Refer to Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR and Topical Response J, Gondola Design and Operations, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the safety features of the proposed Project and how aerial transit systems such as the proposed Project represent one of the safest modes of transportation relative to other forms of transit.

Comment Letter PH275 - Jennifer Martinez

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH275

Comment PH275-1 MS. MARTINEZ: Hi. Can you hear me?

MS. SISCO: Yes.

MS. MARTINEZ: Okay. Thank you for giving me a second chance because I was left off last time. My name is Jennifer Martinez. I'm a resident of Echo Park, and I oppose the gondola project.

Response PH275-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Comment PH275-2 And I am grateful for this session because I have learned a lot, and I also work providing sessions like this, so I appreciate the effort. But I have some common sense concerns about the project, and what strikes me from this discussion is, and what has bothered me about the project is the process. This is a missed opportunity for a wealthy member of Los Angeles to come into a community and create opportunities, perhaps, for that community.

So, my biggest problem is that the public sessions, which I know are part of the process, have not been made easily accessible to all in the community.

Response PH275-2 Refer to Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's public outreach and opportunity for public testimony during the Draft EIR public review period. Refer to Appendix A, Scoping Report, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of outreach and community engagement during the Draft EIR scoping period. Metro sought to engage the community in each stage of the environmental review process. Metro engaged the public in decision making for the proposed Project beginning with the public scoping period for the Draft EIR in October 2020 to receive public comment on the proposed Project's scope of environmental review under CEQA. In June 2021, the Project Sponsor conducted two virtual public outreach meetings. The input from the public, including local community stakeholders, as well as from agencies, organizations, and interested parties, during this period led directly to changes to the proposed Project to incorporate public feedback, including selecting the proposed Project's alignment and the location of Chinatown / State Park Station, as discussed in Section 5.0, Other CEQA Considerations, of the Draft EIR. The Draft EIR was released on October 17, 2022, for a 60-day public review period, which Metro extended an additional 30 days for a 90-day public review period ending on January 17, 2023. Eight public meetings were held immediately preceding, during, and

immediately following the Draft EIR public review period, with four held in-person in the Project area at Los Angeles Union Station and Cathedral High School, and four held virtually via Zoom webinar, to accommodate agencies, interested parties, and organizations who were unable to attend the meetings held in person. Project materials and information were provided at both the in-person meetings and on Metro's website in English, Spanish, Chinese (Traditional), and Chinese (Simplified). Interpretation was provided in English, Spanish, Mandarin, and Cantonese during the eight public meetings, with interpretation provided in Taishanese during the final two public meetings.

Comment PH275-3 And we're hearing this evening about concerns about businesses in Chinatown. So, how many restaurants and halls and public spaces are there where LA Art and Frank McCourt could have held sessions to create actual -- to just good faith, you know, action? And I mean, not like -- I mean, two things about that.

One is, I don't understand why Frank McCourt and LA Art are not courting the business owners and the residents of Chinatown. They have the capacity. They have --

Response PH275-3 Refer to Response PH275- 2 for discussion of the proposed Project's public outreach during each stage of the environmental review process. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, discussing the proposed Project's potential partnerships with and benefits to local businesses. As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, and Topical Response C, Project Features, the proposed Project creates a first/last mile transit link for residents and businesses within Chinatown while unifying and connecting communities through transit mobility access. This new mode of transportation will expand rider access to the regional transit system by attracting new visitors including Dodgers fans, and represents an opportunity for additional visitors along the proposed Project alignment, creating economic opportunities for local businesses, including shops and restaurants, through potential partnerships that drive customers to Chinatown and other businesses along the proposed Project alignment, which, consequently, adds revenues to these small businesses in the communities the proposed Project hopes to serve. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project.

Comment Letter PH276 - Mary

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH276

Comment PH276-1 PARTICIPANT: Hello.

MS. SISCO: Hi. We can hear you.

PARTICIPANT: My name is Mary, and I'm a senior, and I want to make a comment about the last meeting that Metro had.

I believe Metro should have had taken better control of the meeting since the protesters had all the control with the disruption, the profanity, making people feel threatened, scared of the situation happening in front of them.

We should all feel safe no matter where we are, as well as be able to speak and share our support for the gondola.

Thank you so much.

Response PH276-1 Refer to Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's Draft EIR public review period, including the January 12 public hearing. Metro sought to engage with stakeholders in neighborhoods along the proposed Project alignment in each stage of the environmental review process. In light of the disruptions at the January 12, 2023, public hearing, Metro provided a fourth public hearing by way of a virtual public hearing held on February 8, 2023. Verbal comments made at the virtual February 8, 2023 public hearing were deemed timely submitted for the purposes of the Draft EIR public review period.

Comment Letter PH277 - Marlo Cervantes

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH277

Comment PH277-1 MR. M. CERVANTES: Hello?

MS. SISCO: Hi, we can hear you.

MR. M. CERVANTES: Yes. My name is Marlow Cervantes (phonetic), and I am a LA citizen born and raised, and I support the Dodger Stadium gondola.

My neighborhood deserves less traffic, less pollution for clean air with more transportation options. I hope that this is a better and for our future for us and our nation to come. Thank you.

Response PH277-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter PH278 - Ali Rubinfeld

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH278

Comment PH278-1 MS. RUBINFELD: Hi. My name is Ali Rubinfeld. I'm a resident of Solana Canyon. I don't think there are people in Los Angeles who want to alleviate traffic to Dodger Stadium more than the residents of Solana Canyon, but this is just not the way.

This is a transparent power grab with the long-term goal of creating a high end development and shopping center at Dodger Stadium that does not meet the needs of a community currently living in the area.

Response PH278-1 Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at Los Angeles Union Station (LAUS), Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Given the capacity of the proposed Project's system, approximately 20 percent of the fans could take aerial transit connected to Metro's regional transit system. This would reduce vehicular congestion in and around Dodger Stadium, on neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways during game and special event days. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response G, No Improper Project Segmentation: The Proposed Project Is Intended to Create a Transit Connection from Metro's Union Station Transportation Hub via an Aerial Gondola System to the Dodger Stadium Property for a discussion of how the proposed Project solely proposes an aerial gondola system. The proposed Project does not include other development, and neither the Project Sponsor nor any other applicant has applied for other development unrelated to the existing stadium uses on the Dodger Stadium property.

Comment PH278-2 There are so many ways to make Dodger Stadium more accessible that will not cause more harm to communities still healing from the violent taking of Chavez Ravine.

Response PH278-2 Refer to Topical Response H, The Draft EIR Considered an Appropriate Range of Alternatives and Design Options, and Section 4.0, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR, for a discussion of the Draft EIR's consideration of a range of reasonable alternatives pursuant to CEQA. Improving the connection between LAUS and Dodger Stadium via the proposed Project would provide the quickest, most frequent, and highest capacity transit connection for the greatest number of riders traveling to Dodger Stadium to

have the most travel time competitive transit trips from more locations in the region. Refer to Section 5.0, Corrections and Additions, of this Final EIR for a discussion of Chavez Ravine.

Comment PH278-3 This gondola will completely change the socioeconomic landscape of Chinatown, which is one of the last affordable neighborhoods left in Los Angeles, and people have been fighting to keep their homes there.

This gondola will make Los Angeles a less affordable and less livable city and is completely ignoring the true needs of the community. It's here for a profit motive.

We need a grocery store. We don't need a gondola. Thank you.

Response PH278-3 Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not displace housing or prevent planned housing and how the proposed Project will not result in displacement of residents in the surrounding neighborhoods. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for a discussion of how the Draft EIR addresses environmental justice and how the proposed Project would not preclude development of uses including housing, grocery stores, and/or healthcare facilities in the surrounding communities, and would itself address a need for a permanent transit connection to one of the region's most visited venues and would alleviate existing congestion on surrounding neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways, thereby reducing associated air pollution and improving safety. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the potential added benefits from the proposed Project, including potential partnerships with and benefits to local businesses in Chinatown. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project.

Comment Letter PH279 - Erik Van Breene

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH279

Comment PH279-1 Good evening, Erik Van Breene from the Los Angeles Conservancy. The Conservancy submitted written comments prior to the January 17 deadline.

We have real concerns about the project in its current form and its impacts to Chinatown, Union Station, El Pueblo, and Los Angeles State Historic Park.

Response PH279-1 As discussed in Sections 3.01, Aesthetics, 3.04, Biological Resources, 3.05, Cultural Resources, 3.06, Energy, 3.07, Geology and Soils, 3.09, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, 3.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, 3.11, Land Use and Planning, 3.13, Noise, 3.15, Public Services, 3.16, Parks and Recreational Facilities, 3.17, Transportation, 3.18, Tribal Cultural Resources, 3.19, Utilities and Service Systems, 3.20, Wildfire, and 5.0, Other CEQA Considerations, the proposed Project would have less than significant operational impacts, including to Chinatown, LAUS, El Pueblo, and the Los Angeles State Historic Park. Additionally, refer to Topical Response M, Comparable Urban Aerial Transit Systems, discussing how, like the proposed Project, comparable aerial transit systems in cities around the world are integrated with their surrounding urban environments. In particular, comparable aerial transit systems in other locations demonstrate that such systems can operate safely, efficiently, and in concert with nearby residential and open space uses, including parks and other recreational facilities.

Comment PH279-2 Additionally, we have concerns about the proposed transfer of public lands to private hands.

Response PH279-2 Refer to Section 2.5, Proposed Project Alignment and Components, with supporting data provided in Appendix Q, Proposed Alignment Plan and Profile, of the Draft EIR for discussion of how the proposed Project maximizes alignment along the public ROW and publicly owned property and minimizes aerial rights over private properties. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of how the proposed Project would provide numerous benefits to local businesses in El Pueblo, Chinatown, and other areas along the proposed Project alignment, including through potential partnerships with these businesses as well as by providing an accessible and affordable mobility option for employees and area residents.

Comment PH279-3 We don't believe the draft EIR fully demonstrates the purpose and need when an environmentally superior alternative has been identified that would expand the already existing Dodger express bus line.

Response PH279-3 Refer to Topical Response H, The Draft EIR Considered an Appropriate Range of Alternatives and Design Options, for discussion of how the Transportation Systems

Management Alternative for an enhanced Dodger Stadium Express is unlikely to achieve the same level of ridership as the proposed Project, and otherwise fails to meet most of the Project Objectives, which seek to achieve the proposed Project's underlying purpose of providing a permanent direct transit connection between LAUS and the Dodger Stadium property and improving connectivity for surrounding communities, including Chinatown, Mission Junction, Elysian Park, Solano Canyon, and the Los Angeles State Historic Park. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at LAUS, Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Dodger Stadium draws large regional crowds, with approximately 100 baseball games and other events each year, but there are no permanent transit connections to the venue. The vast majority of visitors drive their personal vehicles to access the venue. These vehicles create congestion on the surface streets leading up to and around Dodger Stadium, including Sunset Boulevard/Cesar E. Chavez from LAUS and throughout the surrounding communities. Given the capacity of the proposed Project's system, approximately 20 percent of the fans could take aerial transit connected to Metro's regional transit system. This would reduce vehicular congestion in and around Dodger Stadium, on neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways during game and special event days. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan.

Comment PH279-4 With the project's encroachment into Union Station's parking lots, it's foreseeable that this project will tap federal funding and therefore require additional environmental reviews that typically coincide with the CEQA process, which is not happening here.

Thank you for hearing my comments and we encourage you to take these concerns seriously.

Response PH279-4 Refer to Section 2.0, Project Description, for discussion of the proposed Project's Alameda Station. Refer to Section 3.05, Cultural Resources, and Appendix G, Historical Resource Technical Report for the Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit Project (HRTR), of the Draft EIR, for a discussion outlining the proposed Project's potential construction and operational impacts to the Los Angeles Union Station Passenger Terminal and Grounds. Construction and operational impacts associated with the proposed Project would be less than significant. As proposed, the proposed Project does not require Federal review.

Comment Letter PH280 – Katherine Christman

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH280

Comment PH280-1 Hello, can you hear me? Yes.

Hi, I'm Katherine Christman from West Los Angeles. I'm a 31-year-old entrepreneur from our city with Parkway [inaudible]. I'm also a proud board member on the National Association of Woman Business Owners [inaudible], currently serving in the VP role. I am in full support of this project for a variety of reasons, but to keep it short, the most pressing and urgent to me is the air quality for the beautiful community surrounding the stadium.

[inaudible] deserves a better scenario than they're currently enduring. I also love the opportunity for Dodger Stadium to become more accessible and available from other Southern California [inaudible] from Union Station. And so I think it's a beautiful project. I'm very proud of the [inaudible] and I'm in full support of it, as is our Association of Women Business Owners.

We are so excited about it. A lot of value in it. Thank you so much.

Response PH280-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at LAUS, Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Dodger Stadium draws large regional crowds, with approximately 100 baseball games and other events each year, but there are no permanent transit connections to the venue. The vast majority of visitors drive their personal vehicles to access the venue. These vehicles create congestion on the surface streets leading up to and around Dodger Stadium, including Sunset Boulevard/Cesar E. Chavez from LAUS and throughout the surrounding communities. Given the capacity of the proposed Project's system, approximately 20 percent of the fans could take aerial transit connected to Metro's regional transit system. This would reduce vehicular congestion in and around Dodger Stadium, on neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways during game and special event days. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, discussing how the proposed Project's design takes cues from the immediate

neighborhood culture, including how each component of the proposed Project would be designed to complement and reflect the unique character of the surrounding area. The design for the proposed Project's stations and junction studied in the Draft EIR would provide an opportunity for site specific artwork that is reflective of the unique neighborhood culture and could be commissioned from local artists. In addition, the proposed Project's cabins could feature artwork from local artists or other community programming.

Comment Letter PH281 – Chris Wilson

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH281

Comment PH281-1 Good evening. My name is Chris Wilson with the Los Angeles County Business Federation. This is in full support of this project as proposed. LA ART will provide the first public transit connection to Dodger Stadium, which has the highest attendance out of any stadium in the country and is one of the few without a dedicated transit connection. It will improve traffic and parking for residents by potentially removing up to 3,000 car trips from neighborhood streets, easing local traffic, improving safety and reducing the need to park in the local community.

The LA ART system will be emissions free, emissions free and will provide the opportunity to connect communities who have been dis-appropriately impacted by traffic and pollution. This would significantly improve traffic conditions and air quality in the neighborhood for these reasons, and more [inaudible] supports the zero-emission gondola from Union Station to Dodger Stadium. Thank you so much.

Response PH281-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter PH282 – Mary

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH282

Comment PH282-1 Hello, my name is [Mary] and I live in Solano Canyon.

I support the gondola since it would eliminate the traffic as well as the cars that park and block our driveway. That would be greatly appreciated that this project passes and it will make everyone happy in Solano Canyon. Thank you so much.

Response PH282-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter PH283 – Kathleen Johnson

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH283

Comment PH283-1 Hi, can you hear me? My name's Kathleen Johnson. I'm executive director of L.A. River State Park Partners, the support organization for our state historic park and the two other parts of the park. The gondola will not only adversely affect nearby neighborhoods, it will severely and permanently compromise people's experience of LA State Historic Park, a publicly funded green space that residents fought for decades, literally, to establish, and a site with deep historic significance to L.A. as the former home of the [inaudible] Station. LA ART seeks to take what we feel is a significant portion of land to the station with towers and gondola lines running over the southwestern section just 20 feet above people's heads.

Response PH283-1 Metro and the Project Sponsor acknowledge the more than 20 years of effort the community undertook to convert the closed rail yard at River Station to what is now the Los Angeles State Historic Park. As discussed in Sections 3.01, Aesthetics, 3.04, Biological Resources, 3.05, Cultural Resources, 3.06, Energy, 3.07, Geology and Soils, 3.09, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, 3.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, 3.11, Land Use and Planning, 3.13, Noise, 3.15, Public Services, 3.16, Parks and Recreational Facilities, 3.17, Transportation, 3.18, Tribal Cultural Resources, 3.19, Utilities and Service Systems, 3.20, Wildfire, and 5.0, Other CEQA Considerations, the proposed Project would have less than significant operational impacts, including to Los Angeles State Historic Park. Refer to Responses PH238-2 and PH238-3 regarding the footprint of the proposed Project in the Los Angeles State Historic Park.

Comment PH283-2 This aerial road to the park will disrupt as much as an actual road would with at least 10% of the park under the constant traffic of gondola cars,

Response PH283-2 As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, Section 3.16, Parks and Recreational Facilities, and Section 5.0, Other CEQA Considerations, of the Draft EIR, the Chinatown/State Park Station would have a footprint of 2,195 square feet in the Los Angeles State Historic Park (~.1% of the total 32-acre park), and the station canopy would have an overhang of 9,320 square feet over the park. The proposed Project alignment crosses over the westernmost edge of the Los Angeles State Historic Park, adjacent to the existing Metro L Line (Gold) and the associated overhead catenary system. The proposed Project's required aerial clearance would be located above approximately 59,470 square feet of the total 32-acre park, plus an Additional Separation Buffer. With the required clearances and the height at which the cabins would cross over the Los Angeles State Historic Park, the ability to use the vast majority of the Park for kite flying, special events (e.g., concerts, craft fairs, partnership events, 5K/10K runs, workshops, cultural festivals, and the farmers' market), and other passive recreational opportunities (e.g., picnicking, jogging,

walking, and informal play) would not be affected by the proposed Project. Refer to Response S2-4 for additional discussion regarding the ability of uses to continue at the Park. Further, through collaboration with State Parks, the proposed Project has been designed to provide additional benefits to the Los Angeles State Historic Park, including pedestrian improvements between Metro's L Line (Gold) and the park, and integration of the Chinatown/State Park Station into the southern boundary of the park with hardscape and landscape enhancements, a mobility hub, and other park amenities including concessions, restrooms, and a breezeway connecting the concessions and restrooms. Additionally, refer to Topical Response M, Comparable Urban Aerial Systems, discussing how, like the proposed Project, comparable aerial transit systems in cities around the world are integrated with their surrounding urban environments. In particular, comparable aerial transit systems in other locations demonstrate that such systems can operate safely, efficiently, and in concert with nearby residential and open space uses, including parks and other recreational facilities.

Comment PH283-3 the thoughtfully designed sense of tranquility and open space will be degraded and the park's open skies and magnificent views of the downtown skyline, [Legion] Park and Broadway Viaduct forever altered.

Response PH283-3 Refer to Section 3.01, Aesthetics, and Appendix C, Visual Impact Assessment, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the aesthetic impacts of the proposed Project, which would be less than significant, including at the Park. Regarding scenic vistas, as analyzed in the Draft EIR, there are no designated scenic vistas present in the area of potential impact. However, the Project area provides views that are considered scenic by certain viewers, including views of the downtown Los Angeles skyline, LAUS, El Pueblo, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Arroyo Seco Parkway, Dodger Stadium, and the mountains that make up the Transverse Ranges, including the San Gabriel and San Bernardino Mountains. Specifically, as it pertains to Los Angeles State Historic Park, the open views of the Park, as well as the view of the downtown Los Angeles skyline, make the Park "visually memorable." As discussed in Section 3.01, Aesthetics, and Appendix C, Visual Impact Assessment, views considered to be scenic locally would not be substantially impacted. In addition, while views from the Park toward the surrounding existing urban landscape exhibit various visual values, and the proposed Project would not substantially impact these views as shown in the simulated views. As discussed in Section 3.01, the Chinatown/State Park Station location in the southernmost portion of the park would not block any designated scenic vistas, alter scenic resources, or block panoramic views, including views of Elysian Park and the Broadway Bridge to the north. Therefore, the proposed Project would not block any designated scenic views, alter a designated scenic area, or block panoramic views, and impacts to scenic or panoramic views would be less than significant. In addition, refer to Appendix H.2, Supplemental KOPs in Response to Comments, for additional visual simulations of the proposed Project, including views from a cabin over the park, providing a new and unique perspective of the park, and

its surroundings, including the Roundhouse Observation Deck and the exposed Zanja Madre, which is currently not visually apparent from inside the park.

Comment PH283-4 These park impacts have been severely downplayed or glossed over in the draft EIR, so we request any use of this hard-fought public park, land airways [inaudible] for private enterprise.

Response PH283-4 Refer to Response PH238-2 and PH238-3 regarding the Draft EIR's discussion of the proposed Project's impacts to the Los Angeles State Historic Park. Refer to Comment S2 and the responses therein regarding the Los Angeles State Historic Park. The fundamental goals of environmental review under CEQA are to provide information and allow for a meaningful opportunity for the public to participate in the environmental review process. The Draft EIR provided sufficient information in order for the public and decisionmakers to meaningfully evaluate the proposed Project's potential environmental impacts.

Comment PH283-5 And despite the traffic study, there are 3,000 cars that the planners hope will be eliminated at Dodger Stadium we have little faith about. We feel that they would just be re-routed to the park and surrounding neighborhoods, just further compromising park users' access and experience of this treasured urban greenspace. Thank you very much.

Response PH283-5 Refer to Section 3.03, Air Quality, Section 3.08, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 3.17, Transportation, Appendix D, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's ability to reduce vehicular travel, to improve air quality through reduced emissions, and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through reduced vehicular travel. Refer to Topical Response B, Ridership Model; Queueing at Stations and Pre-game and Post-game Transportation, for discussion of the proposed Project's ridership model which is based on extensive data sources and assumptions validated by data. Traffic congestion is not required to be analyzed under CEQA in the Draft EIR following the implementation of Senate Bill 743, which designated "vehicle miles traveled" as the method for assessing transportation impacts on the environment for CEQA projects. Refer to the Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit Project Non-CEQA Transportation Assessment, which found that there could be localized increases in traffic at the intersections closest to the proposed Project's Alameda Station and Chinatown/State Park Station due to some riders choosing to park and ride or take Uber/Lyft and recommended the proposed Project work with Metro to identify a transit partnership for the proposed Project riders to further encourage them to take transit, walk, or bike to the proposed Project's stations.

Comment Letter PH284 – Bill Chen

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH284**Comment PH284-1** Can you hear me?

Thank you. I am not at my computer. I want to say that the park should have its own autonomy and that there should be no compromise from the original park design tree cutting and/or taking of any of the land.

Response PH284-1 As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, Section 3.16, Parks and Recreational Facilities, and Section 5.0, Other CEQA Considerations, of the Draft EIR, the Chinatown/State Park Station would have a footprint of 2,195 square feet in the Los Angeles State Historic Park (~.1% of the total 32-acre park), and the station canopy would have an overhang of 9,320 square feet over the park. The proposed Project alignment crosses over the westernmost edge of the Los Angeles State Historic Park, adjacent to the existing Metro L Line (Gold) and the associated overhead catenary system. The proposed Project's required aerial clearance would be located above approximately 59,470 square feet of the total 32-acre park, plus an Additional Separation Buffer. With the required clearances and the height at which the cabins would cross over the Los Angeles State Historic Park, the ability to use the vast majority of the Park for kite flying, special events (e.g., concerts, craft fairs, partnership events, 5K/10K runs, workshops, cultural festivals, and the farmers' market), and other passive recreational opportunities (e.g., picnicking, jogging, walking, and informal play) would not be affected by the proposed Project. Refer to Response S2-4 for additional discussion regarding the ability of uses to continue at the Park. The proposed Project would implement BIO-PDF-F and adhere to ordinances and requirements applicable to tree replacement, based on the corresponding jurisdiction of the property where each tree is located. As discussed on page 3.04-23, in Section 3.04, Biological Resources of the Draft EIR, and in Appendix K.1, Updated Tree Report, and in Appendix G, Supplemental Biological Resources Report, of this Final EIR, the removal of the 75 trees within Los Angeles State Historic Park would require a permit or approval from the California Department of Parks and Recreation, and all existing trees required to be removed on California Department of Parks and Recreation property would be replaced at a minimum 1:1 ratio within the Park or as agreed to as part of the approvals required for implementation of the proposed Project from the Department. In addition, 6 trees within the public ROW located near the Los Angeles State Historic Park would be replaced at a ratio specified by the Urban Forestry Division, typically, at a 2:1 ratio. Refer to Section 3.11, Land Use and Planning, of the Draft EIR, for a discussion of the proposed Project's consistency with the Los Angeles State Historic Park General Plan. As discussed therein, the proposed Project's Chinatown/State Park Station would be consistent with the goals and

guidelines of the Los Angeles State Historic Park General Plan, including those that focus on recreation, aesthetics, interpretation, and access and circulation and thus would not conflict with its goals, policies, and objectives that were adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. However, State Parks considers there to be an inconsistency between the proposed Project and the Los Angeles State Historic Park General Plan and therefore a potentially significant impact because the Los Angeles State Historic Park General Plan does not identify transit as a use for the Park. Mitigation Measure LUP-A would be implemented to require the proposed Project to obtain a Los Angeles State Historic Park General Plan Amendment. The General Plan Amendment is subject to the review and approval by the State Park Commission, which retains its independent authority related to the proposed Project. With implementation of Mitigation Measure LUP-A, impacts related to inconsistencies with the Los Angeles State Historic Park General Plan would be reduced to a less than significant level. Refer to Topical Response F, Los Angeles State Historic Park, for additional discussion of the Los Angeles State Historic Park General Plan Amendment.

Comment PH284-2 That said is one thing, but traffic with MTA and I understand events for athleticism, it's just discretionary money that is more important for MTA to look at transportation when people are actually working in downtown [inaudible] into the downtown.

I'm talking about the intersection of Sunset and [inaudible], where the central city West specific plan says there should be widening of [inaudible] onto Sunset. And I'm talking about the 101 freeway that needs to have more lanes. If it has more lanes, it would help with commuter traffic going in and out of downtown.

Response PH284-2 Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at Los Angeles Union Station (LAUS), Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Dodger Stadium draws large regional crowds, with approximately 100 baseball games and other events each year, but there are no permanent transit connections to the venue. The vast majority of visitors drive their personal vehicles to access the venue. These vehicles create congestion on the surface streets leading up to and around Dodger Stadium, including Sunset Boulevard/Cesar E. Chavez from LAUS and throughout the surrounding communities. Given the capacity of the proposed Project's system, approximately 20 percent of the fans could take aerial transit connected to Metro's regional transit system. This would reduce vehicular congestion in and around Dodger Stadium, on neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways during game and special event days. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance

costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project.

Comment PH284-3 And it would also help with moving transportation into Dodger Stadium by way of traffic south of Sunset on [inaudible] going in and out on Sunset Boulevard by way of [inaudible] and to [inaudible] Way up to the mesa.

Response PH284-3 Refer to Response PH284-2 for discussion of the need for the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response H, The Draft EIR Considered an Appropriate Range of Alternatives and Design Options, for discussion of how improving the connection between LAUS and Dodger Stadium via the proposed Project would provide the quickest, most frequent, and highest capacity transit connection for the greatest number of riders traveling to Dodger Stadium to have the most travel time competitive transit trips from more locations in the region.

Comment PH284-4 And I also wonder why people don't talk about having free shuttle from the Chinatown Go station to go up to the [inaudible] because there is busses from Union Station. Why not from Chinatown as well? Thank you.

Response PH284-4 Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of how the proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan. Refer to Topical Response H, The Draft EIR Considered an Appropriate Range of Alternatives and Design Options, for discussion of how the Transportation Systems Management Alternative for an enhanced Dodger Stadium Express is unlikely to achieve the same level of ridership as the proposed Project, and otherwise fails to meet most of the Project Objectives which seek to achieve the proposed Project's underlying purpose of providing a permanent direct transit connection between LAUS and the Dodger Stadium property and improving connectivity for surrounding communities, including Chinatown, Mission Junction, Elysian Park, Solano Canyon, and the Los Angeles State Historic Park. As discussed in Topical Response H, a system of buses from numerous remote locations throughout the Los Angeles region to and from Dodger Stadium events would require a substantial increase in the number of buses which, similar to expanding the fleet for an expanded Dodger Stadium Express service, would result in a fleet of buses that would either be underutilized most of the time or regular Metro bus service that utilizes these vehicles would be disrupted every time a Dodger game or event at the stadium is held. Such a service would also incur substantial costs in paid time and mileage for driving empty buses out to the remote locations before a game and back from the remote locations after a game and paid idle time during the game. Buses from a variety of remote locations would also need to travel in rush hour congestion to get to Dodger Stadium. With limited regional facilities that provide bus

only lanes that these services could utilize, they would not materially improve transit travel time compared with driving. For example, the current Dodger Stadium Express service from South Bay serves a broad area of southern Los Angeles County at stations spread across eight miles, is free, and travels on a priority lane within the I-110 freeway median for most of its trip, but the South Bay Dodger Stadium Express carried an average of only 415 passengers per game in 2019, which is substantially lower than the ridership of 1,895 riders per game on the LAUS Dodger Stadium Express.

Comment Letter PH285 – Elias Garcia

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH285

Comment PH285-1 Good evening. My name's Elias Garcia. On behalf of the Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce, we'd like to offer our strong support for this project and join others on this call that have supported us, have stated their support. The Rapid Transit Project is a transformative project that offers the capacity to move approximately 5,000 people per hour per direction, using a quiet, safe, environment-friendly and a proven zero-emission technology.

It will connect such communities as [inaudible] Union Station, Chinatown, Mission Junction to Newark, Solano Canyon, while also providing access to the L.A. State Historic Park, the LA River and [inaudible] Park. Of course, this connectivity is great, but it also means this project also means better health outcomes for these communities as a result of lower pollution and fewer congestion.

So we urge to move this project forward. Thank you.

Response PH285-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at LAUS, Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Dodger Stadium draws large regional crowds, with approximately 100 baseball games and other events each year, but there are no permanent transit connections to the venue. The vast majority of visitors drive their personal vehicles to access the venue. These vehicles create congestion on the surface streets leading up to and around Dodger Stadium, including Sunset Boulevard/Cesar E. Chavez from LAUS and throughout the surrounding communities. Given the capacity of the proposed Project's system, approximately 20 percent of the fans could take aerial transit connected to Metro's regional transit system. This would reduce vehicular congestion in and around Dodger Stadium, on neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways during game and special event days. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan.

Comment Letter PH286 – Phyllis Ling

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH286

Comment PH286-1 MS. LING: Hello

MS. SISCO: Hi, Phyllis. We can hear you.

MS. LING.: Okay, hi, my name is Phyllis Ling. I'm a resident by the Broadway Junction. I'm completely opposed to this project. It makes no sense. Logistically, it shifts parking and traffic further into Chinatown and this project would dangle less than 40 feet above my property, which invades my air rights

Response PH286-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Traffic congestion is not required to be analyzed under CEQA in the Draft EIR following the implementation of Senate Bill 743, which designated "vehicle miles traveled" as the method for assessing transportation impacts on the environment for CEQA projects. Refer to the *Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit Project Non-CEQA Transportation Assessment*, which found that there could be localized increases in traffic at the intersections closest to the proposed Project's Alameda Station and Chinatown/State Park Station due to some riders choosing to park and ride or take Uber/Lyft and recommended the proposed Project work with Metro to identify a transit partnership for the proposed Project riders to further encourage them to take transit, walk, or bike to the proposed Project's stations. As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the proposed Project was chosen as it maximizes alignment along the public ROW and publicly owned property and minimizes aerial rights over private properties, taking into account existing and future adjacent land uses. As described throughout the Draft EIR, the proposed Project would require aerial easements for certain properties along the proposed Project (see Sections 2.5 of Section 2, Project Description and 3.11.1, Figure 6-12 of Section 3.11, Land Use and Planning). How the Project Sponsor acquires the aerial rights for the proposed Project is beyond the scope of the Draft EIR. Refer to Topical Response M, Comparable Urban Aerial Transit Systems, discussing how, like the proposed Project, comparable aerial transit systems in cities around the world are integrated with their surrounding urban environments. In particular, comparable aerial transit systems in other locations demonstrate that such systems can operate safely, efficiently, and in concert with nearby residential and open space uses, including parks and other recreational facilities. The proposed Project would be located in a densely-populated, urban environment surrounded by a variety of commercial, industrial, and residential development types. In this type of environment, it is common for public transportation, such as Metro's light rail, to be located adjacent to residential uses and modern aerial transit systems in other cities, including Portland, Oregon and New

York City, operate adjacent to residential uses. Nevertheless, as discussed in Topical Response J, Gondola Design and Operations and Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, cabin windows can be equipped with privacy glass that can become opaque while adjacent to sensitive views, and the proposed Project would work with stakeholders adjacent to the proposed Project alignment to identify locations where the use of privacy glass would be warranted. Considerations as to the locations along the proposed Project alignment where the privacy glass could be activated include the subject adjacent sensitive views and the vertical and horizontal distance between the proposed Project cabins and the adjacent sensitive views.

Comment PH286-2 The noise study is vague and needs some more details. Gondola stations and junctions are noisy and you're talking about running this 18 hours per day and then doing maintenance and testing during the other 6 hours. You don't even name the gondola system that was used to take measurements to estimate the noise that the stations would cause.

Response PH286-2 Refer to Section 3.13, Noise, and Appendix M, Noise and Vibration Technical Report, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the operational noise impacts from the proposed Project. To provide a conservative operational noise analysis, the worst-case scenario was selected which represents a Dodger Game Day, with the highest line speed, cabins per hour, and queuing numbers, and with nighttime operations. Tables 3.13-22, 3.13-23, and 3.13-24 on pages 3.13-53 to 3.13-57 of Section 3.13, Noise, of the Draft EIR demonstrate that operational noise impacts would be less than significant at all receptor locations based on the L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide, FTA, and LAMC. In addition to the primary operational noise levels evaluated in the Draft EIR, the noise generated inside cabins was also evaluated separately, as demonstrated on Table 3.13-25 on page 3.13-57 of the Draft EIR. The cabin noise would not result in a contribution to cumulative noise levels because NOI-PDF-A ensures that the cabins would be designed such that they would generate noise levels of at least 10 dBA below the current background levels. Table 3.13-26 summarizes operational noise impacts for the worst-case operational scenario which includes potential impacts from cabin noise as the gondolas travel between and within the stations, towers, and junction. Operational noise impacts would be less than significant. Refer to Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR and Topical Response J, Gondola Design and Operations, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the safety features of the proposed Project and how maintenance would be performed by the operator and would include daily observation of the overall system as part of the startup routine.

Refer to Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR and Topical Response J, Gondola Design and Operations, of the Final EIR, for discussion of how maintenance would include observation of the overall system as part of the startup routine for system safety. Maintenance for the proposed Project would include maintenance of cabins, daily inspections, minor repairs, and major repairs. The proposed Project cabins would be primarily serviced overnight at the subterranean cabin maintenance

area below the Dodger Stadium Station. Maintenance activities in the Broadway Junction are expected to be limited primarily to maintenance of the Broadway Junction itself and would include daily inspections, minor repairs, and major repairs. Daily inspections would be conducted by the system operator and would not be associated with any noise generating equipment. Periodically, minor repairs may be needed based on these daily inspections. Work associated with minor repairs would be limited. Any major repairs to or replacement of large capital equipment at the Broadway Junction would be performed during planned outages and would occur on an infrequent basis. For instance, the drive motor is estimated to have a ten-year or greater life cycle and would be replaced as part of a planned outage.

Refer to Topical Response P, Gondola System Noise Modeling, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the noise model used to predict noise levels from operations of the proposed Project and how use of the Rossi Article's equations to evaluate the proposed Project's operational noise was appropriately validated and has been shown to result in a conservative assessment of the noise generated by the proposed Project. The reference noise levels in Appendix L, 3S Sound Measurements Memo, of the Final EIR, were taken in Tyrol, Austria at the Stubai Glacier.

Comment PH286-3 There's no discussion of the differences between these systems the drive [inaudible] pulling the gondolas all the way from Union Station is in a junction across the street from my house. So that's going to have a huge impact.

Response PH286-3 Refer to Section 3.13, Noise, and Appendix M, Noise and Vibration Technical Report, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the construction and operational noise impacts from the proposed Project. Operational noise impacts would be less than significant, including from Broadway Junction. Refer to Response PH286-2 for discussion of the noise model used to predict noise levels from the operation of the proposed Project and how the reference noise levels in Appendix L, 3S Sound Measurements Memo, of the Final EIR, were taken in Tyrol, Austria at the Stubai Glacier. The Evaluation of operational noise impacts in the Draft EIR appropriately relied on the Rossi Article because a 3S gondola system similar to the proposed Project, which includes the system components of the Broadway Junction, was utilized in the assessment of noise impacts to validate the Rossi Article equations. Based on the similarities between the 3S gondola system for the proposed Project, and the 3S gondola system in Tyrol, including the same speed as the proposed Project, a similar cabin capacity, and similar system mechanics. Using the Tyrol system to validate the Rossi Article equations is appropriate and no adjustment to the noise predictions is needed to use the Tyrol system to validate the Rossi Article. Like the Broadway Junction, the system in Tyrol includes both a drive bullwheel and a return bullwheel. Accordingly, the assumptions in the Draft EIR conservatively reflect noise associated with both a drive bullwheel and a return bullwheel at all station and junction locations.

Comment PH286-4 There's also hardly any disclosure about how this project would be operated and implemented, which would impact ridership and greenhouse gas emissions

Response PH286-4 Refer to Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR and Topical Response J, Gondola Design and Operations, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's design and operations, including discussion of the safety, privacy, and operations features of the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response B, Ridership Model; Queueing at Stations and Pre-game and Post-game Transportation, for discussion of the proposed Project's ridership model which is based on extensive data sources and assumptions validated by data, and the management of queueing at stations, and pre-game and post-game transportation. Refer to Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of how the proposed Project would operate at zero emissions, with the electrical power for the proposed Project supplied by the City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) through the utility's Green Power Program, pursuant to GHG-PDF-A. Refer to Section 3.03, Air Quality, Section 3.08, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 3.17, Transportation, Appendix D, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's ability to reduce vehicular travel, to improve air quality through reduced emissions, and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through reduced vehicular travel.

Comment PH286-5 Security management of cues and crowd control are hardly discussed at maximum capacity. People could have to wait in line for 1 to 2 hours, and you're relying on a magical ticket reservation system to even out the crowds. You need to explain how that works.

Response PH286-5 Refer to Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR and Topical Response J, Gondola Design and Operations, of the Final EIR for discussion of how the proposed Project is equipped with security features. For example, to provide added security to system passengers, each gondola cabin would have a security camera on board with a feed to the control room, as well as a "push to talk" button, which would open two-way communications with the control room. The control room would be able to address all cabins at once, or an individually selected cabin. Control room operators would have the ability to contact local security, law enforcement or other emergency response agencies as needed. The Emergency Operations Plan for the proposed Project would also include emergency response protocols and safety procedures developed in conjunction with the operator, system provider, and local authorities, and would address operational changes and communication protocols required in response to a range of potential emergencies such as a medical emergency in a cabin or in a station or a fire near the alignment. The plan would consider a wide range of scenarios for which default operational responses would be determined. In addition, the plan would include communication protocols with local authorities for further instruction and coordination. Refer to Topical Response B, Ridership Model; Queueing at Stations and Pre-game and Post-game Transportation, for discussion of how queues would be managed by efficient vertical circulation and by staff at the station and due to the nature of queue formation, the pre-game/event passenger

queues at the Alameda Station in 2026 are estimated to be largely contained on the platform and only minimally extend out into the planned LAUS Forecourt. More active queue management would become more frequently needed at Alameda Station as ridership increases toward the 2042 ridership projection of 10,000 riders, but even with the maximum queue length, a person at the end of the line would wait for an estimated maximum of seven minutes before boarding the gondola cabin. Others would wait shorter durations. Approximately 15 percent of proposed Project riders to Dodger Stadium (900 passengers in 2026 and 1,500 passengers in 2042) are expected to board the system before a game or event at the Stadium at the Chinatown/State Park Station, and queues would therefore be accommodated within the Station, given this lesser boarding demand and the larger queuing capacity at the Station. Post-game queues at Dodger Stadium were estimated based on assumptions about the departure patterns and estimates of walk times from the various seating areas within the stadium. Those seated the furthest away from the Dodger Stadium Station would take more time to arrive at the Station, much like how it is currently for passengers riding the Dodger Stadium Express. In addition, passengers who would rather not join the line immediately to board the proposed Project in the post-game period could visit some of the entertainment amenities at the stadium, including at the Centerfield Plaza. The post-game/event queue for the proposed Project would be constantly moving as cabins would depart every 23 seconds.

The purpose of the timed ticket reservation system would be to reduce queue lengths and waiting times for riders waiting to board the proposed Project at the Alameda Station or the Chinatown/State Park Station before a large game or event at Dodger Stadium by managing arrival times. Potential elements of such a system could include: the timed arrival reservations would be free; the reservation system would be online; for those without online access, kiosks could be provided at LAUS, the Chinatown/State Park Station, and/or at Dodger Stadium; reservations would be issued for 30-minute arrival periods and the user would pick a time and the boarding station; the timed ticket reservations would be transferable similar to how game and event tickets themselves are transferable; the timed tickets would be checked by proposed Project attendants at the entrance to the line; those who arrive earlier than their arrival window would be fed into the boarding line when possible in advance of their arrival window or wait until their arrival window; those who arrive later than their arrival window would be held and fed into the boarding line when possible; incentives could potentially be offered to encourage choice of earlier windows; and there would be no exclusive access to preferred arrival windows to particular groups of people. The timed ticket reservation system would likely not be used post-game. The system will be more fully developed prior to proposed Project operations.

Comment PH286-6 I don't even have time to get into the flight from advertisements constantly streaming over our neighborhoods.

Response PH286-6 Refer to Topical Response K, Signage and Lighting, for discussion of how the proposed Project's Sign Concept Plan included at Appendix B of the Lighting Study, which is included in Appendix C, Visual Impact Assessment, of the Draft EIR, provides that across the entire proposed Project, including stations, the junction, towers, and cabins, the proposed Project is proposing static signage and digital signage. The digital signage would be limited to the Alameda Station and the Dodger Stadium Station. No digital signage is proposed on the exterior of the cabins. Signage proposed for the exterior of the cabins is static non-illuminated naming rights signage. In addition to the naming rights signage, the proposed Project is proposing that two cabins be designated for the display of community programming graphics and that one cabin be designated for the display of artwork by local arts collaborators. Signage would be designed to complement the proposed Project design and use and would be consistent with the existing urban condition, as illustrated in Appendix H.2, Supplemental KOPs in Response to Comments, of the Final EIR, which includes KOPs updated in part to incorporate the proposed Project's signage program, as depicted in the signage package included in the Lighting Study. There is existing signage in the Project area, and the proposed Project signage would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views. Instead, the proposed Project's design ensures that signage would enhance the public realm. Specifically, signage for the proposed Project would be architecturally integrated into the design of the proposed Project system, including its stations, the junction, towers, and cabins, and would be designed consistent with applicable Metro, City, and State approval requirements.

Comment PH286-7 There's also cutting down 50-foot trees and oak trees in the park.

Response PH286-7 Refer to Section 3.04, Biological Resources, and Appendix E, Biological Resources Assessment, of the Draft EIR and Appendix G, Supplemental Biological Resources Report, of the Final EIR. The proposed Project would implement BIO-PDF-F and adhere to ordinances and requirements applicable to tree replacement, based on the corresponding jurisdiction of the property where each tree is located. As discussed on page 3.04-23, in Section 3.04, Biological Resources, of the Draft EIR, and in Appendix K.1, Updated Tree Report, and in Appendix G, Supplemental Biological Resources Report, of this Final EIR, the removal of the 75 trees within Los Angeles State Historic Park would require a permit or approval from the California Department of Parks and Recreation, and all existing trees required to be removed on California Department of Parks and Recreation property would be replaced at a minimum 1:1 ratio within the Park or as agreed to as part of the approvals required for implementation of the proposed Project from the Department. In addition, 6 trees within the public ROW located near the Los Angeles State Historic Park would be replaced at a ratio specified by the Urban Forestry Division, typically, at a 2:1 ratio.

Comment PH286-8 And this faulty parking study that includes a lot of parking that isn't even open until, such as parking at the state park, which closes at sunset. So how are people going to get their cars out of the state park parking lot?

Response PH286-8 Parking is not required to be analyzed under CEQA or the Transportation Assessment Guidelines ("TAG"). Nevertheless, the Parking Study was prepared to provide additional information to the community and decision makers about existing parking conditions and the proposed Project's potential to effect parking conditions around the Alameda Station and Chinatown/State Park Station. As recommended in the Parking Study, the Project Sponsor will prepare, in collaboration with the City, and with robust feedback from community stakeholders, a parking management plan. The City would implement any on-street parking management strategies identified. Anyone parking in a parking lot is subject to the operating hours established by the operator of the parking lot.

Comment PH286-9 And then also, I want to say that the pedestrian bridge into the park from Broadway, it shouldn't be held hostage to this project.

Response PH286-9 As discussed in Topical Response C, Project Features, while not proposed as part of the proposed Project, the Draft EIR included as Design and Use Option E an analysis of the State Park's proposed bike and pedestrian bridge. The bridge would provide important connections for students at Cathedral High School, as well as between the Park and the Chinatown, Savoy, and Solano Canyon neighborhoods to support convenient access for the community. The analysis serves to provide environmental clearance for the bike and pedestrian bridge as a benefit to the Los Angeles State Historic Park, as while the bike and pedestrian bridge was mentioned in the Los Angeles State Historic Park General Plan and studied in the State Park's Bridge Feasibility Study, the bike and pedestrian bridge was never environmentally cleared. Support for the Los Angeles State Historic Park bike and pedestrian bridge would otherwise be provided as part of the proposed Project. Accordingly, the proposed Project is furthering the bike and pedestrian bridge by providing the necessary environmental clearance and support for the bridge.

Comment PH286-10 And then I think an option to get to Dodger Stadium is all fine and good, but not when it sucks away resources from all other options that we're not even discussing. This would be a tourist trap. There should be additional studies. The Dodger Stadium Express from other locations, such as Pasadena.

Response PH286-10 Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at LAUS, Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Dodger Stadium draws large regional crowds, with approximately 100 baseball games and other events each year, but

there are no permanent transit connections to the venue. The vast majority of visitors drive their personal vehicles to access the venue. These vehicles create congestion on the surface streets leading up to and around Dodger Stadium, including Sunset Boulevard/Cesar E. Chavez from LAUS and throughout the surrounding communities. Given the capacity of the proposed Project's system, approximately 20 percent of the fans could take aerial transit connected to Metro's regional transit system. This would reduce vehicular congestion in and around Dodger Stadium, on neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways during game and special event days. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response H, The Draft EIR Considered an Appropriate Range of Alternatives and Design Options, for discussion of how the Transportation Systems Management Alternative for an enhanced Dodger Stadium Express is unlikely to achieve the same level of ridership as the proposed Project, and otherwise fails to meet most of the Project Objectives which seek to achieve the proposed Project's underlying purpose of providing a permanent direct transit connection between LAUS and the Dodger Stadium property and improving connectivity for surrounding communities, including Chinatown, Mission Junction, Elysian Park, Solano Canyon, and the Los Angeles State Historic Park. As discussed in Topical Response H, a system of buses from numerous remote locations throughout the Los Angeles region to and from Dodger Stadium events would require a substantial increase in the number of buses which, similar to expanding the fleet for an expanded Dodger Stadium Express service, would result in a fleet of buses that would either be underutilized most of the time or regular Metro bus service that utilizes these vehicles would be disrupted every time a Dodger game or event at the stadium is held. Such a service would also incur substantial costs in paid time and mileage for driving empty buses out to the remote locations before a game and back from the remote locations after a game and paid idle time during the game. Buses from a variety of remote locations would also need to travel in rush hour congestion to get to Dodger Stadium. With limited regional facilities that provide bus only lanes that these services could utilize, they would not materially improve transit travel time compared with driving. For example, the current Dodger Stadium Express service from South Bay serves a broad area of southern Los Angeles County at stations spread across eight miles, is free, and travels on a priority lane within the I-110 freeway median for most of its trip, but the South Bay Dodger Stadium Express carried an average of only 415 passengers per game in 2019, which is substantially lower than the ridership of 1,895 riders per game on the LAUS Dodger Stadium Express. Improving the connection between LAUS and Dodger Stadium via the proposed Project would provide the quickest, most frequent, and highest capacity transit connection for the greatest number of riders traveling to

Dodger Stadium to have the most travel time competitive transit trips from more locations in the region.

Comment Letter PH287 - Tabitha

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH287

Comment PH287-1 Hi, my name is Tabitha, I'm an organizer with Power Out Way. We do organizing in this area, especially around Chinatown. I have a few issues with the draft EIR and I'm completely opposed to the project.

Response PH287-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. This comment provides a general introduction to the comments raised in this letter. Responses to the comments contained in this letter are provided below in Responses PH287-2 through PH287-9.

Comment PH287-2 The first one being that the EIR studies are routinely conducted by outside entities that are selected by the developers of the project. [inaudible] disclosure, public input in deciding who's going to conduct the EIR.

Response PH287-2 Refer to Section 8.0, List of Preparers, of the Draft EIR for list of preparers for the Draft EIR. AECOM was selected from Metro's roster of environmental consultants.

Comment PH287-3 So it's very convenient for them, that they found everything to be less than significant.

Response PH287-3 Consistent with the requirements of CEQA, Metro has and will independently review, evaluate, and exercise its judgment over the proposed Project's environmental review and EIR. The Draft EIR that was circulated reflects Metro's independent judgment. The Draft EIR includes 7,877 pages of detailed analysis from experts in their respective fields, intended to provide the public and decision makers the information that they need to meaningfully consider the proposed Project's potential environmental impacts, as well as a shorter executive summary that explains the analysis and conclusions in clean and simple language. Accordingly, the Draft EIR more than adequately complies with CEQA's requirements for a Draft EIR. Additionally, Metro hired Stantec to peer review the transportation analyses conducted for the proposed Project, including Section 3.17, Transportation, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR.¹ Stantec is an internationally-respected global design and delivery firm that provides transportation engineering and planning services among its many service lines. Stantec concluded that the proposed Project ridership forecasting model and the model inputs and data sources were credible, defensible, and appropriate to use for the analysis and that they agreed with the ridership forecasts in the Draft EIR.

Comment PH287-4 Second is it's unclear to me that this project will reduce vehicle miles traveled. It seems like we'll just displace those vehicle miles traveled to Union Station and

¹ Stantec. 2023. Memo to Holly Rockwell Regarding Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit (LA ART) Project Transportation Analysis Peer Review.

Chinatown Station. Chinatown is the neighborhood with the lowest [inaudible] after Skid Row. And this community cannot become a giant parking lot.

Response PH287-4 Refer to Section 3.03, Air Quality, Section 3.08, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 3.17, Transportation, Appendix D, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project’s ability to reduce vehicular travel, to improve air quality through reduced emissions, and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through reduced vehicular travel. Refer to Topical Response B, Ridership Model; Queueing at Stations and Pre-game and Post-game Transportation, for discussion of the proposed Project’s ridership model which is based on extensive data sources and assumptions validated by data. Traffic congestion is not required to be analyzed under CEQA in the Draft EIR following the implementation of Senate Bill 743, which designated “vehicle miles traveled” as the method for assessing transportation impacts on the environment for CEQA projects. Refer to the Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit Project Non-CEQA Transportation Assessment, which found that there could be localized increases in traffic at the intersections closest to the proposed Project’s Alameda Station and Chinatown/State Park Station due to some riders choosing to park and ride or take Uber/Lyft and recommended the proposed Project work with Metro to identify a transit partnership for the proposed Project riders to further encourage them to take transit, walk, or bike to the proposed Project’s stations. Parking is not required to be analyzed under CEQA or the Transportation Assessment Guidelines (“TAG”). Nevertheless, the Parking Study was prepared to provide additional information to the community and decision makers about existing parking conditions and the proposed Project’s potential to effect parking conditions around the Alameda Station and Chinatown/State Park Station. As recommended in the Parking Study, the Project Sponsor will prepare, in collaboration with the City, and with robust feedback from community stakeholders, a parking management plan. The City would implement any on-street parking management strategies identified.

Comment PH287-5 Citizens need actual services. During the land use and planning analysis, they talk about how this will remove first the last mile transit. I don’t see how that’s possible. People are still going to have to drive to the gondola in order to take it. So that is, I don’t see how that makes any sense.

Response PH287-5 Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at LAUS, Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Dodger Stadium draws large regional crowds, with approximately 100 baseball games and other events each year, but there are no permanent transit connections to the venue. The vast majority of visitors

drive their personal vehicles to access the venue. These vehicles create congestion on the surface streets leading up to and around Dodger Stadium, including Sunset Boulevard/Cesar E. Chavez from LAUS and throughout the surrounding communities. Given the capacity of the proposed Project's system, approximately 20 percent of the fans could take aerial transit connected to Metro's regional transit system. This would reduce vehicular congestion in and around Dodger Stadium, on neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways during game and special event days. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan. Refer to Section 3.03, Air Quality, Section 3.08, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 3.17, Transportation, Appendix D, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's ability to reduce vehicular travel, to improve air quality through reduced emissions, and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through reduced vehicular travel.

Comment PH287-6 I'm also opposed to giving any sort of exceptions to the general plan for the park to cut down the trees.

Response PH287-6 The proposed Project would implement BIO-PDF-F and adhere to ordinances and requirements applicable to tree replacement, based on the corresponding jurisdiction of the property where each tree is located. As discussed on page 3.04-23, in Section 3.04, Biological Resources of the Draft EIR, and in Appendix K.1, Updated Tree Report, and in Appendix G, Supplemental Biological Resources Report, of this Final EIR, the removal of the 75 trees within Los Angeles State Historic Park would require a permit or approval from the California Department of Parks and Recreation, and all existing trees required to be removed on California Department of Parks and Recreation property would be replaced at a minimum 1:1 ratio within the Park or as agreed to as part of the approvals required for implementation of the proposed Project from the Department. In addition, 6 trees within the public ROW located near the Los Angeles State Historic Park would be replaced at a ratio specified by the Urban Forestry Division, typically, at a 2:1 ratio. Refer to Section 3.11, Land Use and Planning, of the Draft EIR, for a discussion of the proposed Project's consistency with the Los Angeles State Historic Park General Plan. As discussed therein, State Parks has determined that the proposed Project would be inconsistent with the Los Angeles State Historic Park General Plan because the identified land uses in the General Plan's Preferred Park Concept Elements did not contemplate a transit station like the proposed Project's Chinatown/State Park Station. State Parks considers this inconsistency a potentially significant impact. Therefore, Mitigation Measure LUP-A would be implemented to require the proposed Project to obtain an amendment to the Los Angeles State Historic Park General Plan. The General Plan Amendment is subject to the review and approval by the State Park Commission, which retains its independent

authority related to the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response F, Los Angeles State Historic Park, for a discussion of the Los Angeles State Historic Park General Plan Amendment.

Comment PH287-7 As several members of the communities have voiced, I don't know if you know, but Chinatown has an increasing aging community and the construction impacts, I don't know if they were calculated for average people of like average age or if they're calculated, considering that this elderly community has special needs. The elderly population is more sensitive to air pollutants and noise pollutants.

Response PH287-7 Refer to Section 3.03, Air Quality, Section 3.08, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 3.17, Transportation, Appendix D, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's ability to reduce vehicular travel, to improve air quality through reduced emissions, and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through reduced vehicular. Refer to Section 3.03, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR, for a discussion of how the proposed Project's potential to expose sensitive receptors to Toxic Air Contaminants during construction was evaluated through a Health Risk Assessment (HRA), included as Appendix D, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, in the Draft EIR. As discussed in the Draft EIR, the HRA was conducted in accordance with South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) risk assessment guidelines, which are based on the Air Toxics Hot Spots Program Risk Assessment Guidelines developed by the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) and updated in 2015. The 2015 OEHHA guidelines are based on years of scientific studies evaluating health risks and include a number of conservative assumptions to be protective of human health and to estimate potentially higher risks and sensitivity factors for infants, children, and other sensitive receptors, including the elderly. The results from the construction HRA in Table 3.3-7 show that the maximum incremental cancer risk and chronic non-cancer impacts would be below SCAQMD significance thresholds for all modeled receptors, which include the sensitive receptors located near proposed construction areas. Refer to Section 3.13, Noise, and Appendix M, Noise and Vibration Technical Report, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the construction and operational noise impacts from the proposed Project. As detailed therein, construction related noise impacts would be significant and unavoidable even with implementation of mitigation. Operational noise impacts would be less than significant. Refer to Responses GO17-129 and GO17-130 for discussion of the proposed Project's less than significant impact on human health associated with hearing loss, hearing damage, and sleep disturbance.

Comment PH287-8 Will the gondolas affect property values? A lot of planners like to say that displacement will not happen because you're not removing any houses, you're not building on an existing housing site. But if it's going to hike property values and that's going to cause gentrification to come into the neighborhood, again, this is the poorest

house neighborhood in the city, but you're not going to add or alter any existing facilities.

Response PH287-8 Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not exacerbate gentrification or result in displacement of residents in the surrounding neighborhoods and is consistent with Metro's considerations regarding gentrification and displacement. Refer to Section 3.15, Public Services, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of how the proposed Project would have less than significant operational impacts, including to public facilities.

Comment PH287-9 This is a community that needs more investment in services. So the fact that you're making it harder to add more is a problem for wildfire. Existing wildfire routes are already inadequate a lot of times.

Response PH287-9 Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project, and accordingly the proposed Project would not detract from potential investment in neighborhood services. Refer to Section 3.20, Wildfire, of the Draft EIR for discussion of the proposed Project's potential impacts to wildfire, which would be less than significant, including with respect to the implementation of emergency evacuation plans. Refer to Section 3.15, Public Services, for a discussion of how impacts related to fire protection services during proposed Project operation would be less than significant.

Comment Letter PH288 – Speaker 18

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH288

Comment PH288-1 My name is [inaudible]. My family owns and operates the [inaudible] in Olvera Street, and we are in full support of the project. Not only would it help reduce traffic, good for the environment and provide much needed infrastructure and resources to an underserved part of downtown L.A., but as we enter a global recession, the L.A. region would benefit greatly from this world class project, a proven, innovative mode of transportation, and would attract much needed visitors from around the region and the globe.

It can also be a catalyst for future innovative transport solutions. This is a huge opportunity for L.A. and I hope it is approved. Thank you.

Response PH288-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at LAUS, Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Dodger Stadium draws large regional crowds, with approximately 100 baseball games and other events each year, but there are no permanent transit connections to the venue. The vast majority of visitors drive their personal vehicles to access the venue. These vehicles create congestion on the surface streets leading up to and around Dodger Stadium, including Sunset Boulevard/Cesar E. Chavez from LAUS and throughout the surrounding communities. Given the capacity of the proposed Project's system, approximately 20 percent of the fans could take aerial transit connected to Metro's regional transit system. This would reduce vehicular congestion in and around Dodger Stadium, on neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways during game and special event days. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan.

Comment Letter PH289 – Speaker 19

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH289

Comment PH289-1 Hello, my name is [inaudible], Manager of Advocacy and Public Policy for [inaudible], Southern California. We're an environmental health non-profit that focuses on clean air and healthy lungs. We would like to convey our support for the L.A. Aerial Rapid Transit Project. The project provides a zero-emission form of transportation that would decrease greenhouse gas emissions, cut smog and reduce the number of cars on the road, all of which provide significant public health and environmental benefits.

Thank you.

Response PH289-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter PH290 – Ernest Li

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH290

Comment PH290-1 Thank you. My name is Ernest Li from the [inaudible] Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association. I'm speaking in full support of the gondola project. It is a good project that is almost zero emission. This green project is good for the environment. And also it's at the iconic structure through the Chinatown area, and this is good for Chinatown, and also it provides an opportunity to link up the key cultural institution like Olvera Street, the Chinese [inaudible] Museum, and it links to Chinatown and allow a lot of the traffic and the opportunity for the local merchants to promote visitors, to eat and shop locally.

So it's good for the local economy. So I'm speaking in full support of this project. Thank you.

Response PH290-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, discussing the proposed Project's potential partnerships with and benefits to local businesses. As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, and Topical Response C, Project Features, the proposed Project creates a first/last mile transit link for residents and businesses within Chinatown while unifying and connecting communities through transit mobility access. This new mode of transportation will expand rider access to the regional transit system by attracting new visitors including Dodgers fans, and represents an opportunity for additional visitors along the proposed Project alignment, creating economic opportunities for local businesses, including shops and restaurants, through potential partnerships that drive customers to Chinatown and other businesses along the proposed Project alignment, which, consequently, adds revenues to these small businesses in the communities the proposed Project hopes to serve.

Comment Letter PH291 – Speaker 21

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH291

Comment PH291-1 Hello? Hello? Can you hear me?

Okay. What's [inaudible] this project cause the people that we live here, we get stuck when there's anything. And if we come back from work and we forget something from our groceries we have to go away to [inaudible] come back into our own houses. This will help a lot, you know, [inaudible] we move around the city.

Also, zero emissions. I am here to support the [inaudible]. Thank you very much.

Response PH291-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter PH292 – Wong

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH292

Comment PH292-1 Hi, I organize with Power L.A. and Chinatown Community for Equitable Development, providing tenant support to low-income Cantonese seniors and I absolutely oppose this project. Seniors with limited ability, with limited mobility have no need for a train in the sky that only goes to Dodger Stadium. Their needs are on staying housed, securing affordable housing and a halt to the rising cost of living, which this gondola as a tourist attraction would only contribute to.

Response PH292-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the proposed Project would not preclude development of housing in the surrounding communities, and would itself address a need for a permanent transit connection to one of the region's most visited venues, and would benefit the surrounding community by alleviating existing congestion on surrounding neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways, thereby reducing associated air pollution and improving safety. Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not exacerbate gentrification or result in displacement of residents in the surrounding neighborhoods and is consistent with Metro's considerations regarding gentrification and displacement. Refer to Topical Response M, Comparable Urban Aerial Transit Systems, for discussion of how comparable aerial transit systems in cities around the world operate safely, efficiently, and in concert with nearby residential uses.

Comment PH292-2 If you look at just College Station alone, where one of these gondolas support towers is slated to be built, that area's already been flipped into this upscale expensive area to dire effects, pricing out long-time low-income residents. This gondola is just more of the same. And before you think that affordability of the neighborhood is not an issue with this project, which I know you're thinking because one of the L.A. ART Cantonese-speaking interpreters tried to tell me so after reading a resident's written comment at the Union Station hearing on Saturday, You're wrong!

Response PH292-2 Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not exacerbate gentrification or result in displacement of residents in the surrounding neighborhoods and is consistent with Metro's considerations regarding gentrification and displacement.

Comment PH292-3 This gondola is being built public land where that land should be used for public good. To serve the most good, you must protect and be in alignment with the most poor. You want to fly over red lanterns and go to rooftops. You want to flash Chinese culture without paying a lick for the Chinese immigrants who built it and risk being displaced from it.

This gondola is not a community serving project. It is a private billionaire serving project. Chinatown is the second poorest neighborhood in L.A. It doesn't even have a full-service grocery store. It does everything that you would spend time and money catering to a seasonal entertainment issue and not honoring the truly urgent life-threatening issues of displacement that our most vulnerable residents face.

So every time I saw this project for the good of people, do not build this gondola. Thanks, maybe.

Response PH292-3 Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, discussing the proposed Project's potential partnerships with and benefits to local businesses. As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, and Topical Response C, Project Features, the proposed Project creates a first/last mile transit link for residents and businesses within Chinatown while unifying and connecting communities through transit mobility access. This new mode of transportation will expand rider access to the regional transit system by attracting new visitors including Dodgers fans, and represents an opportunity for additional visitors along the proposed Project alignment, creating economic opportunities for local businesses, including shops and restaurants, through potential partnerships that drive customers to Chinatown and other businesses along the proposed Project alignment, which, consequently, adds revenues to these small businesses in the communities the proposed Project hopes to serve. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the proposed Project would not preclude development of uses including housing, grocery stores, and/or healthcare facilities in the surrounding communities and would alleviate existing congestion on surrounding neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways, thereby reducing associated air pollution and improving safety. Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing

or Prevent Planned Housing, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not displace housing or prevent planned housing.

Comment Letter PH293 – King

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH293

Comment PH293-1 Hi, my name is King [inaudible], a member of the Chinatown Community for Equitable Development, which is located in Chinatown. I strongly oppose the gondola project. It is nothing but a rip off of the taxpayers using public space, public money and is only for the good of one guy who want to build a kind of LA life, kind of a project up on the parking lot and near the Dodger Stadium.

Response PH293-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response G, No Improper Project Segmentation: The Proposed Project Is Intended to Create a Transit Connection from Metro's Union Station Transportation Hub via an Aerial Gondola System to the Dodger Stadium Property, for a discussion of how the proposed Project solely proposes an aerial gondola system. The proposed Project does not include other development, and neither the Project Sponsor nor any other applicant has applied for other development unrelated to the existing stadium uses on the Dodger Stadium property.

Comment PH293-2 And I think that is not going to be good for the Chinatown community, for small businesses. Why would anybody stick around Chinatown when they can just get up there, eat and drink and attend games? So I think that the line that is good for Chinatown business is not are not going to [inaudible], in fact it make things worse, make things a lot worse.

If there's a station near LA State Historic Park, who want to walk up there to Chinatown, maybe for [inaudible] and the [inaudible] area. But who are going to [inaudible] and Alpine area to eat and shop, which is a [inaudible]. Nobody would do that. Convenience is they're going to just take the gondola and go and shop up there.

Response PH293-2 Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, discussing the proposed Project's potential partnerships with and benefits to local businesses. As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the proposed Project creates a first/last mile transit link for residents and businesses along the proposed Project alignment while unifying and connecting communities through transit mobility access. This new mode of transportation will expand rider access to the regional transit system by attracting new visitors including Dodgers fans, and represents an opportunity for additional visitors along the proposed Project alignment, creating economic opportunities for local businesses, including shops and restaurants, through potential partnerships that drive customers to businesses along the alignment, which, consequently, adds revenues to these small businesses in the communities the proposed Project hopes to serve.

Comment PH293-3 So it is going to be worse for Chinatown, but that is going to be cause more gentrification, making housing a more expensive and less affordable for the low-income residents in Chinatown. [inaudible] oppose the project.

Response PH293-3 Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not exacerbate gentrification or result in displacement of residents in the surrounding neighborhoods and is consistent with Metro's considerations regarding gentrification and displacement.

Comment Letter PH294 – Luke MacDonald

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH294

Comment PH294-1 Hello? Can you hear me? My name is Luke MacDonald. I live nearby Union Station and I wanted to comment that I think this is a really bad idea. I don't really trust the arguments for lower pollution and I think that the money would be much better invested in in public transportation. The [inaudible] application, not just going to Dodger Stadium, baseball games.

Response PH294-1 Refer to Section 3.03, Air Quality, Section 3.08, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 3.17, Transportation, Appendix D, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's ability to reduce vehicular travel, to improve air quality through reduced emissions, and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through reduced vehicular travel. Refer to Topical Response A, SB 44, for discussion of how the proposed Project is public transportation because it will be open to the general public for service at regular, scheduled operating times, operating daily to serve existing residents, workers, park users, and visitors to Los Angeles. Refer to Section 2.01, Overview of the Project, of the Draft EIR, discussing how the proposed Project would operate daily to serve existing residents, workers, park users, and visitors to Los Angeles. As discussed on page 2-42, in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the proposed Project would provide service to all pre-season, regular season, and post-season Los Angeles Dodger games and any special events (e.g., concerts, the Los Angeles Marathon) at the Dodger Stadium property. The proposed Project would also provide service to events at the Los Angeles State Historic Park. In addition to providing service on game and special event days at Dodger Stadium and events at the Los Angeles State Historic Park, it is anticipated that the proposed Project would also provide daily service between 6:00am to 12:00am, for the surrounding communities, including Chinatown, Mission Junction, Elysian Park, Solano Canyon, and the Los Angeles State Historic Park. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan.

Comment PH294-2 I'm definitely also concerned with the gentrifying of the communities and also like the thing that like that's going to improve parking I think is also very [inaudible]. It seems like it's just going to move [inaudible] thing making Chinatown a big parking lot. It doesn't seem like great idea. So it's just kind of like a really strange and kind of a waste of money.

So yeah, yeah, I think [inaudible].

Response PH294-2 Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not exacerbate gentrification or result in displacement of residents in the surrounding neighborhoods and is consistent with Metro’s considerations regarding gentrification and displacement. Parking is not required to be analyzed under CEQA or the Transportation Assessment Guidelines (“TAG”). Nevertheless, the Parking Study was prepared to provide additional information to the community and decision makers about existing parking conditions and the proposed Project’s potential to effect parking conditions around the Alameda Station and Chinatown/State Park Station. As recommended in the Parking Study, the Project Sponsor will prepare, in collaboration with the City, and with robust feedback from community stakeholders, a parking management plan. The City would implement any on-street parking management strategies identified. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at Los Angeles Union Station (LAUS), Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project’s capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project’s capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project.

Comment Letter PH295 – Michael

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH295

Comment PH295-1 Hi, good evening. Michael [inaudible] with Central City Association. We support the proposed L.A. ART zero emission project and appreciate the community engagement that the project team has conducted in downtown and in surrounding areas. In addition to making progress on our state’s climate goals, the proposed gondola would reduce emissions, and some of the L.A. community is very most impacted by air pollution.

I think LA ART is expected to take 3,000 cars off the road before and after Dodger Stadium events. It will reduce vehicle congestion, which frees up stadium visitors and the surrounding communities’ time and improves accessibility to surrounding residences and local businesses in the project area. Thank you.

Response PH295-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project’s public outreach and opportunity for public testimony during the Draft EIR public review period. Refer to Appendix A, Scoping Report, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of outreach and community engagement during the Draft EIR scoping period. Metro sought to engage the community in each stage of the environmental review process. Metro engaged the public in decision making for the proposed Project beginning with the public scoping period for the Draft EIR in October 2020 to receive public comment on the proposed Project’s scope of environmental review under CEQA. In June 2021, the Project Sponsor conducted two virtual public outreach meetings. The input from the public, including local community stakeholders, as well as from agencies, organizations, and interested parties, during this period led directly to changes to the proposed Project to incorporate public feedback. The Draft EIR was released on October 17, 2022, for a 60-day public review period, which Metro extended an additional 30 days for a 90-day public review period ending on January 17, 2023. Eight public meetings were held immediately preceding, during, and immediately following the Draft EIR public review period, with four held in-person in the Project area at Los Angeles Union Station and Cathedral High School, and four held virtually via Zoom webinar. Project materials and information were provided at both the in-person meetings and on Metro’s website in English, Spanish, Chinese (Traditional), and Chinese (Simplified). Interpretation was provided in English, Spanish, Mandarin, and Cantonese during the eight public meetings, with interpretation provided in Taishanese during the final two public meetings.

Refer to Section 3.03, Air Quality, Section 3.08, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 3.17, Transportation, Appendix D, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Technical

Report, Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's ability to reduce vehicular travel, to improve air quality through reduced emissions, and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through reduced vehicular travel. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at LAUS, Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities including but not limited to sustainability features and open space enhancements, the Community Access Plan for fares, access to parks, mobility hubs, signage, utilization of local artists for site specific artwork at each station reflective of the unique neighborhood culture, design of each component of the proposed Project to complement and reflect the unique character of the surrounding neighborhood, the Business and Community Support Program during construction, and benefits to local businesses along the proposed Project alignment. The Project Sponsor would convene stakeholder groups to coordinate on issues related to proposed Project features. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan.

Comment Letter PH296 – Douglas Carstens

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH296

Comment PH296-1 Hello. Good evening. This is Douglas Carstens on behalf of the California Endowment. We oppose the gondola project. Metro should not be pursuing this private project at Frank McCourt's behest at all. Metro should not be the lead agency because the City of Los Angeles is in a much better position and there's more property designated as the lead agency.

Response PH296-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response D, Metro Is the Proper Lead Agency for the Proposed Project as the Region's Transportation Authority; Metro Named and Consulted with the Applicable Responsible Agencies, for discussion of how Metro is the proper lead agency for the proposed Project because Metro has primary responsibility for implementation of the proposed Project as the region's transportation authority.

Comment PH296-2 First, regarding the EIR SEQA, the California Environmental Quality Act is a Bill of Rights for an environmental democracy. An EIR is the heart of SEQA, an EIR is not supposed to be a sales brochure or an infomercial for a project.

It's supposed to be an unbiased, full disclosure document that advises the public and decision-makers of the impacts of the project and how those impacts can be reduced. This draft EIR presented by ART and Metro falls woefully short of those legal requirements for full disclosure and accuracy, and instead it's biased in favor of the project.

Response PH296-2 The Draft EIR includes 7,877 pages of detailed analysis from experts in their respective fields, intended to provide the public and decision makers the information that they need to meaningfully consider the proposed Project's potential environmental impacts, as well as a shorter executive summary that explains the analysis and conclusions in clean and simple language. Accordingly, the Draft EIR more than adequately complies with CEQA's requirements for a Draft EIR.

Comment PH296-3 I wish I could repeat verbatim everything that Kathleen Johnson, [inaudible], Tabitha, Phyllis Ling, Bill Chen, Luke McDonald said.

Because a lot of that I'd like to say, but I only have this 2 minutes, so I will say the analysis in the gondola, instead of being meaningful and accurate, is distorted and misleading.

Response PH296-3 The Draft EIR complied with CEQA's requirements, providing the necessary analysis in the Draft EIR's main sections to adequately inform the public and decision makers regarding the proposed Project and its potential environmental impacts. Refer to Response PH296-2 for discussion of how the Draft EIR more than adequately complies with CEQA's requirements for a Draft EIR. Refer to Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's public outreach and opportunity for public testimony during the Draft EIR public review period. Refer to Appendix A, Scoping Report, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of outreach and community engagement during the Draft EIR scoping period.

Comment PH296-4 The entire financial plan, which the Metro Board was promised would be made available before the end of September 2022, is missing altogether. The missing financial information is critical to understanding how impacts identified in the EIR would be mitigated by the project proponent and how they will not be.

The project proponent, Frank McCourt, has only committed to funding 3% of the entire project budget, so the shortfalls in construction and operating revenues will be need to be made up somewhere, most likely from public transit funding sources. Better use for public projects.

Response PH296-4 Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response I, Use of Project Design Features and Plans in Mitigation Measures, for discussion of how CEQA does not require the proposed Project to provide a full accounting of how each mitigation measure will be funded.

Comment PH296-5 We ask that you terminate the project review process immediately if you don't terminate it immediately, Metro should transfer the lead agency status to the city of L.A. to complete the review and process it.

Thank you for your time.

Response PH296-5 Refer to Topical Response D, Metro Is the Proper Lead Agency for the Proposed Project as the Region's Transportation Authority; Metro Named and Consulted with

the Applicable Responsible Agencies, for discussion of why Metro is the proper lead agency for the proposed Project and the City's participation in the environmental review process as a CEQA responsible agency.

Comment Letter PH297 – Speaker 27

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH297

Comment PH297-1 From the very start of this project, I knew I wanted to keep an eye on it because it impacts both my communities of Chinatown and my community of Pueblos or [inaudible]. My name is [inaudible], I grew up in Chinatown, and I am currently, after retiring from Cal State L.A. as a professor of [inaudible] education, I am now associated with the Chinese American Museum.

Response PH297-1 This comment is noted and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Comment PH297-2 So from the very beginning I was keeping my eye on this project, and what I found very worthy of supporting is the fact that I agree that this project would benefit both Chinatown and El Pueblo. Very often when I had questions or wanted to push back on some of the plans, I was able to communicate with L.A. ART and they listened and they tried to incorporate as much of our community's suggestions as possible.

Response PH297-2 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, Appendix A, Scoping Report, of the Draft EIR, and Topical C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project team's outreach efforts to neighborhoods along the proposed Project alignment and the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities. Metro sought to engage with stakeholders in neighborhoods along the proposed Project alignment in each stage of the environmental review process. Input from the public, including local community stakeholders, led directly to the selection of the proposed Project alignment, including an intermediate station in Chinatown (the Chinatown/State Park Station), as well as to the redesign of the proposed Project stations and junction and additional pedestrian enhancements including hardscape and landscape improvements.

Comment PH297-3 For the EIR tonight. I just want to comment that as an academic, I understand what significant means and what less than significant means. And so while on one hand, I like the reporting that it lessened significant with mitigation, but even then I like to connect that with community input to look at what that, what those mitigations might be so that we can have a more well-rounded view on how we can resolve some of the problems that not everybody would agree with. Thank you

Response PH297-3 Refer to Topical Response I, Use of Project Design Features and Plans in Mitigation Measures, for discussion of how the proposed Project’s use of mitigation measures and project design features is consistent with the requirements of CEQA. Refer to Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project’s public outreach and opportunity for public testimony during the Draft EIR public review period. Refer to Appendix A, Scoping Report, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of outreach and community engagement during the Draft EIR scoping period.

Comment Letter PH298 – Jim Starr

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH298

Comment PH298-1 Hello, this is Jim Starr. I'm against Frank McCourt [inaudible] because it's Alameda Street Terminal, which is designed like a Disneyland attraction, will harm the view of Los Angeles Union Station's Hispanic architecture. And one of the reasons it is a national historic landmark. Thank you.

Response PH298-1 This comment indicating opposition to the Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project. Refer to Section 3.01, Aesthetics, and Appendix C, Visual Impact Assessment, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the aesthetic impacts of the proposed Project's towers, which would be less than significant. The Draft EIR fully analyzed and addressed the proposed Project's potential impacts to historic resources in Section 3.05, Cultural Resources, with supporting data provided in Appendix G, Historical Resource Technical Report for the Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit Project (HRTR). As discussed in Section 3.05, the Draft EIR's analysis concludes that all potential impacts related to historical resources would be less than significant.

Comment Letter PH299 – Melissa

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH299

Comment PH299-1 Hello.

Hi, good afternoon.

I'm calling today because I support the gondola project.

One of the reasons is because I feel like, there will be actually more visitors to Chinatown than people just jumping into their cars after the game and going back home.

They'll pass by Chinatown. And, you know, be curious and come back and visit. Also because of the pollution and less traffic. Thank you for your time.

Response PH299-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter PH300 – Michael Chong

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH300

Comment PH300-1 Hi. This is Michael [Chong], and I’m calling in favor of the L.A. ART project. I’m currently a Chinatown resident, and, you know, Metro has, in the past couple of decades, has made us understand that Los Angeles can have a strong network of public transportation along the side of cars and other variables. The [inaudible] is a good example of that.

But unfortunately, it doesn’t [run] on non-Dodger events. We have a lot more activities in Dodger Stadium lately, which is a good thing, but also causes a lot of concerns in regards to traffic and congestion, air traffic congestion and pollution. I believe that the gondola project is the next step in our future. It would be a marker and an important infrastructure that people can visually see that Los Angeles can be centered around alternative modes of transportation, finding creative solutions for people to get out of their vehicles and hopefully as a result, supporting the surrounding businesses instead of driving past them.

Thank you.

Response PH300-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, discussing how the proposed Project would operate daily to serve existing residents, workers, park users, and visitors to Los Angeles. As discussed on page 2-42, in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the proposed Project would provide service to all pre-season, regular season, and post-season Los Angeles Dodger games and any special events (e.g., concerts, the Los Angeles Marathon) at the Dodger Stadium property. The proposed Project would also provide service to events at the Los Angeles State Historic Park.

Comment Letter PH301 – Edwin Lee

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH301

Comment PH301-1 Hi, my name's Edwin Lee and I'm a resident at the Bishop and Broadway Junction and I'm against the project.

Response PH301-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Comment PH301-2 I don't, I think the visual impact assessment is biased and dismissive. These are massive concrete structures and five-ton gondola cabinets flying over our streets and parks. Of course, this will have a negative visual impact. If this was a more rich, more wealthier neighborhood, this would not be allowed.

Response PH301-2 Refer to Section 3.01, Aesthetics, and Appendix C, Visual Impact Assessment, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the aesthetic impacts of the proposed Project, which would be less than significant. Refer to Appendix C, Visual Impact Assessment, for detailed discussion about the implementation and results of the visual simulation. Refer to Appendix H.2, Supplemental KOPs in Response to Comments, for additional visual simulations of the proposed Project. Refer to Appendix H.1, Memo Regarding Preparation of View Simulations, of the Final EIR, for a discussion of how the view simulations were prepared. As discussed in Sections 3.01, Aesthetics, 3.04, Biological Resources, 3.05, Cultural Resources, 3.06, Energy, 3.07, Geology and Soils, 3.09, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, 3.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, 3.11, Land Use and Planning, 3.13, Noise, 3.15, Public Services, 3.16, Parks and Recreational Facilities, 3.17, Transportation, 3.18, Tribal Cultural Resources, 3.19, Utilities and Service Systems, 3.20, Wildfire, and 5.0, Other CEQA Considerations, the proposed Project would have less than significant operational impacts. Refer to Topical Response M, Comparable Urban Aerial Transit Systems, discussing how, like the proposed Project, comparable aerial transit systems in cities around the world are integrated with their surrounding urban environments. In particular, comparable aerial transit systems in other locations demonstrate that such systems can operate safely, efficiently, and in concert with nearby residential and open space uses, including parks and other recreational facilities. Refer to Section 2.0, Project Description, Section 3.16, Parks and Recreational Facilities, and Section 5.0, Other CEQA Considerations, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the footprint of the proposed Project in the Los Angeles State Historic Park. With the small footprint of the proposed Project's Chinatown/State Park Station, and the required clearances and the height at which the cabins would cross over the Park, the ability to use the vast majority of the Park would not be affected by the proposed Project. Refer to Response S2-4 for additional discussion

regarding the ability of uses to continue at the park. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the Draft EIR addresses environmental justice, how the proposed Project supports Metro's goal of prioritizing equity opportunities, and is designed to extend affordable, regional access and mobility options to the communities adjacent to the proposed Project alignment. The proposed Project would not preclude development of uses including housing, grocery stores, and/or healthcare facilities in the surrounding communities, and would itself address a need for a permanent transit connection to one of the region's most visited venues and would alleviate existing congestion on surrounding neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways, thereby reducing associated air pollution and improving safety, and how the proposed Project is designed to be ADA compliant. The Draft EIR addresses environmental justice by considering the proposed Project's ability to reduce congestion and emissions from on-road vehicles in an area disproportionately burdened by pollution and including an analysis of the proposed Project's potential impacts to the surrounding community, concluding that the proposed Project could result in air quality benefits for the surrounding communities. The proposed Project is designed to extend affordable, regional access and mobility options to the communities adjacent to the proposed Project alignment, providing connections to Metro's growing regional public transit system. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan.

Comment PH301-3 And the noise from the gondola station in our neighborhood is not adequately studied. The noise analysis is vague and does not even disclose the gondola system used to take reference measurements. We are the difference. What the difference and similarities in these gondola systems?

Response PH301-3 Refer to Section 3.13, Noise, and Appendix M, Noise and Vibration Technical Report, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the construction and operational noise impacts from the proposed Project. As detailed therein, construction related noise impacts would be significant and unavoidable even with implementation of mitigation. Operational noise impacts would be less than significant. Refer to Topical Response P, Gondola System Noise Modeling, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the noise model used to predict noise levels from operations of the proposed Project and how use of the Rossi Article's equations to evaluate the proposed Project's operational noise was appropriately validated and has been shown to result in a conservative assessment of the noise generated by the proposed Project. The evaluation of operational noise impacts in the Draft EIR appropriately relied on the Rossi Article because a 3S gondola system similar to the proposed Project, which includes the system components of the Broadway Junction, was utilized in the assessment of noise impacts to validate the Rossi Article equations. Based on the similarities between the 3S gondola system for the proposed Project, and the 3S gondola system studied in the Rossi Article (in Tyrol,

Austria), including the same speed as the proposed Project, a similar cabin capacity, and similar system mechanics. Using the Tyrol system to validate the Rossi Article equations is appropriate and no adjustment to the noise predictions is needed to use the Tyrol system to validate the Rossi Article.

Comment PH301-4 And furthermore, there's still no funding plan for this project. Thank you.

Response PH301-4 This comment is noted and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project.

Comment Letter PH302 – Alan Weeks

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH302

Comment PH302-1 Okay. Okay. Thank you. My name is Alan Weeks and I’m very interested in the project. I think it’s interesting, it’s unique and it will make a great tourist attraction.

Response PH302-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment PH302-2 But I do have one objection, and I think it’s a major one. I’ve lived here, I’m 90 years old. I’ve lived here all my life. And I remember my mother took me to the Union Station opening in 1939. And as you know, when you come in from the Plaza, you get a tremendously beautiful view of really historical monuments. And if you build that station and it appears to be quite significantly large, and will definitely block the view from people coming in on the west side of the station, it’s going to block their views. So for that reason alone, if you find another location for the station, otherwise I don’t have any objection to the project.

Thank you.

Response PH302-2 Refer to Section 3.05, Cultural Resources, and Appendix G, Historical Resource Technical Report for the Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit Project (HRTR), of the Draft EIR for a discussion outlining the proposed Project’s potential construction and operational impacts to the Los Angeles Union Station Passenger Terminal and Grounds. Construction and operational impacts associated with the proposed Project would be less than significant. Refer to Section 3.01, Aesthetics, and Appendix C, Visual Impact Assessment, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the aesthetic impacts of the proposed Project, which would be less than significant, including at Los Angeles Union Station (LAUS).

Comment Letter PH303 – Darryl Saucedo

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH303**Comment PH303-1** Did it work?

Did it work? Okay. Well, good afternoon. My name is Darryl Saucedo. I'm the chairman of the board of the Los Angeles Latino Chamber of Commerce, and we support this project as well.

Response PH303-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment PH303-2 But I would like to go on record that the LA [LCC] has strongly recommended that if this project moves forward, that the project hires at least 35% small, local, small, diverse businesses, not only in construction but to provide maintenance and staffing through our local AGC participants.

And I think that they should be given a preference for anybody that uses our local workforce. Thank you.

Response PH303-2 Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the Project Sponsor has committed to a goal of 35 percent utilization of minority business enterprises (MBE), women business enterprises (WBE), disadvantaged business enterprises (DBE), small business enterprise (SBE), disabled veteran business enterprises (DVBE), and LGBTQ-owned businesses during the proposed Project's construction phase.

Comment Letter PH304 – Speaker 35

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH304

Comment PH304-1 So my name is [inaudible]. I'm a local resident of the Chinatown community. I'm here in support of the gondola project because I believe it brings a lot of benefits to our neighborhood and community. First, it improves the traffic, improves the air quality, also brings visitors to different locations and thereby improve our business structure. Thank you.

I already participate.

Response PH304-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter PH305 – Carlos Gomez

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH305**Comment PH305-1** Yes? Can you hear me?

Hi. Yeah. Carlos Gomez, long-time Dodger season ticket holder. I fully support the gondola project. I think it's very innovative. You know, this specific year, you know, attending so many games, I caught myself waiting longer than usual for the Dodger Stadium Express. I don't know if there was maybe like, a lack of funding or but I know there were just like, you know, maybe two busses going out every 50 minutes or so.

And, you know, anything that we can do to really alleviate any type of congestion or traffic, you know, for the what is 30 to 40,000 Dodger fans that go to the games or millions throughout the season would be great. I fully support this project. And we really need this project. I mean, I think it would help the surrounding community and Dodger fans in general. Go Dodgers!

Response PH305-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter PH306 – Lester

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH306

Comment PH306-1 Oh, hello.

Yeah, Lester [inaudible].

I just wanna say that I'm a big Dodgers fan and I support this project.

Response PH306-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter PH307 – Speakers 40/41

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH307

Comment PH307-1 I support the project.

Hello?

[inaudible]

I support the gondola project in Chinatown because it brings more attention business to the area.

[inaudible]

Response PH307-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter PH308 – Kayla

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH308

Comment PH308-1 Good evening. This is Kayla. I am a resident of Chinatown, and I wanted to call in today to oppose the gondola project for a few reasons. There's no additional parking accommodations for those 3,000 vehicles you mentioned that would presumably be arriving at Union Station. So the traffic won't really be alleviated at all. The congestion will just shift south a few blocks.

Response PH308-1 Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at Los Angeles Union Station (LAUS), Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Dodger Stadium draws large regional crowds, with approximately 100 baseball games and other events each year, but there are no permanent transit connections to the venue. The vast majority of visitors drive their personal vehicles to access the venue. These vehicles create congestion on the surface streets leading up to and around Dodger Stadium, including Sunset Boulevard/Cesar E. Chavez from LAUS and throughout the surrounding communities. Given the capacity of the proposed Project's system, approximately 20 percent of the fans could take aerial transit connected to Metro's regional transit system. This would reduce vehicular congestion in and around Dodger Stadium, on neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways during game and special event days. Parking is not required to be analyzed under CEQA or the Transportation Assessment Guidelines ("TAG"). Nevertheless, the Parking Study was prepared to provide additional information to the community and decision makers about existing parking conditions and the proposed Project's potential to effect parking conditions around the Alameda Station and Chinatown/State Park Station. As recommended in the Parking Study, the Project Sponsor will prepare, in collaboration with the City, and with robust feedback from community stakeholders, a parking management plan. The City would implement any on-street parking management strategies identified. Traffic congestion is not required to be analyzed under CEQA in the Draft EIR following the implementation of Senate Bill 743, which designated "vehicle miles traveled" as the method for assessing transportation impacts on the environment for CEQA projects. Refer to the Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit Project Non-CEQA Transportation Assessment, which found that there could be localized increases in traffic at the intersections closest to the proposed Project's Alameda Station and Chinatown/State Park Station due to some riders choosing to park and ride or take Uber/Lyft and recommended the proposed Project work with Metro to identify a transit partnership for the proposed Project riders to further encourage

them to take transit, walk, or bike to the proposed Project's stations. Refer to Section 3.03, Air Quality, Section 3.08, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 3.17, Transportation, Appendix D, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's ability to reduce vehicular travel, to improve air quality through reduced emissions, and to reduce greenhouse gases through reduced vehicular travel.

Comment PH308-2 It's also hard to be convinced of an emission reduction plan that's only one mile long, especially when the vehicles will still be driving to the gondola terminal, but more so than the traffic in the parking.

Response PH308-2 Refer to Section 3.03, Air Quality, Section 3.08, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 3.17, Transportation, Appendix D, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's ability to reduce vehicular travel, to improve air quality through reduced emissions, and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through reduced vehicular travel. Contrary to the comment, the Draft EIR analysis reports that the proposed Project would reduce air pollutant emissions in the area. As shown in Table 3.3-5, Maximum Mass Daily Emissions Due to Operation of the Project, of the Draft EIR, the proposed Project would result in a net reduction in criteria pollutant emissions in both 2026 (Build Out) and 2042 (Horizon Year) by reducing vehicle miles travelled (VMT) and thereby decreasing emissions compared to existing conditions. The analysis shows that VMT reduction may occur from riders' use of other transit to arrive at Los Angeles Union Station (LAUS), and that not all users would drive to LAUS. As a fixed guideway transit project, providing new high-frequency high speed transit connections between the regional transit hub of LAUS and Dodger Stadium, the proposed Project is forecast to reduce VMT, as game and event attendees shift their travel mode from driving to Dodger Stadium to utilizing transit on the proposed Project. As an innovative transportation project that will reduce VMT over time, the proposed Project helps advance local and state climate and transportation policies (see Section 3.8.4 of the Draft EIR and Table C-1 through Table C-4 provided in Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, of the Draft EIR for additional discussion). The operational VMT and trips for the existing, Build Out, and Horizon Year that are used to calculate these mobile emissions are presented in Table A.2-3 of Draft EIR Appendix D, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Technical Report. Refer to Response PH308-1 for discussion of traffic.

Comment PH308-3 I'm concerned about the impacts of gentrification and displacement that were mentioned by some other commenters earlier, especially due to that property value increase in this historic but unfortunately very under-supported neighborhood.

Response PH308-3 Refer to Topical Response E, The Proposed Project Will Not Displace Housing or Prevent Planned Housing, for discussion of how the proposed Project will not

exacerbate gentrification or result in displacement of residents in the surrounding neighborhoods and is consistent with Metro’s considerations regarding gentrification and displacement.

Comment PH308-4 The gondola won’t support Chinatown businesses. It’ll detract from them, people going from Union Station and flying right over.

Response PH308-4 Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, discussing the proposed Project’s potential partnerships with and benefits to businesses in Chinatown. As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, and Topical Response C, Project Features, the proposed Project creates a first/last mile transit link for residents and businesses along the proposed Project alignment while unifying and connecting communities through transit mobility access. This new mode of transportation will expand rider access to the regional transit system by attracting new visitors including Dodgers fans, and represents an opportunity for additional visitors along the proposed Project alignment, creating economic opportunities for local businesses, including shops and restaurants, through potential partnerships that drive customers to businesses along the alignment, which, consequently, adds revenues to these small businesses in the communities the proposed Project hopes to serve.

Comment PH308-5 It’s the gondola’s plan to use public rights of way public airspace, public land. It’ll impose itself on our skyline. Cars moving thousands of camera-phone equipped sports spectators back and forth between Union Station and Dodger Stadium with a full view down into our patios or gardens or homes.

Response PH308-5 As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, one of the proposed Project objectives is to maximize the proposed Project’s alignment along the public ROW and publicly owned property and minimize aerial rights requirements over private properties, taking into account existing and future adjacent land uses. Refer to Topical Response M, Comparable Systems, discussing how, like the proposed Project, comparable aerial transit systems in cities around the world are integrated with their surrounding urban environments. In particular, comparable aerial transit systems in other locations demonstrate that such systems can operate safely, efficiently, and in concert with nearby residential and open space uses, including parks and other recreational facilities. The proposed Project would be located in a densely-populated, urban environment surrounded by a variety of commercial, industrial, and residential development types. In this type of environment, it is common for public transportation, such as Metro’s light rail, to be located adjacent to residential uses and, as discussed in Topical Response M, Comparable Systems, modern aerial transit systems in other cities, including Portland, Oregon and New York City, operate adjacent to residential uses. Refer to Topical Response J, Gondola Design and Operations and Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of how cabin windows can be equipped with privacy glass that can become opaque while adjacent to sensitive views, and the proposed Project would work with stakeholders adjacent to the proposed Project alignment to identify locations where

the use of privacy glass would be warranted. Considerations as to the locations along the proposed Project alignment where the privacy glass could be activated include the subject adjacent sensitive views and the vertical and horizontal distance between the proposed Project cabins and the adjacent sensitive views.

Comment PH308-6 The gondola's not needed year-round, but it'll be visible and audible year round like a permanent string of cables and towers and our sidewalks and our skies.

Response PH308-6 Refer to Section 2.1, Overview of the Project, of the Draft EIR, discussing how the proposed Project would operate daily to serve existing residents, workers, park users, and visitors to Los Angeles. As discussed on page 2-42, in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the proposed Project would provide service to all pre-season, regular season, and post-season Los Angeles Dodger games and any special events (e.g., concerts, the Los Angeles Marathon) at the Dodger Stadium property. The proposed Project would also provide service to events at the Los Angeles State Historic Park. In addition to providing service on game and special event days at Dodger Stadium and events at the Los Angeles State Historic Park, it is anticipated that the proposed Project would also provide daily service between 6:00am to 12:00am, for the surrounding communities, including Chinatown, Mission Junction, Elysian Park, Solano Canyon, and the Los Angeles State Historic Park. The proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan. Refer to Section 3.01, Aesthetics, and Appendix C, Visual Impact Assessment, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the aesthetic impacts of the proposed Project, which would be less than significant. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, discussing how the proposed Project's design takes cues from the immediate neighborhood culture, including how each component of the proposed Project would be designed to complement and reflect the unique character of the surrounding area. Additionally, refer to Topical Response M, Comparable Urban Aerial Transit Systems, discussing how, like the proposed Project, comparable aerial transit systems in cities around the world are integrated with their surrounding urban environments. In particular, comparable aerial transit systems in other locations demonstrate that such systems can operate safely, efficiently, and in concert with nearby residential and open space uses. Refer to Section 3.13, Noise, and Appendix M, Noise and Vibration Technical Report, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the operational noise impacts from the proposed Project, which would be less than significant.

Comment PH308-7 Lastly, it's unclear who will pay for this project, but it's clear that a billionaire will profit from it. It's for these reasons that I oppose the gondola. Thank you. Thank you very much.

Response PH308-7 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue

on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project.

Comment Letter PH309 – Monica Vasquez

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH309

Comment PH309-1 Yes. Hi. Yes.

My name is Monica Vasquez, and I fully support the gondola project. This not only will help with the traffic and pollution and stuff like that, but now I live [inaudible] and it has some of the worst traffic, too. And this is [inaudible]. Less traffic and more [inaudible] transportation, which the gondola will provide all of that.

Plus it'll be good for the people. And this project will help the region with traffic. Like I said, the pollution, the time of traffic as well, because driving [inaudible] my house to the Dodger Stadium. It's only a short distance, but once in traffic it's a long way. And like I said, I just I just called to support the [inaudible] and gondola project and I hope you guys do, too.

Thank you so much.

Response PH309-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter PH310 – Ms. Wong

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH310

Comment PH310-1 Hello?

[inaudible]

So my name Ms. Wong, I'm a local resident of the Chinatown area. I'm pulling support in favor of this project because it's going to bring a lot of good things to the area. It's going to help with the air quality and relieve the traffic and various benefits and welfare for the neighborhood. Thank you.

Response PH310-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter PH311 - Jason

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH311

Comment PH311-1 Hi. Yes, this is Jason [inaudible]. I'm with the Los Angeles Chinatown Corporation. We are the founding organization that actually founded Chinatown when it was displaced, when it moved from Union Station to where it's at now. We own Central Plaza and we are one of the oldest organizations in Chinatown. Conceptually, the board has voted to support the gondola project, but conceptually there are still things that still need to be worked out.

But in general, we do support it for several reasons. Reasons to for reasons no other than Chinatown is completely dead. It has been dead for many, many years. I have lived in Chinatown before I moved out and nothing has happened. And so with the gondola project, this attraction will hopefully bring in visitors, people to see Chinatown, shop, visit, eat, and our merchants need it.

Despite what all the opposing arguments are, our merchants do need some kind of revitalization and right now our merchants are suffering. I speak to our merchants all the time and they support the gondola because they need people in Chinatown to serve, to make money, and to hopefully get Chinatown out of being one of the poorest area in the community.

Thank you.

Response PH311-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, discussing the proposed Project's potential partnerships with and benefits to local businesses. As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, and Topical Response C, Project Features, the proposed Project creates a first/last mile transit link for residents and businesses within Chinatown while unifying and connecting communities through transit mobility access. This new mode of transportation will expand rider access to the regional transit system by attracting new visitors including Dodgers fans, and represents an opportunity for additional visitors along the proposed Project alignment, creating economic opportunities for local businesses, including shops and restaurants, through potential partnerships that drive customers to Chinatown and other businesses along the proposed Project alignment, which, consequently, adds revenues to these small businesses in the communities the proposed Project hopes to serve.

Comment Letter PH312 – Sharon Coleman

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH312

Comment PH312-1 My name is Sharon Coleman. I am president of the National Association [inaudible] Contractors. And I just want to say I support this mission and I agree with the previous caller in reference to making sure that we have not only minority participation on the building of the actual structure, but on the long-term aspects of it.

That's my comment.

Response PH312-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the Project Sponsor has committed to a goal of 35 percent utilization of minority business enterprises (MBE), women business enterprises (WBE), disadvantaged business enterprises (DBE), small business enterprise (SBE), disabled veteran business enterprises (DVBE), and LGBTQ-owned businesses during the proposed Project's construction phase.

Comment Letter PH313 – Sarah Van de Camp

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH313

Comment PH313-1 Hi. Thank you so much. My name's Sarah Van de Camp and I'm a resident of East L.A., specifically Cypress Park. I support this project. I think it's really no secret that we desperately need zero-emission solutions and climate solutions. We also need more public transportation options and connectivity in Los Angeles. So I wholeheartedly support this project and the efforts by climate resolve.

And I'm also really excited about the opportunity that aerial gondola technology presents in Los Angeles as well. This is a super innovative idea and I really do think it would be good for the city. Thank you so much.

Response PH313-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter PH314 – Bill

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH314

Comment PH314-1 Hi, my name is Bill [inaudible] with people organized for Westside Renewal. Yes, we oppose this project. I'm concerned about a couple of things in the EIR in particular.

Response PH314-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address and environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Comment PH314-2 One is I'm concerned about the way this project fits in with the larger plan to redevelop the parking lots around Dodger Stadium. I do not believe that the actual goal of this project is to facilitate the growth of business in Chinatown, but to facilitate an excuse to redevelop the parking lots that Frank McCourt still has an interest in.

This is not really a secret that this was part of the goal. They were discussing it in the press over a decade ago, and I always find very, very wealthy individuals boosting a project that serves their interests and trying to use the public infrastructure to do that as very suspect.

Response PH314-2 Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at Los Angeles Union Station (LAUS), Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Refer to Topical Response G, No Improper Project Segmentation: The Proposed Project Is Intended to Create a Transit Connection from Metro's Union Station Transportation Hub via an Aerial Gondola System to the Dodger Stadium Property for a discussion of how the proposed Project solely proposes an aerial gondola system. The proposed Project does not include other development, and neither the Project Sponsor nor any other applicant has applied for other development unrelated to the existing stadium uses on the Dodger Stadium property. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project.

Comment PH314-3 I think people have already talked about the way that the traffic study is flawed.

I don't see how adding a gondola really takes cars off the road. It doesn't do anything to get people to take transit to where they can get the gondola. I do not believe it's a

first and last-mile solution. I think it's going to become an only mile solution. And what folks will do in practice is really take the gondola as kind of more a tourist attraction type thing and bring traffic and parking into the community.

Response PH314-3 Refer to Section 3.17, Transportation, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's ability to reduce vehicular travel. The Draft EIR's transportation analyses were prepared by experts in the field, as set forth in Section 8.0, List of Preparers, and intended to provide the public and decision makers the information that they need to meaningfully consider the proposed Project's potential environmental impacts. Metro hired Stantec to peer review the transportation analyses conducted for the proposed Project, including Section 3.17, Transportation, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices of the Draft EIR.² Stantec is an internationally-respected global design and delivery firm that provides transportation engineering and planning services among its many service lines. Stantec concluded that the proposed Project ridership forecasting model and the model inputs and data sources were credible, defensible, and appropriate to use for the analysis and that they agreed with the ridership forecasts in the Draft EIR. Traffic congestion is not required to be analyzed under CEQA in the Draft EIR following the implementation of Senate Bill 743, which designated "vehicle miles traveled" as the method for assessing transportation impacts on the environment for CEQA projects. Refer to the Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit Project Non-CEQA Transportation Assessment, which found that there could be localized increases in traffic at the intersections closest to the proposed Project's Alameda Station and Chinatown/State Park Station due to some riders choosing to park and ride or take Uber/Lyft and recommended the proposed Project work with Metro to identify a transit partnership for the proposed Project riders to further encourage them to take transit, walk, or bike to the proposed Project's stations.

Comment PH314-4 And of course, once that redevelopment around Dodger Stadium happens, I don't see those folks even spending that much money or time in Chinatown. When we talk to members in the community, nobody says the thing that we need most is a gondola. Folks need affordable housing, but they also need like local level traffic solutions, like a traffic light to get from William Meade Public housing community to the historic state park, for instance.

We need to invest in what folks actually need and do bottom-up planning. This is a misuse of the public process. Thank you.

Response PH314-4 Refer to Topical Response G, No Improper Project Segmentation: The Proposed Project Is Intended to Create a Transit Connection from Metro's Union Station Transportation Hub via an Aerial Gondola System to the Dodger Stadium Property for a discussion of how the proposed Project solely proposes an aerial gondola system. The proposed Project does not include other development, and neither the Project

² Stantec. 2023. Memo to Holly Rockwell Regarding Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit (LA ART) Project Transportation Analysis Peer Review.

Sponsor nor any other applicant has applied for other development unrelated to the existing stadium uses on the Dodger Stadium property. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of how the proposed Project would provide numerous benefits to local businesses in El Pueblo, Chinatown, and other areas along the proposed Project alignment, including through potential partnerships with these businesses as well as by providing an accessible and affordable mobility option for employees and area residents. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the proposed Project would not preclude development housing and would itself address a need for a permanent transit connection to one of the region's most visited venues, and would benefit the surrounding community by alleviating existing congestion on surrounding neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways, thereby reducing associated air pollution and improving safety. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, Appendix A, Scoping Report, of the Draft EIR, and Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project team's outreach efforts to neighborhoods along the proposed Project alignment and the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities. Metro sought to engage with stakeholders in neighborhoods along the proposed Project alignment in each stage of the environmental review process. Input from the public, including local community stakeholders, led directly to the selection of the proposed Project alignment, including an intermediate station in Chinatown (the Chinatown/State Park Station), as well as to the redesign of the proposed Project stations and junction and additional pedestrian enhancements including hardscape and landscape improvements.

Comment Letter PH315 – Diane Weiss

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH315

Comment PH315-1 Hi. Can you hear me? Okay. Hi. I am 100% opposed to this project.

Response PH315-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Comment PH315-2 In the last 50 years, which is barely a blip of time, we have lost two-thirds of our worldwide wildlife. Two-thirds in 50 years. Recently, it was documented, also that documentation can be found through the World Wildlife Fund. It's also been documented that currently there are over 150,000 species that are threatened or extinction currently due to man-made endeavors such as this kind of short-sighted one,

We are the stewards of the environment and we just forget about that every time some billionaire wants to have a seasonal vanity project that they will benefit from.

I know the wildlife doesn't buy Dodger tickets. Wildlife doesn't buy amusement park tickets.

And it doesn't want a tourist trap. We already have enough of all of those things. At some point we have to realize that we have to preserve our environment because even if you're a billionaire developer, you have to understand that when we kill the environment, we kill ourselves.

Response PH315-2 Refer to Section 3.04, Biological Resources, and Appendix E, Biological Resources Assessment, of the Draft EIR and Appendix G, Supplemental Biological Resources Report, of the Final EIR for discussion of how impacts to biological resources from the proposed Project would be less than significant. Further, as discussed in Sections 3.01, Aesthetics, 3.04, Biological Resources, 3.05, Cultural Resources, 3.06, Energy, 3.07, Geology and Soils, 3.09, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, 3.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, 3.11, Land Use and Planning, 3.13, Noise, 3.15, Public Services, 3.16, Parks and Recreational Facilities, 3.17, Transportation, 3.18, Tribal Cultural Resources, 3.19, Utilities and Service Systems, 3.20, Wildfire, and 5.0, Other CEQA Considerations, the proposed Project would have less than significant operational impacts.

Refer to Section 3.03, Air Quality, Section 3.08, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 3.17, Transportation, Appendix D, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's

ability to reduce vehicular travel, to improve air quality through reduced emissions, and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through reduced vehicular travel.

Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at LAUS, Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Dodger Stadium draws large regional crowds, with approximately 100 baseball games and other events each year, but there are no permanent transit connections to the venue. The vast majority of visitors drive their personal vehicles to access the venue. These vehicles create congestion on the surface streets leading up to and around Dodger Stadium, including Sunset Boulevard/Cesar E. Chavez from LAUS and throughout the surrounding communities. Given the capacity of the proposed Project's system, approximately 20 percent of the fans could take aerial transit connected to Metro's regional transit system. This would reduce vehicular congestion in and around Dodger Stadium, on neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways during game and special event days. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan. Refer to Section 2.1, Overview of the Project, of the Draft EIR, discussing how the proposed Project would operate daily to serve existing residents, workers, park users, and visitors to Los Angeles. As discussed on page 2-42, in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the proposed Project would provide service to all pre-season, regular season, and post-season Los Angeles Dodger games and any special events (e.g., concerts, the Los Angeles Marathon) at the Dodger Stadium property. The proposed Project would also provide service to events at the Los Angeles State Historic Park.

Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project

Comment PH315-3 And even the highly skilled greenwasher, like this whole plan has been presented as, it's pretty dubious.

We need to get our priorities straight and quit thinking so short term in our city.

Response PH315-3 Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project. Refer to Section 3.03, Air Quality, Section 3.08, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 3.17, Transportation,

Appendix D, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's ability to reduce vehicular travel, to improve air quality through reduced emissions, and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through reduced vehicular travel.

Comment Letter PH316 – Drew Miller

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH316

Comment PH316-1 Hi, my name is Drew Miller, and I am calling to voice my full support for the gondola. The proposed Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit Project presents an important opportunity to advance zero emissions transportation and slash carbon emissions at a crucial time in human history. It would be the first permanent rapid transit connection from the region’s transportation hub, Union Station, to Dodger Stadium, as well as a region park.

This will remove thousands of vehicles from the road, reducing congestion and pollution while providing a unique and safe experience for the community. As rising temperatures from human-caused greenhouse gases threaten the city of Los Angeles and the world as we know it, the time for action is now. Thank you.

Response PH316-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter PH317 – Dawn Huang

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH317

Comment PH317-1 Hi. Can you hear me? My name is Dawn Huang and while I agree that Los Angeles is much more in need of public transportation, a gondola going to a sports stadium is a bizarre choice. Have any of you ridden a gondola? How many people does a gondola move and how quickly? I know taking gondolas in my life, including the Roosevelt Island gondola, known as the aerial tramway, they're very slow and they're huge expense that will be funded by our city for a slow moving mile that doesn't take that many people.

Response PH317-1 Refer to Topical Response A, SB 44, for discussion of how the proposed Project is public transportation because it will be open to the general public for service at regular, scheduled operating times, operating daily to serve existing residents, workers, park users, and visitors to Los Angeles. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at LAUS, Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Dodger Stadium draws large regional crowds, with approximately 100 baseball games and other events each year, but there are no permanent transit connections to the venue. The vast majority of visitors drive their personal vehicles to access the venue. These vehicles create congestion on the surface streets leading up to and around Dodger Stadium, including Sunset Boulevard/Cesar E. Chavez from LAUS and throughout the surrounding communities. Given the capacity of the proposed Project's system, approximately 20 percent of the fans could take aerial transit connected to Metro's regional transit system. This would reduce vehicular congestion in and around Dodger Stadium, on neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways during game and special event days. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan. Refer to Section 2.1, Overview of the Project, of the Draft EIR, discussing how the proposed Project would operate daily to serve existing residents, workers, park users, and visitors to Los Angeles. As discussed on page 2-42, in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the proposed Project would provide service to all pre-season, regular season, and post-season Los Angeles Dodger games and any special events (e.g., concerts, the Los Angeles Marathon) at the Dodger Stadium property. The proposed Project would also provide service to events at the Los Angeles State Historic Park. Refer to Topical Response M, Comparable Urban Aerial Transit Systems, discussing

how, like the proposed Project, comparable aerial transit systems in cities around the world are integrated with their surrounding urban environments. In particular, comparable aerial transit systems in other locations demonstrate that such systems can operate safely, efficiently, and in concert with nearby residential and open space uses, including parks and other recreational facilities.

Refer to Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR and Topical Response J, Gondola Design and Operations, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's design and operations, including discussion of the safety, privacy, and operations features of the proposed Project. The proposed Project would carry up to approximately 5,000 passengers per hour per direction (pphpd). The cabins would move at an approximate speed of 13.4 miles per hour with headways of approximately 23 seconds, which represents the time between cabins arriving at a station. The proposed Project's Tricable Detachable Gondola system ("3S") cabins typically carry between 30 to 40 passengers each, depending on the exact configuration of seating and cabin amenities selected.

Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project.

Comment PH317-2 I lived in New York City for years and saw the aerial tramway overhead and underneath.

Few people felt like walking underneath it.

Response PH317-2 Refer to Topical Response M, Comparable Urban Aerial Transit Systems, discussing how, like the proposed Project, comparable aerial transit systems in cities around the world are integrated with their surrounding urban environments. In particular, comparable aerial transit systems in other locations, including the Roosevelt Island Tramway in New York City, demonstrate that such systems can operate safely, efficiently, and in concert with nearby residential and open space uses, including parks and other recreational facilities.

Comment PH317-3 Apparently only two properties in the world, according to Roosevelt Island's aerial tramway, can make these systems. So it's a French company that built the Roosevelt Island one that was only used temporarily and meant to be used temporarily.

Response PH317-3 This comment is noted and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted. Refer to Comments from Doppelmayr USA, Inc. and Leitner-Poma of

America, Inc., the two manufacturers of 3S gondola systems. Refer to Response PH317-2 for discussion of the Roosevelt Island Tramway.

Comment PH317-4 It's currently privately run and pays New York City a franchise fee, while subways and cars are much more often used by residents due to speed. I never went to Roosevelt Island in those 20 years on the tramway while I did drive and take the subway. Not all people are comfortable with aerial travel.

Response PH317-4 Refer to Response PH317-3 for discussion of the Roosevelt Island Tramway. Refer to Topical Response M, Comparable Urban Aerial Transit Systems, discussing how, like the proposed Project, comparable aerial transit systems in cities around the world are integrated with their surrounding urban environments. In particular, comparable aerial transit systems in other locations, including the Roosevelt Island Tramway in New York City, demonstrate that such systems can operate safely, efficiently, and in concert with nearby residential and open space uses, including parks and other recreational facilities. Refer to Response PH317-1 for discussion of the need for the proposed Project and how the proposed Project is public transportation because it will be open to the general public for service at regular, scheduled operating times, operating daily to serve existing residents, workers, park users, and visitors to Los Angeles.

Comment PH317-5 There's a large percentage of the population who are afraid of heights. The tram often wasn't used by the residents because of its slowness and was used often by tourists or in a Spider-Man movie. Although the tramway was opened in 1976 in July it was intended to be just temporary transportation while the subway was getting connected. And then the subway fell behind schedule and it became a permanent fixture.

Response PH317-5 This comment is noted and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted. Refer to Responses PH317-2 through PH317-4 for discussion of the Roosevelt Island Tramway.

Comment PH317-6 But in the 50 years it was in existence, it was only moved 26 million people while the subway moved millions a day, billions of people since. And then when the subway was completed in 1989, ridership drastically went down. So as a historian and documentary filmmaker, I've studied the impacts of public policy and transport policies on community [inaudible].

Response PH317-6 This comment is noted and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted. Refer to Responses PH317-2 through PH317-4 for discussion of the Roosevelt Island Tramway.

Comment PH317-7 Chinatown’s historically suffered from being moved already, past harassment and a past massacre perpetrated by non-Chinese. In the past, China and the US. California looks like.

Well, racism is a part here. You chose a community that can’t speak enough for itself and is in depression. So I believe that I should be able to speak and to use fund public funding to fund a private enterprise for a specific group of people, baseball fans, which is not the whole population. You could funnel your money into actual metro service for the entire city. Thank you very much.

Response PH317-7 Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, discussing the proposed Project’s potential partnerships with and benefits to local businesses in Chinatown. As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the proposed Project creates a first/last mile transit link for residents and businesses along the proposed Project alignment while unifying and connecting communities through transit mobility access. This new mode of transportation will expand rider access to the regional transit system by attracting new visitors including Dodgers fans, and represents an opportunity for additional visitors along the proposed Project alignment, creating economic opportunities for local businesses, including shops and restaurants, through potential partnerships that drive customers to businesses along the alignment, which, consequently, adds revenues to these small businesses in the communities the proposed Project hopes to serve. The Project Sponsor would convene stakeholder groups to coordinate on issues related to proposed Project features. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the Draft EIR addresses environmental justice by considering the proposed Project’s ability to reduce congestion and emissions from on-road vehicles in an area disproportionately burdened by pollution, and including an analysis of the proposed Project’s potential impacts to the surrounding community, concluding that the proposed Project could result in air quality benefits for the surrounding communities.

Refer to Appendix A, Public Outreach Report, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project’s public outreach and opportunity for public testimony during the Draft EIR public review period. Refer to Appendix A, Scoping Report, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of outreach and community engagement during the Draft EIR scoping period. Metro sought to engage the community in each stage of the environmental review process.

Comment Letter PH318 - Carlos

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH318

Comment PH318-1 Hi, my name is Carlos [inaudible] Senior. [inaudible] I support the project, the gondola. We are taking people out of town, so I'm fine with [inaudible] and it's really a pain in the neck trying to get parking [inaudible]. Now [inaudible] much benefit for the community. It will be [inaudible] the gondolas going to go through [inaudible] support the project is also [inaudible] going to Dodger Stadium and it's good for people who don't [inaudible] parking lot [inaudible] and they like to take their kids and their families for, you know, [inaudible] and bottom line 100%, hopefully that this project can get approval. Thank you for listening

Response PH318-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter PH319 - Eric

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH319

Comment PH319-1 Yeah. Hello. My name is, my name is Eric. I've lived in Echo Park within a gondola ride of Dodger Stadium for about 13 years, but on the other side of the stadium. On game nights when I'm leaving my house, it often means waiting like ten minutes just to exit my driveway. So I totally understand how important it is to find new ways to bring visitors to Dodger Stadium.

But this project won't bring enough people fast enough to justify the intrusion into the community's backyards. It's not the answer to our problems. It will divert cars to Chinatown in Union Station if anything. If you don't get rid of the parking, you'll never get rid of the cars. Let's call this gondola project what it is. It's silly. It's a novelty and it's a [inaudible].

Response PH319-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at LAUS, Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Dodger Stadium draws large regional crowds, with approximately 100 baseball games and other events each year, but there are no permanent transit connections to the venue. The vast majority of visitors drive their personal vehicles to access the venue. These vehicles create congestion on the surface streets leading up to and around Dodger Stadium, including Sunset Boulevard/Cesar E. Chavez from LAUS and throughout the surrounding communities. Given the capacity of the proposed Project's system, approximately 20 percent of the fans could take aerial transit connected to Metro's regional transit system. This would reduce vehicular congestion in and around Dodger Stadium, on neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways during game and special event days. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan.

Traffic congestion is not required to be analyzed under CEQA in the Draft EIR following the implementation of Senate Bill 743, which designated "vehicle miles traveled" as the method for assessing transportation impacts on the environment for CEQA projects. Refer to the Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit Project Non-CEQA Transportation Assessment, which found that there could be localized increases in

traffic at the intersections closest to the proposed Project's Alameda Station and Chinatown/State Park Station due to some riders choosing to park and ride or take Uber/Lyft and recommended the proposed Project work with Metro to identify a transit partnership for the proposed Project riders to further encourage them to take transit, walk, or bike to the proposed Project's stations.

Parking is not required to be analyzed under CEQA or the Transportation Assessment Guidelines ("TAG"). Nevertheless, the Parking Study was prepared to provide additional information to the community and decision makers about existing parking conditions and the proposed Project's potential to effect parking conditions around the Alameda Station and Chinatown/State Park Station. As recommended in the Parking Study, the Project Sponsor will prepare, in collaboration with the City, and with robust feedback from community stakeholders, a parking management plan. The City would implement any on-street parking management strategies identified.

Comment PH319-2 This [inaudible] achievement will enrich Frank McCourt and be a shiny new thing to show up at the Olympics. The community doesn't want this. Stop wasting time and money talking about it.

Response PH319-2 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project. Refer to Response PH319-1 for an overview of the need for the proposed Project.

Comment PH319-3 Please just run more busses and dedicated lanes to run even when there is no game. There's a beautiful park up there that's more or less inaccessible by transit. We don't want novelty tourist transit. We want robust systems to access our green spaces. This project ain't it. Thank you.

Response PH319-3 Refer to Response PH319-1 for an overview of the need for the proposed Project, including improving mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at LAUS, Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Refer to Topical Response H, The Draft EIR Considered an Appropriate Range of Alternatives and Design Options, for discussion of how the Transportation Systems Management Alternative for an enhanced Dodger Stadium Express is unlikely to achieve the same level of ridership as the proposed Project, and otherwise fails to meet most of the Project Objectives which seek to achieve the proposed Project's underlying purpose of providing a permanent direct transit connection between LAUS and the Dodger Stadium property and improving connectivity for surrounding communities, including Chinatown, Mission Junction, Elysian Park, Solano Canyon, and the Los Angeles State

Historic Park. Improving the connection between LAUS and Dodger Stadium via the proposed Project would provide the quickest, most frequent, and highest capacity transit connection for the greatest number of riders traveling to Dodger Stadium to have the most travel time competitive transit trips from more locations in the region. As discussed in Section 5.0, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR, access to Elysian Park, the City's second largest park, comprising 575 acres, would be provided through a mobility hub at Dodger Stadium Station, where passengers would be able to access a suite of first/last mile multi-modal options, such as a bike share program.

Comment Letter PH320 – Monica Cruz

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH320

Comment PH320-1 Hi everyone. I am Monica and I support the [inaudible] congestion wants to find a solution that will enhance our communications [inaudible] as a zero emission transit. So in this case, [inaudible] we support this project as we know that aerial rapid transit through this road, through extraordinary innovation [inaudible].

Response PH320-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter PH321 – Michael Berg

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH321

Comment PH321-1 Hello.

I'm so sorry. I started talking without even [inaudible]. Anyway, thank you. My name is Michael Berg and I am a Los Angeles Union Station Historical Society board member, also the founder of the Aliso Street Manufacturer [inaudible] Society, and also a member of the Chinese Historical Society that's along the route. This is nothing more than a carnival ride.

Response PH321-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at LAUS, Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Dodger Stadium draws large regional crowds, with approximately 100 baseball games and other events each year, but there are no permanent transit connections to the venue. The vast majority of visitors drive their personal vehicles to access the venue. These vehicles create congestion on the surface streets leading up to and around Dodger Stadium, including Sunset Boulevard/Cesar E. Chavez from LAUS and throughout the surrounding communities. Given the capacity of the proposed Project's system, approximately 20 percent of the fans could take aerial transit connected to Metro's regional transit system. This would reduce vehicular congestion in and around Dodger Stadium, on neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways during game and special event days. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan.

Comment PH321-2 Los Angeles private transport projects historically have proven to be financially and viable for carrying [inaudible] passengers, i.e. [inaudible].

Response PH321-2 Refer to Topical Response A, SB 44, for discussion of how the proposed Project is public transportation because it will be open to the general public for service at regular, scheduled operating times, operating daily to serve existing residents, workers, park users, and visitors to Los Angeles. Refer to Response PH321-1 for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and

Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project.

Comment PH321-3 And I agree with the California Endowment's position that the ruining of the view scape of their building severely degrades the quality of their company, and that by doing the same, [inaudible] damage in front of Union Station by that enormous terminal on Alameda Street blocks a world class architectural wonder, one of the most iconic and culturally significant architectural masterpieces in all of Los Angeles.

Response PH321-3 Refer to Section 3.01, Aesthetics, and Appendix C, Visual Impact Assessment, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the aesthetic impacts of the proposed Project's Alameda Tower, which would be less than significant, and for visual simulations of the proposed Project's Alameda Tower. The Alameda Tower's modern architectural style is evident and would complement the buildings within The California Endowment. The neutral light-tone gray color scheme of Alameda Tower was designed for consistency with the surrounding urban environment, and to not distract from visually distinct structures such as the United States Post Office Terminal Annex building. And, as discussed in Section 3.01, Aesthetics, of the Draft EIR, the proposed Project's Alameda Station is in an urban area that currently has a mix of architectural styles, building materials and colors, as well as a mix of primarily traditional and some modern style buildings. As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the proposed Project's design goal is to develop a common architectural design that unifies the overall aerial gondola system, while allowing for each major component to contribute to the respective localized urban condition. The Alameda Station's platform and canopy would include a light color scheme and warm tones, which has been designed to complement and reflect the materiality of the existing mix of adobe buildings, large Victorian commercial blocks, and Spanish Revival style buildings within the El Pueblo and Olvera Street area. In addition, the "shell" roof design provides a visual lightness with an integrated perforation pattern motif based upon the arched forms that mark openings and entries to Union Station, Pico House, and other historic buildings within El Pueblo. The proposed Project would also integrate physical and visual connections between the proposed Alameda Station and existing adjacent development, such as the new pedestrian plaza at El Pueblo. The new pedestrian plaza at El Pueblo would be open to the public and would extend view corridors between the proposed Alameda Station and existing development in a way that creates an observed visual unity. The Draft EIR fully analyzed and addressed the proposed Project's potential impacts to cultural resources in Section 3.05, Cultural Resources, with supporting data provided in Appendix F, Archaeological and Paleontological Resources Assessment for the Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit Project, and Appendix G, Historical Resource Technical Report for the Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit Project (HRTR). As discussed in Section 3.05, the Draft EIR's

analysis concludes that all potential impacts related to historical resources would be less than significant, and all potential impacts related to archaeological resources would be either less than significant or reduced to less than significant with mitigation. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, discussing how the proposed Project's design takes cues from the immediate neighborhood culture, including how each component of the proposed Project would be designed to complement and reflect the unique character of the surrounding area.

Comment PH321-4 We would like to, I would like to say that I believe this project is not viable for anything, and the damage to these [inaudible] is completely irresponsible and unacceptable. And it's amazing to me to think that all of this could be changed if they just put in a subway to Dodger Stadium would solve all of the issues you're talking about.

Response PH321-4 Refer to Response PH321-2 for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response H, The Draft EIR Considered an Appropriate Range of Alternatives and Design Options, for discussion of how the proposed Project's objectives were defined in order to assist Metro in considering alternatives that achieve the proposed Project's fundamental purpose of providing a permanent transit connection to Dodger Stadium. Aerial rapid transit technology has the ability to overcome grade and elevation issues between LAUS and Dodger Stadium in order to provide a direct transit connection between the two locations, and provide safe, zero emission, environmentally friendly, and high-capacity transit connectivity in the Project area that would reduce GHG emissions as a result of reduced vehicular congestion in and around Dodger Stadium and on neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways.

Comment PH321-5 And I did a little calculation. You have to unload 80 people every minute, to 5,000 people an hour. And I'd like to know how you plan to load and unload 80 people a minute to meet that 5,000 number. I believe that traffic stats that you gave a flood of.

Thank you.

Response PH321-5 Refer to Topical Response B, Ridership Model; Queueing at Stations and Pre-game and Post-game Transportation, for discussion of the proposed Project's ridership model which is based on extensive data sources and assumptions validated by data, and the management of queueing at stations, and pre-game and post-game transportation. Refer to Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR and Topical Response J, Gondola Design and Operations, of the Final EIR, for discussion of how the proposed Project would carry up to approximately 5,000 passengers per hour per direction (pphpd). The cabins would move at an approximate speed of 13.4 miles per hour with headways of approximately 23 seconds, which represents the time between cabins arriving at a station. As one hour consists of 3,600 seconds, approximately 156.5 cabins would arrive every hour (3,600 seconds / 23 seconds).

The proposed Project's Tricable Detachable Gondola system ("3S") cabins typically carry between 30 to 40 passengers each, depending on the exact configuration of seating and cabin amenities selected. At a capacity of 35 passengers per cabin, at 156.5 cabins per hour, 5,478 passengers would arrive at each station per hour (35 passengers per cabin x 156.5 cabins per hour). Given that the same headway applies in each direction, the total, calculated system capacity is therefore 5,478 pphpd. To account for variations in the exact configuration of seating and cabin amenities, as well as operational considerations (including, for example, fewer than 35 people boarding a cabin or cabins being either slowed or stopped in the station for boarding purposes), the proposed Project has included an approximately 10 percent reduction in capacity from 5,478 pphpd to 5,000 pphpd.

Comment Letter PH322 – Alex Alvarez

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH322

Comment PH322-1 Oh, sorry about that. Good evening. My name is Alex Alvarez. We all have to deal with the traffic around Dodger Stadium on game days.

The gondolas could take 3,000 cars off the road, making it easier to get around and reducing our pollution from cars.

I support the gondola, [inaudible] because it would be great for Los Angeles, for the Dodgers and their fans.

And you for taking the opportunity to take my comment and have a good night.

Response PH322-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter PH323 – Speaker 58

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH323**Comment PH323-1** Hello?

Yes, my name is [inaudible] for the community and I am [inaudible] and I would like to thank you for your time.

Response PH323-1 This comment is noted and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted

Comment Letter PH324 - Crystal

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH324

Comment PH324-1 Hi. My name is [Crystal]. [inaudible]. Thank you.

Response PH324-1 This comment is noted and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted

Comment Letter PH325 – Ron

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH325

Comment PH325-1 Hello.

Right. Thank you. I can't stress enough how opposed I am for this project.

There's not enough time really to address the countless reasons that this is a bad idea. Even if I didn't live in the neighborhood, I'd still be against this project. I'm all for environmental protection and for business people to do well and to be successful. But this whole project is built on a lie.

Response PH325-1 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Section 3.03, Air Quality, Section 3.08, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 3.17, Transportation, Appendix D, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of the proposed Project's ability to reduce vehicular travel, to improve air quality through reduced emissions, and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through reduced vehicular travel. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of how the proposed Project would provide numerous benefits to local businesses in El Pueblo, Chinatown, and other areas along the proposed Project alignment, including through potential partnerships with these businesses as well as by providing an accessible and affordable mobility option for employees and area residents.

Comment PH325-2 It's not about saving the environment, but about increasing the fortunes of a billionaire. There's no way that this project will be paid for by proponents or pay for itself, and taxpayers do not need to be put on the hook for this.

Response PH325-2 This comment is noted and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, for discussion of the Project Sponsor and donation to Zero Emissions Transit, a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting zero emissions transportation programs, policies, and projects, such as the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed

Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project.

Comment PH325-3 There are other ways to reduce emissions. California's already on track to have automobiles become environmentally safer. If you live in the neighborhood, there's nothing environmentally friendly about this project. Rather, it's environmentally ruinous to everything it touches or is in its vicinity.

Response PH325-3 The proposed Project's ability to reduce vehicular travel, to improve air quality through reduced emissions, and to reduce greenhouse gases through reduced vehicular travel are discussed in Section 3.03, Air Quality, Section 3.08, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 3.17, Transportation, Appendix D, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, Appendix J, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report, and Appendix N, Transportation Appendices, of the Draft EIR. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by connecting LAUS to Dodger Stadium via an aerial gondola system, including an intermediate station at the southernmost entrance of the Los Angeles State Historic Park. Dodger Stadium draws large regional crowds, with approximately 100 baseball games and other events each year, but there are no permanent transit connections to the venue. Given the capacity of this system, approximately 20 percent of the fans could take aerial transit connected to Metro's regional transit system. This would reduce vehicular congestion in and around Dodger Stadium, on neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways during game and special event days, thereby reducing VMT and GHG emissions. Accordingly, the proposed Project would result in air quality benefits to the surrounding communities. The lifetime emissions of the proposed Project over the useful life of the project would be a reduction of 166,653 MT CO₂e. The lifetime VMT reduction of the project would be a reduction of 129,629,500 VMT. Emissions are decreased through reducing vehicle miles travelled. The proposed Project would result in a net reduction in criteria pollutant emissions by reducing vehicle miles travelled. Refer to Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, for discussion of how the proposed Project would operate at zero emissions, with the electrical power for the proposed Project supplied by the City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) through the utility's Green Power Program, pursuant to GHG-PDF-A.

As discussed in Sections 3.01, Aesthetics, 3.04, Biological Resources, 3.05, Cultural Resources, 3.06, Energy, 3.07, Geology and Soils, 3.09, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, 3.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, 3.11, Land Use and Planning, 3.13, Noise, 3.15, Public Services, 3.16, Parks and Recreational Facilities, 3.17, Transportation, 3.18, Tribal Cultural Resources, 3.19, Utilities and Service Systems, 3.20, Wildfire, and 5.0, Other CEQA Considerations, the proposed Project would have less than significant operational impacts. Additionally, refer to Topical Response M, Comparable Urban Aerial Transit Systems, discussing how, like the proposed Project, comparable aerial transit systems in cities around the world are integrated with their

surrounding urban environments. In particular, comparable aerial transit systems in other locations demonstrate that such systems can operate safely, efficiently, and in concert with nearby residential and open space uses, including parks and other recreational facilities.

Comment PH325-4 It offers nothing but [inaudible]. Generally impacts would not be significant until they are, and they will be. If whatever benefits to the business community there could possibly be would already be provided by the Metro rail. This will not add to anything. If anybody thinks Chinatown is dead, maybe they could encourage businesses to paint their buildings so that the buildings looked alive.

Response PH325-4 Refer to the Executive Summary of the Draft EIR for discussion of how the proposed Project operation would have less than significant environmental impacts. Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of the proposed Project's features to enhance and provide additional benefits to the surrounding communities, including the proposed Project's potential partnerships with and benefits to local businesses. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the proposed Project would not displace businesses and represents an opportunity for additional visitors along the proposed Project alignment, creating economic opportunities for local businesses, including shops and restaurants, through potential partnerships that drive customers to businesses along the alignment, which, consequently, adds revenues to these small businesses in the communities the proposed Project hopes to serve. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of how during construction, the Project Sponsor would create a Business and Community Support Program to assist local businesses affected by proposed Project construction activities. The proposed Project would provide numerous benefits to local businesses in El Pueblo, Chinatown, and other areas along the proposed Project alignment, including through potential partnerships with these businesses as well as by providing an accessible and affordable mobility option for employees and area residents.

Comment PH325-5 But actually I have one more comment. The scheme just screams the old saying about preferring to ask for forgiveness instead of permission. And surely things are going to go wrong and there'll be no way to forgive those things from happening. Thank you.

Response PH325-5 This comment is noted and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Because the comment does not address an environmental issue or raise a substantive issue on the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

Comment Letter PH326 – Katie

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH326

Comment PH326-1 Hey, can you hear me? Yes, thank you. My name is Katie. I live right by Dodger Stadium. I do agree that we need better public transit on game days. It's very difficult to leave my house and go anywhere, but the gondola is the opposite of that. The gondola won't make it easier to take public transit to Dodger Stadium. It won't help our neighbors access effective and affordable public transit.

Response PH326-1 Refer to Section 2.3.7, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR, for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would improve mobility and accessibility for the region by providing a daily, high-capacity aerial rapid transit connection between the regional transit system at LAUS, Dodger Stadium, Los Angeles State Historic Park, Elysian Park, and surrounding communities via the intermediate Chinatown/State Park Station. Dodger Stadium draws large regional crowds, with approximately 100 baseball games and other events each year, but there are no permanent transit connections to the venue. The vast majority of visitors drive their personal vehicles to access the venue. These vehicles create congestion on the surface streets leading up to and around Dodger Stadium, including Sunset Boulevard/Cesar E. Chavez from LAUS and throughout the surrounding communities. Given the capacity of the proposed Project's system, approximately 20 percent of the fans could take aerial transit connected to Metro's regional transit system. This would reduce vehicular congestion in and around Dodger Stadium, on neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways during game and special event days. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of how the proposed Project would provide active transportation connectivity along the proposed Project alignment through pedestrian access enhancements and first/last mile multi-modal options at the mobility hubs proposed for the Chinatown/State Park Station and the Dodger Stadium Station.

Comment PH326-2 And frankly, it won't help anyone get anywhere that they need to go. It's going to disrupt our neighborhood. And it's, as other people have said, an entirely unrealistic plan. The numbers that are, that it says it will bring of people is just like, that's a wish. That's not reality. And as a taxpayer, I do not agree with the city paying hundreds of millions of dollars, of dollars of our own money for something that none of us want or need.

Response PH326-2 Refer to Response PH326-1 for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. Refer to Section 2.1, Overview of the Project, of the Draft EIR, discussing how the

proposed Project would operate daily to serve existing residents, workers, park users, and visitors to Los Angeles. As discussed on page 2-42, in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the proposed Project would provide service to all pre-season, regular season, and post-season Los Angeles Dodger games and any special events (e.g., concerts, the Los Angeles Marathon) at the Dodger Stadium property. The proposed Project would also provide service to events at the Los Angeles State Historic Park. Refer to Topical Response L, Project Sponsor and Proposed Project Costs and Financial Analysis, and Section 4.0, Costs and Financing, of the Final EIR, which provide detail as to the proposed Project's capital, operation, and maintenance costs and planned sources of funding, recognizing that the proposed Project's capital funding would primarily be sourced from bond financing serviced by revenue from the proposed Project. No public sources of funding have been sought or committed to the proposed Project.

Comment PH326-3 We need affordable housing. We need streets where we can ride our bikes and use accessible public transportation. We need to be able to have public transportation that goes to places that we actually need to go in a way that gets us there.

And that's not what the gondola does. So we really do not need the gondola and we are opposed to it in our neighborhood. Thank you.

Response PH326-3 This comment indicating opposition to the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Response PH326-1 for an overview of the need for the proposed Project. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the proposed Project would not preclude development of uses including housing, grocery stores, and/or healthcare facilities in the surrounding communities, and would itself address a need for a permanent transit connection to one of the region's most visited venues, and would benefit the surrounding community by alleviating existing congestion on surrounding neighborhood streets, arterial roadways, and freeways, thereby reducing associated air pollution and improving safety. The proposed Project is designed to extend affordable, regional access and mobility options to the communities adjacent to the proposed Project alignment, providing connections to Metro's growing regional public transit system. The proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan.

Comment Letter PH327 – Yeg Lin Wong

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH327

Comment PH327-1 Support Gondola, brings more business

Response PH327-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter PH328 – Wu Shuo Li

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH328**Comment PH328-1** Support Gondola

Response PH328-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter PH329 – Zhey Wen Zhen

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH329**Comment PH329-1** Support Gondola

Response PH329-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter PH330 – Lorenz G Biyun

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH330

Comment PH330-1 Support Gondola, brings more business to Chinatown

Response PH330-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter PH331 – Aicui Zhou

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH331

Comment PH331-1 Support Gondola, brings more business to Chinatown

Response PH331-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter PH332 – Zhou

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH332**Comment PH332-1 Support**

Response PH332-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter PH333 – Wei Mei

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH333**Comment PH333-1** Support Gondola

Response PH333-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter PH334 – Mei Kven Li

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH334**Comment PH334-1** Support Gondola

Response PH334-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter PH335 – Lean Ah Tan

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH335

Comment PH335-1 Ok to build the gondola bring more people here

Response PH335-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter PH336 – Sean Lee

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH336

Comment PH336-1 It would benefit the traffic when there is dodger games

Response PH336-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter PH337 – Lee Suan

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH337

Comment PH337-1 It would benefit the traffic when there is dodger games

Response PH337-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter PH338 – Josefina Hanas

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH338

Comment PH338-1 I urgently need this project to be finished, I don't like the crowds, they litter, the cut plants when they pass by, they block driveways with their cars.

Response PH338-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter PH339 – Magdalena Luna

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH339

Comment PH339-1 I am pleased that the project is done soon. That would save us some headaches related to our houses' parking, also less garbage.

Response PH339-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter PH340 – Isabel Rios

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH340

Comment PH340-1 I think it will be very helpful with regards to traffic, especially for people like me, who suffer panic attacks, we could be stuck for long on the road; over there, we won't even have time to feel bad because it will only take 7 minutes, I hope I can ride it one day and that it helps other people that suffer anxiety or panic attacks so they want to ride this means of transportation. I rode one in Chicago.

Response PH340-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter PH341 – Maria Ortega

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH341

Comment PH341-1 I support the Gondola Project, it seems to me like a good idea and I hope it is done soon so I can see it, because who knows how long it is going to take and I am already an old woman.

Response PH341-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter PH342 – Enrique Luna

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH342

Comment PH342-1 I want this Gondola Project to be ready soon, it would reduce a lot of traffic on our street and there won't be so many cars blocking our driveways, they block our streets and sometimes our cars have to stay far away from our home until very late.

Response PH342-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter PH343 – Bertha Magona

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH343

Comment PH343-1 I support the Gondola because it will bring more business to us,

Response PH343-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response C, Project Features, for discussion of how the proposed Project would provide benefits to local businesses in El Pueblo, Chinatown, and other areas along the proposed Project alignment, including through potential partnerships with these businesses as well as by providing an accessible and affordable mobility option for employees and area residents.

Comment PH343-2 also because it will help with traffic and because it will be free for us, the residents in the area.

Response PH343-2 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response N, Environmental Justice, for discussion of how the proposed Project would be free to ride for anyone with a ticket to a Dodgers game. In addition, the proposed Project would allow all residents, employees, and businesses located close to the proposed Project to ride the gondola using their Metro fare at no additional cost under the Community Access Plan.

Comment Letter PH344 – Araceli Rico

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH344

Comment PH344-1 I support the Gondola and I hope they won't come and park here because they would take the bus or train, and the gondola to Union Station.

Response PH344-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter PH345 – Alicia Garcia

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH345

Comment PH345-1 A very good idea to reduce traffic and clean the environment, it was about time to have something like that here in Los Angeles

Response PH345-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter PH346 – Jesus Rico

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH346

Comment PH346-1 I heard about this project 10 years ago.

It should already be built after so long, it would help a lot to our area in terms of parking spots, because they park here and they walk to the stadium.

Response PH346-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter PH347 – Andrea Hernandez

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH347

Comment PH347-1 I like it because it is very fast, just 7 minutes to get to the stadium it will carry 5000 people per hour and will reduce pollution.

Response PH347-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter PH348 – Bertha

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH348

Comment PH348-1 I support the gondola, I think it is a good idea.

Response PH348-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment PH348-2 There won't be so much traffic anymore and we will have cleaner air.

Response PH348-2 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter PH349 – Rosa Juarez

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH349

Comment PH349-1 I support the Transit plans because they will help reduce traffic and because the air will be less polluted.

Response PH349-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter PH350 – Maribel Aceves

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH350

Comment PH350-1 This new project is a good idea because many more people will visit Chinatown and that would help their community, and will also reduce traffic.

Response PH350-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter PH351 – Karen Alfaro

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH351

Comment PH351-1 I am all in for this new project because a lot more people will be curious to visit other small businesses in the area.

Response PH351-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment PH351-2 Secondly I believe that the aerial transit will reduce traffic and last one of the most catching good facts is less pollution.

Response PH351-2 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter PH352 – Saul Duran

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH352

Comment PH352-1 It would bring many benefits

It would benefit in terms of traffic, less pollution, more tourists, less time to get to the stadium and get back home, it will alleviate stress, because there won't be as much traffic as now;

Response PH352-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment PH352-2 it would be modern, efficient and take stress away from traffic.

Response PH352-2 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter PH353 – Angel Ruiz

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH353

Comment PH353-1 Good Idea cause it's good for the environment and cause is going to reduce traffic

Response PH353-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter PH354 – Stephanie

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH354

Comment PH354-1 Good idea. Is going to cut down traffic. Will help us get quicker where we want to go or have to go cause we cant get out on game day

Response PH354-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter PH355 – Alexis Cuevas

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH355

Comment PH355-1 The gondola could remove up to 3,000 cars from the neighborhood streets before and after events at Dodgers Stadium, helping reduce traffic and reducing the need to park in the local community

Response PH355-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter PH356 – Manuel Antonio Vasquez

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH356

Comment PH356-1 I support this means of transportation, it is a good project, new transportation for the community. It helps with traffic and it will clean our air.

Response PH356-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter PH357 – Alfredo Gutierrez

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH357

Comment PH357-1 This project is about less cars, less pollution and safer & healthier neighborhoods. I support the Dodger Stadium Gondola.

Response PH357-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter PH358 – Cynthia Gutierrez

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH358

Comment PH358-1 The gondola is a great project that will aid with the traffic situation in our city.

Response PH358-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter PH359 – Alicia Jimenez

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH359

Comment PH359-1 Great project, up to 3000 cars would be removed from the streets in the neighborhood before and after the Dodgers' events, it would ease local traffic and reduce the need to park within the local community.

Response PH359-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter PH360 – Aquiles Castino

The full bracketed comment is provided in Appendix B, Public Hearing Transcripts, of the Final EIR, for reference.

Responses to PH360

Comment PH360-1 I like the project but what I don't like is the exit is far away from the stadium. I prefer to have the stop by the dodgers store. Easier for people that have trouble to walk.

Response PH360-1 Refer to Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR and Topical Response J, Gondola Design and Operations, of the Final EIR, for discussion of the safety features of the proposed Project and how it meets ADA requirements. The station boarding process and cabins would comply with all accessibility requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act ("ADA"). If needed, cabins could be either slowed or stopped in the station for boarding purposes. Station attendants would be located within each station to assure safe boarding and to execute stops for unloading or boarding purposes, if necessary. Attendants would also provide customer interaction and observation; if a passenger needs special assistance, an attendant may either further slow or stop a cabin. A separate operator would be at stations in a control booth monitoring screens, which would show activities in each cabin and station, as well as the system controls. The time necessary to slow or stop a cabin is factored into the overall system capacity of the proposed Project. Pathways to the boarding areas would be ADA compliant with redundant vertical circulation and appropriately sized passageways. The entry widths and interiors size of each cabin would comply with the requirements of the ADA. The pedestrian pathway from the Dodger Stadium Station to the Stadium would be ADA compliant.

Comment PH360-2 Also please offer rides to people with disability to walk from their car to the stadium.

Response PH360-2 Refer to Response PH360-1 for discussion of the proposed Project's compliance with ADA requirements.

Comment Letter PH361 – Jose Luis Ramos

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH361

Comment PH361-1 This project in Los Angeles would be very helpful to the local community, I have been near the Dodger Stadium for many years now and there will be much less traffic with this project. I hope it is built as soon as possible. Thank you.

Response PH361-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter PH362 – Giovanni Duran

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH362

Comment PH362-1 Great Ideas. It's convinient and reduces traffic and good for the enviornment.

Response PH362-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter PH363 – Edith Salmeron

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH363

Comment PH363-1 It is an excellent project, my neighborhood has one of the worst traffic and pollution problems in all Los Angeles. We want and deserve cleaner air.

Response PH363-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter PH364 – Elena Garcia

The full bracketed letter is provided in Appendix C, Public Comments on the Draft EIR, of the Final EIR for reference.

Responses to PH364

Comment PH364-1 I like the project because it would also be a tourist attraction, not to mention that it would be beneficial in terms of traffic and less pollution here in the area.

Response PH364-1 This comment indicating support for the proposed Project is noted for the record and will be provided to the decision makers for review and consideration.

This page intentionally left blank.

Section 7.0 | Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

7.1 INTRODUCTION

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires a lead agency to adopt a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for projects where mitigation measures are a condition of their approval and development. An Environmental Impact Report has been prepared to analyze and address the potential environmental impacts of the proposed Project, identifying project design features or recommending mitigation measures in order to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed Project. As the lead agency for the proposed Project, Metro is responsible for administering and implementing the MMRP, which has been prepared in compliance with CEQA, including Public Resources Code section 21081.6 and CEQA Guidelines section 15097. The decision makers must define specific monitoring and reporting requirements to be enforced during implementation of the proposed Project. The primary purpose of the MMRP is to monitor the implementation of the project design features (PDFs) and mitigation measures (MMs) identified in the Draft and Final EIR.

7.2 ORGANIZATION

As shown in **Table 7-1, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program**, below, each identified PDF and MM for the Project is listed and categorized by environmental impact area, with accompanying discussion of the following:

- **Responsible Party:** The entity accountable for the action.
- **Monitoring Agency:** The agency to which reports involving feasibility, compliance, implementation, and development are made.
- **Enforcement Agency:** The agency or agencies with the power to enforce the project design feature or mitigation measure.
- **Monitoring Phase:** The phase of the Project during which the project design feature or mitigation measure shall be monitored.
- **Monitoring Frequency:** The frequency at which the project design feature or mitigation measure shall be monitored.
- **Action(s) Indicating Compliance:** The action(s) of which the Enforcement or Monitoring Agency indicates that compliance with the identified project design feature or required mitigation measure has been implemented.

7.3 PROGRAM MODIFICATION

After review and approval of the final MMRP by the Lead Agency, minor changes and modifications to the MMRP are permitted, but can only be made subject to Metro approval. The Lead Agency, in conjunction with any appropriate agencies or departments, will determine the adequacy of any proposed change or modification. This flexibility is necessary in light of the nature of the MMRP and the need to protect the

environment. No changes will be permitted unless the MMRP continues to satisfy the requirements of CEQA, as determined by the Lead Agency.

The proposed Project shall be in substantial conformance with the PDFs and MMs contained in this MMRP. The enforcing departments or agencies may determine substantial conformance with PDFs and MMs in the MMRP in their reasonable discretion. If the department or agency cannot find substantial conformance, a PDF or MM may be modified or deleted as follows: the enforcing department or agency, or the decision maker for a subsequent discretionary project-related approval, finds that the modification or deletion complies with CEQA, including CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162 and 15164, which could include the preparation of an addendum or subsequent environmental clearance, if necessary, to analyze the impacts from the modifications to or deletion of the PDFs or MMs. Any addendum or subsequent CEQA clearance shall explain why the PDF or MM is no longer needed, not feasible, or the other basis for modifying or deleting the PDF or MM, and that the modification will not result in a new significant impact or a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified significant impact consistent with the requirements of CEQA. Under this process, the modification or deletion of a PDF or MM shall not in and of itself require a modification to any proposed Project discretionary approval unless the Director of Planning for Metro as the Lead Agency also finds that the change to the PDF or MM results in a substantial change to the proposed Project or the non-environmental conditions of approval.

Table 7-1: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Project Design Feature or Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Monitoring / Enforcement Agency	Monitoring Phase	Monitoring Frequency	Action(s) Indicating Compliance
Aesthetics					
AES-PDF-A: Project Lighting. The Project would also include the following Project Design Features related to lighting: • Building Lighting will not exceed 60 watts. • Building Lighting outdoor luminaires will not exceed 6200 initial lumens. • Sign Lighting luminance will not exceed 10,000 candelas per m2 (cd/m2) during the day from after sunrise until 45 minutes prior to sunset. Sign Lighting will not exceed 300 cd/m2 at night from sunset until 45 minutes prior to sunrise. • Sign Lighting luminance shall transition smoothly from daytime luminance to nighttime luminance and vice versa. • Illuminated signs that have the potential to exceed 300 cd/m2 will include an electronic control mechanism to reduce sign luminance to 300 cd/m2 at any time when ambient sunlight is less than 100 footcandles (fc).	Project Sponsor Lighting Professional	Metro and/or the City of Los Angeles	Prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy	Once, prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy	Compliance Certificate by Lighting Professional Issuance of Certificate of Occupancy
Air Quality					
AIR-PDF-A: All off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 horsepower shall meet, at a minimum, the Tier 4 emission standards for nonroad diesel engines promulgated by the USEPA.	Project Sponsor Construction Contractor	Metro and/or the City of Los Angeles and South Coast Air Quality Management District	Pre-Construction Construction	Once, Plan Check (proof of compliance) Periodic Field Inspections during Construction	Inclusion of requirement in Construction Plan Submittal of Compliance Report
Biological Resources					
BIO-PDF-A: The Project will establish a Tree Protection Zone to protect trees during construction to establish and maintain a healthy environment for all retained trees during the course of construction. The Tree Protection Zone will apply to any trees within the construction footprint, or any trees where a portion of their drip line overhangs the construction footprint (i.e., the trunk of a tree may be outside of the construction footprint, but the tree's drip line	Project Sponsor Arborist or Landscape Contractor Construction Contractor	Metro and/or the City of Los Angeles (Department of Public Works Urban Forestry) and/or State Department of Parks and Recreation	Pre-Construction Construction	Once, Plan Check (proof of compliance) Periodic Field Inspections during Construction	Inclusion of requirement in Construction Plan Submittal of Compliance Report

Project Design Feature or Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Monitoring / Enforcement Agency	Monitoring Phase	Monitoring Frequency	Action(s) Indicating Compliance
overhangs the construction footprint). The Tree Protection Zone generally encompasses an area within the drip line of the tree plus an additional 5 feet, depending on the species and size of the tree. Any construction activities within the Tree Protection Zone should follow the following guidelines for root protection. For utilities, any required trenching should be routed in such a manner as to minimize root damage. In areas where the grade around the Tree Protection Zone will be lowered, some root cutting may be unavoidable. Cuts should be clean and made at right angles to the roots. When practical, roots will be cut back to a branching lateral root to avoid root damage.					
BIO-PDF-B: Avian Collision Mitigation, Monitoring, and Adaptive Management Plan. The Project Sponsor, in coordination with and subject to the approval of CDFW, shall develop an Avian Collision Mitigation, Monitoring, and Adaptive Management Plan to address the potential for bird collisions. The Plan shall include the following components: 1. Monitoring for first 5 years of Project operation: All Project operations and maintenance personnel, including subcontractors, shall undergo training on how to identify and report avian and bat injuries or mortalities detected in the Project area during routine maintenance activities. 2. An adaptive management table will be developed, outlining measures to implement upon detection of incidents associated with common species and special status species. 3. Annual reporting criteria and requirements.	Project Sponsor Qualified Biologist	Metro and/or California Department of Fish and Wildlife	Prior to Certificate of Occupancy (Submittal of Plan) Operations, first 5 years (Annual Monitoring)	Once, prior to Certificate of Occupancy (Submittal of Plan) Annually, for first 5 years	Submittal of Avian Collision Mitigation, Monitoring, and Adaptive Management Plan Annual Reporting, for first 5 years
BIO-PDF-C: Cabin Window Features. The cabin windows shall be designed with non-transparent (tinted) and/or partially covered with a vinyl window film to be made visible to birds in flight. Reflective surfaces would be reduced as much as possible with opaque or translucent surfaces.	Project Sponsor Qualified Biologist	Metro and/or the City of Los Angeles	Prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy	Once, prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy	Compliance Certificate by Qualified Biologist Issuance of Certificate of Occupancy

Project Design Feature or Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Monitoring / Enforcement Agency	Monitoring Phase	Monitoring Frequency	Action(s) Indicating Compliance
BIO-PDF-D: The proposed Project shall avoid using any rodenticides and second generation anticoagulant rodenticides during Project activities. Any agreement between the proposed Project and a pest control service provider would include restrictions on the use of rodenticides and second generation anticoagulant rodenticides.	Project Operator Pest Control Service Provider	Metro and/or the City of Los Angeles	Prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy	Once, prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy	Inclusion of requirement in Pest Control Service Agreement Issuance of Certificate of Occupancy
BIO-PDF-E: Tree Disease Management. Trees scheduled for removal resulting from the Project shall be inspected for contagious tree diseases, including but not limited to: thousand canker fungus (<i>Geosmithia morbida</i>), Polyphagous Shot Hole Borer (<i>Euwallacea spp.</i>), and goldspotted oak borer (<i>Agrilus auroguttatus</i>) (TCD 2020; UCANR 2020; UCIPM 2013). To avoid the spread of infectious tree diseases, diseased trees shall not be transported from the Project site without first being treated using the best available management practices relevant for each tree disease observed. Any agreement between the proposed Project and a tree removal contractor would include the provisions for tree disease management.	Project Sponsor Arborist or Landscape Contractor	Metro and/or the City of Los Angeles	Pre-Construction Construction (Tree Removal)	Once, Plan Check (proof of compliance) Periodic Field Inspections during Construction (Tree Removal)	Inclusion of requirement in Construction Plan Issuance of Applicable Building Permit Compliance Certificate by Arborist or Landscape Contractor Submittal of Compliance Report
BIO-PDF-F: The proposed Project would comply with applicable tree replacement requirements, based on the jurisdiction of the property where each tree is located, including the following replacement ratios for trees: - City of Los Angeles: “Protected” Trees: 4:1 - Non-protected, but “significant” trees, i.e., where the trunk is > 8 inches at 4.5 feet DBH: 1:1 “Street trees” in the public ROW: as specified by Urban Forestry Division (typically 2:1) - California Department of Parks and Recreation: At least 1:1 - Caltrans: Large trees, where the trunk is > 8 inches at 4.5 feet DBH: 1:1	Project Sponsor Arborist or Landscape Contractor	Metro and/or the City of Los Angeles and/or Department of California Parks and Recreation and/or Caltrans	Prior to Certificate of Occupancy	Once, prior to Certificate of Occupancy	Compliance Certificate by Arborist or Landscape Contractor Issuance of Certificate of Occupancy

Project Design Feature or Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Monitoring / Enforcement Agency	Monitoring Phase	Monitoring Frequency	Action(s) Indicating Compliance
BIO-PDF-G: Tree removal for the proposed Project would occur outside of the bird nesting season (generally February 1 through September 30) and bat maternity roosting season (generally April 15 through August 31).	Project Sponsor Construction Contractor	Metro and/or the City of Los Angeles	Pre-Construction Construction (Tree Removal)	Once, Plan Check (proof of compliance) Periodic Field Inspections during Construction (Tree Removal)	Inclusion of requirement in Construction Plan Issuance of Applicable Building Permit Submittal of Compliance Report
BIO-PDF-H: Any fencing used during and after the proposed Project's construction would be constructed with materials that are not harmful to wildlife. Prohibited materials should include, but are not limited to, spikes, glass, razor, or barbed wire. Where chain link fences are used, they would utilize scrim, green screen or other such coverage to avoid injuring wildlife. Use of chain link fences would be minimal and would not create barriers to wildlife dispersal. All hollow posts and pipes would be capped to prevent wildlife entrapment and mortality. Metal fence stakes used on the proposed Project site would be plugged to avoid this hazard. Fences would not have any slack that may cause wildlife entanglement. In addition, workers will be educated and instructed in best practices to avoid attracting wildlife to the construction site, including requiring lids on all trash cans and permitting eating in designated areas or offsite, with daily cleanup of such areas. All workers will be educated on reporting protocols for the appropriate authorities in the event wildlife is encountered on the construction site.	Project Sponsor Qualified Biologist Construction Contractor	Metro and/or the City of Los Angeles	Pre-Construction Construction	Once, Plan Check (proof of compliance) Periodic Field Inspections during Construction	Compliance Certificate by Qualified Biologist Issuance of Applicable Building Permit Inclusion of requirement in Construction Plan Submittal of Compliance Report
MM-BIO-A: Avoid and minimize project related impacts to special-status and/or roosting bat species. During the maternity season (April 15 through August 31) prior to construction, a field survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist to determine the potential presence of colonial bat roosts within 100 feet of the Alameda Station and Dodger Stadium Station footprints and SR-110 overpass over Stadium Way (near Stadium Tower), because these locations	Project Sponsor Qualified Biologist Construction Contractor	Metro and/or the City of Los Angeles	Pre-Construction Construction	Once, Plan Check (proof of compliance) Periodic Field Inspections during Construction	Pre-Construction Field Survey by Qualified Biologist Compliance Certificate and Report by Qualified Biologist

Project Design Feature or Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Monitoring / Enforcement Agency	Monitoring Phase	Monitoring Frequency	Action(s) Indicating Compliance
provide potentially suitable habitat. A visual inspection and/or one-night emergence survey of trees to be removed near the Alameda Station and Dodger Stadium Station and of the overpass shall be completed using acoustic recognition technology to determine if any maternity roosts are present. To avoid any impacts on roosting bats resulting from construction activities for Stadium Tower, the following shall be implemented: <u>At the SR-110 Overpass</u> Should an active maternity roost be found at the SR-110 overpass, a determination (in coordination with a qualified bat biologist) shall be made whether indirect effects of construction-related activities (i.e., noise and vibration) could substantially disturb roosting bats, and if exclusionary devices should be used to remove bats. This determination shall be based on baseline noise/vibration levels, anticipated noise levels associated with construction of the Stadium Tower, and the sensitivity to noise-disturbances of the bat species present. If it is determined that noise could result in the temporary abandonment of a maternity roost, construction-related activities shall be scheduled to avoid the maternity season (April 15 through August 31), or as determined by the biologist. To avoid any impacts on roosting bats resulting from construction activities at Alameda Station and Dodger Stadium Station, the following shall be implemented: <u>Trees</u> All trees to be removed as part of the Project at the Alameda Station, Stadium Tower, and Dodger Stadium Station sites should be evaluated for their potential to support bat roosts. In particular, any palm and eucalyptus trees that bats are known to use should be evaluated by a qualified biologist by conducting a one-night emergence survey during acceptable weather conditions; or if conditions permit, physically examine the trees for presence or absence of bats (such as with lift equipment) before the start of construction/tree					Inclusion of requirement in Construction Plan Issuance of Applicable Building Permit Submittal of Compliance Report

Project Design Feature or Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Monitoring / Enforcement Agency	Monitoring Phase	Monitoring Frequency	Action(s) Indicating Compliance
removal. Palm trees are present at the Alameda Station site along Alameda Street and eucalyptus trees are present at the Dodger Stadium Station site. The following measures would apply to trees to be removed that are determined to provide potential bat roost habitat by a qualified biologist. • If roosting bats are determined present during the maternity season (April 15 through August 31), the tree shall be avoided until after the maternity season, when <u>the</u> young are self-sufficient. If roosting bats are determined present during the winter months when bats are in torpor, a state in which the bats have significantly lowered their physiological state, such as body temperature and metabolic rate, due to lowered food availability (October 31 through February 15, but is dependent on specific weather conditions), a qualified bat biologist shall physically examine the roost if conditions permit for presence or absence of bats (such as with lift equipment) before the start of construction. If the roost is determined to be occupied during this time, the tree shall be avoided until after the winter season when bats are once again active. • Trees with potential colonial bat habitat can be removed outside of the maternity season and winter season (February 16 through April 14 and August 16 through October 30, or as determined by a qualified biologist) using a two-step tree trimming process that occurs over 2 consecutive days. ○ Day 1, Step 1: Under the supervision of a qualified bat biologist, tree branches and limbs with no cavities shall be removed by hand (e.g., using chainsaws). This will create a disturbance (noise and vibration) and physically alter the tree. Bats roosting in the tree will either abandon the roost immediately, or, after emergence, will avoid returning to the roost. ○ Day 2, Step 2: Removal of the remainder of the tree under the supervision of a qualified bat					

Project Design Feature or Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Monitoring / Enforcement Agency	Monitoring Phase	Monitoring Frequency	Action(s) Indicating Compliance
biologist may occur on the following day. Trees that are only to be trimmed and not removed would be processed in the same manner; if a branch with a potential roost must be removed, all surrounding branches would be trimmed on Day 1 under supervision of a qualified bat biologist, and then the limb with the potential roost would be removed on Day 2. - Trees with foliage (and without colonial bat roost potential), such as sycamores, that can support lasiurine bats, shall have the two-step tree trimming process occur over one day under the supervision of a qualified bat biologist. Step 1 would be to remove adjacent, smaller, or non-habitat trees to create noise and vibration disturbance that would cause abandonment. Step 2 would be to remove the remainder of the tree on that same day. For palm trees that can support western yellow bat (a special-status bat species documented in the BSA with the potential to occur in the Project area), the two-step tree process shall be used over two days. Western yellow bats may move deeper within the dead fronds during disturbance. The two-day process will allow the bats to vacate the tree before removal. - The results of bat surveys, evaluations, and monitoring efforts that are undertaken shall be documented in a report by the qualified biologist at the conclusion of all bat-related activities.					
MM-BIO-B: <i>Avoid and minimize project-related impacts to nesting birds.</i> To avoid impacts to nesting birds protected under the MBTA and CFGC resulting from construction activities that may occur during the nesting season, the following mitigation measure shall be implemented: Construction activities, including the clearance of trees potentially suitable for nesting birds, shall occur outside of the nesting season (generally February 1 through September 30). If construction	Project Sponsor Qualified Biologist Construction Contractor	Metro and/or the City of Los Angeles	Pre-Construction Construction	Once, Plan Check (proof of compliance) Periodic Field Inspections during Construction	Pre-Construction Field Survey by Qualified Biologist Compliance Certificate and Report by Qualified Biologist Inclusion of requirement in Construction Plan

Project Design Feature or Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Monitoring / Enforcement Agency	Monitoring Phase	Monitoring Frequency	Action(s) Indicating Compliance
activities must occur within this time period, the following measures shall be employed: ○ A pre-construction nesting survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist within 3 days (72 hours) prior to the start of construction activities to determine whether active nests are present within 500 feet of the construction zone. All nests found shall be recorded. ○ A minimum 300-foot no-work buffer shall be established around any active passerine bird nest. A minimum 500-foot no-work buffer shall be established around any active raptor nest. The qualified biologist shall monitor the nest on a weekly basis, and construction activities within 300 feet of an active nest of any passerine bird or within 500 feet of an active nest of any raptor shall be postponed until the biologist determines that the nest is no longer active. However, the standard 300- to 500-foot no-disturbance buffer distance may be adjusted (including increases or reductions to the buffer) by a qualified biologist on a case-by-case basis, taking into consideration the location, type, duration and timing, and severity of work, distance of nest from work area, surrounding vegetation and line-of-sight between the nest and work areas (also taking into account existing ambient conditions from human activity within the line of sight), the influence of other environmental factors, and species' site-specific level of habituation to the disturbance. If the qualified biologist determines nesting activities may fail as a result of work activities, the biologist shall immediately inform the construction manager, and all Project work shall cease (except access along established roadways) within the recommended no-disturbance buffer until the biologist determines the adults and young are no longer reliant on the nest site.					Issuance of Applicable Building Permit Submittal of Compliance Report

Project Design Feature or Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Monitoring / Enforcement Agency	Monitoring Phase	Monitoring Frequency	Action(s) Indicating Compliance
○ Buffers will be delineated on-site with bright flagging for easy identification by project staff. The on-site construction supervisor and operator staff will be notified of the nest and the buffer limits, and instructed of the sensitivity of the area to ensure the buffer is maintained. ○ A summary of preconstruction surveys and methodologies employed, monitoring efforts, and any no-disturbance buffers that were installed shall be documented in a report by the qualified biologist at the conclusion of each nesting season.					
Cultural Resources					
CUL-PDF-A: Pre-Construction Documentation of The Winery. Prior to the issuance of building permits for the Alameda Station, the Project Sponsor will prepare documentation equal to Historic American Building Survey (HABS) Level III for The Winery, per the <i>Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Architectural and Engineering Documentation</i>. The report will: 1. Be prepared by a historic preservation professional meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for history, architectural history, or historic architecture with demonstrated experience in preparing HABS documentation. 2. Include full-color digital photographs (with a minimum resolution of 300 ppi and 3,000-pixel image size along one dimension) showing the following: a. The full northern elevation (facing Cesar E. Chavez Avenue) and i. The roofline, foundation, and any door, window, or walkway openings, ii. Detail views showing the typical existing condition of the exterior wall, and	Project Sponsor Historic Preservation Professional	Metro and/or the City of Los Angeles (City of Los Angeles Office of Historic Resources)	Pre-Construction	Once, prior to Issuance of Applicable Building Permits for the Alameda Station (proof of compliance)	Pre-Construction Documentation by Historic Preservation Professional Issuance of Applicable Building Permits for the Alameda Station

Project Design Feature or Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Monitoring / Enforcement Agency	Monitoring Phase	Monitoring Frequency	Action(s) Indicating Compliance
iii. Detail views showing any existing damage to the exterior such as cracks or spalling. b. West elevation (facing Olvera Street), and i. The roofline, foundation, and any door, window, or walkway openings, and ii. Detail views showing the typical existing condition of the exterior brick wall, and iii. Detail views showing any existing damage to the exterior such as loose bricks and mortar. c. East elevation (facing Alameda Street) i. The roofline and foundation, and ii. Detail views showing the typical existing condition of the exterior brick wall, and iii. Detail views showing any existing damage to the exterior such as loose bricks and mortar. 3. Include written descriptive data, including detailed notes of its pre-construction condition, index to photographs, and photo key plan. Photographs of existing damage will be keyed to a sketch of the elevation indicating its location. 4. Include copies of historic photographs and other supporting documentation, if available. 5. Be offered to the following repositories for use by future researchers and educators. Each repository will be contacted as to whether they are willing and able to accept the items, as well as their preferred format for transmittal. Copies need to only be distributed to repositories that express interest. a. Los Angeles Public Library - One hard copy and/or digital file (dependent on repository preference) of the descriptive data, index to photographs, photo key plan, and photographs. b. El Pueblo de Los Angeles Historical Monument Authority - One hard copy and/or digital file (dependent on repository preference) of the					

Project Design Feature or Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Monitoring / Enforcement Agency	Monitoring Phase	Monitoring Frequency	Action(s) Indicating Compliance
descriptive data, index to photographs, photo key plan, and photographs. c. California State Library – One hard copy and/or digital file (dependent on repository preference) of the descriptive data, index to photographs, photo key plan, and photographs.					
CUL-PDF-B: Post-Construction Documentation of The Winery. Post-Construction: After construction is complete, pictures of The Winery equivalent to CUL-PDF-A will be taken to objectively compare the condition of The Winery before and after construction. In the event that damage to the Winery not documented at the time of the pre-construction survey is identified as being caused by construction activities during construction monitoring, the Project Sponsor will retain an experienced professional or professionals qualified to carry out the repairs within 12 months of completion of the project. Repairs will conform to the Secretary of Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (36 CFR Part 68).	Project Sponsor Historic Preservation Professional	Metro and/or the City of Los Angeles (City of Los Angeles Office of Historic Resources)	Post-Construction	Once, Post-Construction of the Alameda Station Once, if Repairs Required, Post-Repairs	Post-Construction Documentation by Historic Preservation Professional If Repairs Required, Repairs within 12 Months; Completion of Repairs shall not Delay Issuance of Certificate of Occupancy
CUL-PDF-C: Pre-Construction Documentation. Prior to the issuance of building permits for the Alameda Station, the Project Sponsor will prepare documentation equal to Historic American Building Survey (HABS) Level III for the <i>El Grito</i> mural, per the <i>Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Architectural and Engineering Documentation</i>. The report will: - Be prepared by a historic preservation professional meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for history, architectural history, or historic architecture with demonstrated experience in preparing HABS documentation. - Include full-color digital photographs (with a minimum resolution of 300 ppi and 3,000-pixel image size along one dimension) showing the following: - The entirety of the <i>El Grito</i> mural from edge to edge, looking straight on	Project Sponsor Historic Preservation Professional	Metro and/or the City of Los Angeles (City of Los Angeles Office of Historic Resources)	Pre-Construction	Once, prior to Issuance of Building Permits for the Alameda Station (proof of compliance)	Pre-Construction Documentation by Historic Preservation Professional Issuance of Building Permits for the Alameda Station

Project Design Feature or Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Monitoring / Enforcement Agency	Monitoring Phase	Monitoring Frequency	Action(s) Indicating Compliance
b. The left half of the <i>El Grito</i> mural looking straight on c. The right half of the <i>El Grito</i> mural looking straight on d. Oblique views illustrating the curvature of the wall e. Sequential photographs showing the various panels and subjects in greater detail f. The back and sides of the curved wall on which the <i>El Grito</i> mural is located, and g. Detail views showing: i. Typical profile view of the <i>El Grito</i> mural (e.g., showing the depth of the tiles on the substrate) ii. Notch shapes at the top two corners (two views, left and right) iii. Curved shape of the sides of the <i>El Grito</i> mural (two views, left and right side) iv. Typical grout between tiles in two or more locations, v. Bottom edge where the <i>El Grito</i> mural meets the plaza floor vi. Any existing damage or deterioration prior to construction 3. Include written descriptive data, including detailed notes of its pre-construction condition, index to photographs, and photo key plan. Photographs of existing damage should be keyed to a sketch of mural indicating its location. 4. Include copies of historic photographs and other supporting documentation, if available. 5. Be offered to the following repositories for use by future researchers and educators. Each repository will be contacted as to whether they are willing and able to accept the items, as well as their preferred format for transmittal. Copies need to					

Project Design Feature or Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Monitoring / Enforcement Agency	Monitoring Phase	Monitoring Frequency	Action(s) Indicating Compliance
be distributed to only repositories that express interest. a. Los Angeles Public Library - One hard copy and/or digital file (dependent on repository preference) of the descriptive data, index to photographs, photo key plan, and photographs. b. UC Santa Cruz Library - One hard copy and/or digital file (dependent on repository preference) of the descriptive data, index to photographs, photo key plan, and photographs. c. Los Angeles Department of Cultural Affairs (DCA) - One hard copy and/or digital file (dependent on repository preference) of the descriptive data, index to photographs, photo key plan, and photographs. d. California State Library – One hard copy and/or digital file (dependent on repository preference) of the descriptive data, index to photographs, photo key plan, and photographs. e. Mural Conservancy of Los Angeles - One hard copy and/or digital file (dependent on repository preference) of the descriptive data, index to photographs, photo key plan, and photographs. f. Museo Eduardo Carillo - One hard copy and/or digital file (dependent on repository preference) of the descriptive data, index to photographs, photo key plan, and photographs.					
CUL-PDF-D: Protection During Adjacent Construction. Prior to the issuance of building permits for the Alameda Station, the Project Sponsor will ensure that the <i>El Grito</i> mural is sufficiently protected from any inadvertent damage caused by construction activities. Following National Park Service guidance for protecting historical resources during nearby construction, the following measures, at a minimum, should be implemented:	Project Sponsor Historic Preservation Professional Construction Contractor	Metro and/or the City of Los Angeles (City of Los Angeles Office of Historic Resources)	Pre-Construction Construction	Once, prior to Issuance of Applicable Building Permits for the Alameda Station (proof of compliance) Periodic Field Inspections during Construction	Documentation by Historic Preservation Professional Issuance of Building Permits for the Alameda Station

Project Design Feature or Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Monitoring / Enforcement Agency	Monitoring Phase	Monitoring Frequency	Action(s) Indicating Compliance
1. Vibration monitoring equipment (VIB-A) should be carefully installed so that it does not permanently damage the face of the <i>El Grito</i> mural. 2. The <i>El Grito</i> mural should be cushioned and buttressed from either side of the wall with padded wood supports. The padding may consist of insulating foam or similar material. 3. A protective barrier or barriers made from plywood should be installed over the front, back, top, and sides of the <i>El Grito</i> mural and curved wall to diffuse the force of any potential physical contact. The barrier should include removable panels or a similar feature to ensure the vibration monitors and mural can be visually inspected during construction monitoring (CUL-PDF-C). 4. Plastic tarp or polyethylene sheeting should be secured over the wood barriers to protect against the accumulation of dust or contact with materials such as uncured concrete or other liquids that could damage or mark the surface of the <i>El Grito</i> mural. All of the protective measures described above should be installed and secured in such a way that does not damage the <i>El Grito</i> mural or the wall on which it is located. The barrier will not be physically attached to the <i>El Grito</i> mural or wall with screws, nails, or other fasteners.					
CUL-PDF-E: Construction Monitoring Plan (Built Resources). Prior to the issuance of building permits for the Alameda Station, the Project Sponsor will prepare a Construction Monitoring Plan in coordination with the DCA. The Construction Monitoring Plan will identify specific project milestones at which a qualified professional meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for architectural history or historic architecture will be notified by the Project Sponsor or Project Sponsor's contractor to visit the site and observe and document the <i>El Grito</i> mural's condition. Details will be recorded in construction monitoring	Project Sponsor Historic Preservation Professional Construction Contractor	Metro and/or the City of Los Angeles (City of Los Angeles Office of Historic Resources)	Pre-Construction Construction Post-Construction	Once, Pre-Construction of the Alameda Station Periodic Field Inspections during Construction (after each phase of construction) Once, Post-Construction Once, if Repairs Required, Post-Repairs	Construction Monitoring Plan and other Documentation by Historic Preservation Professional If Repairs Required, Repairs within 12 Months; Completion of Repairs shall not Delay Issuance of

Project Design Feature or Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Monitoring / Enforcement Agency	Monitoring Phase	Monitoring Frequency	Action(s) Indicating Compliance
memorandums submitted to DCA. These milestones will include, at a minimum: 1. Pre-Construction: Before protection measures are installed (CUL-PDF-D), to confirm the baseline condition of the <i>El Grito</i> mural is still consistent with the information presented in the HABS-like documentation (CUL-PDF-C). 2. Pre-Construction: Once protection measures (CUL-PDF-D) are installed, to ensure they are sufficient, and their installation has not damaged the <i>El Grito</i> mural. 3. Construction: After each phase of active construction. 4. Post-Construction: After construction is complete and protective measures have been removed. At this stage, pictures of the <i>El Grito</i> mural equivalent to CUL-PDF-C will be taken to objectively compare the condition of the <i>El Grito</i> mural before and after construction. The Construction Monitor will also be included on notifications from the real-time vibration monitoring equipment (VIB-A). In the event that damage to the <i>El Grito</i> mural not documented at the time of the pre-construction survey is identified as being caused by construction activities during construction monitoring, the Project Sponsor will retain an experienced professional or professionals qualified to carry out the repairs within 12 months of completion of the Project. Repairs will conform to the Secretary of Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties 36 CFR Part 68.					Certificate of Occupancy
MM-CUL-A: Cultural Resources Monitoring and Mitigation Plan. A Cultural Resources Monitoring and Mitigation Plan (CRMMP) shall be prepared for the Project by a qualified archaeologist meeting the Secretary of Interior Standards for Archaeology (36 CFR § 61) prior to construction. Where specific Project components, such as the Chinatown/State Park Station, have requirements specific to that component, the CRMMP	Project Sponsor Qualified Archaeologist Construction Contractor	Metro and/or the City of Los Angeles and/or the California Department of Parks and Recreation	Pre-Construction Construction Post-Construction	Once, Prior to Construction Periodic Field Inspections During Construction as Determined by the Qualified Archaeologist	Cultural Resources Monitoring and Mitigation Plan (CRMMP) by Qualified Archaeologist If There Is a Discovery That Proves

Project Design Feature or Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Monitoring / Enforcement Agency	Monitoring Phase	Monitoring Frequency	Action(s) Indicating Compliance
will lay out regulatory requirements (such as PRC § 5024) which will be adhered to. This includes SHPO consultation and following practices that seek to avoid and preserve state-owned historical resources, when prudent and feasible. The same would be for any specific requirement from El Pueblo de Los Angeles specific to the work at the Alameda Station. The General Plan acknowledges the Park has archaeological sensitivities and, as such, recommends continued study of existing and potential resources as well as the need to constantly update and expand the knowledge of historic activities at the Park. As for the cultural resources associated with the Park, the General Plan states that the Park should “[i]dentify, document, evaluate, and interpret cultural resources at the Park,” and “[p]rotect, stabilize, and preserve significant cultural resources within the Park.” Specifically, the CRMMP shall be applicable to all ground-disturbance activities extending into native soil within known archaeological sites and other areas of high sensitivity. Excavations within a specified radius of known archaeological sites shall be monitored up to a depth at which the qualified archaeologist determines the base of the archaeological deposit has been reached. The qualified archaeologist shall supervise the archaeological monitor. Monitoring is expected to be required to the maximum depth of planned excavations at the Alameda Station and up to approximately 15 feet in depth at the Alameda Tower and the Chinatown/State Park Station. Work will also be monitored by Native American monitors in accordance with Mitigation Measure TCR-A. However, if in the course of excavations the qualified archaeologist determines that the site is disturbed or the sensitivity for significant archaeological resources is low because no resources have been encountered, then monitoring may be reduced or suspended. The monitoring plan shall define pre-construction coordination, construction monitoring for the excavations based on activities and depth of				Once Post-Construction Once, if There Is a Discovery that Proves Significant	Significant, Curation of Specimens and a Repository Submittal Report within a Year of Completion of Fieldwork; Final Report Filed with the SCCIC

Project Design Feature or Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Monitoring / Enforcement Agency	Monitoring Phase	Monitoring Frequency	Action(s) Indicating Compliance
disturbance planned for each Project component (including ground-disturbing activities in native soil within known archaeological sites), unanticipated discovery protocols, data recovery (including halting or diverting construction so that archaeological resources can be evaluated and recovered in a timely manner), artifact and feature treatment, procurement (including a curation plan), and reporting. The Project Sponsor shall coordinate with the archaeologist and Metro to develop an appropriate treatment plan for the resources in accordance with California Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21083.2(i) if they are determined by Metro to be potentially eligible for the CRHR or potentially qualify as unique archaeological resources pursuant to CEQA. Preservation in place is the preferred method of treatment, but if preservation in place is not feasible, treatment may include implementation of archaeological data recovery excavations to remove the resource. Key staff shall be identified, and the process of notification and consultation (where entities specific to each station would be identified) shall be specified within the CRMMP as well as protocols for reporting. If the discovery proves significant under CEQA and data recovery is the selected means of treatment, the archaeologist shall also be required to curate specimens in a repository with permanent retrievable storage and submit a written report to the lead agency within a year of completion of the fieldwork. Once complete, the final report shall be filed with the SCCIC. For Resource 19-004200 and the granite paving (within the Area of Direct Impact of the Project) at Site 19-003120, the CRMMP shall describe the required documentation and treatment of the resources during excavation and potential removal.					

Project Design Feature or Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Monitoring / Enforcement Agency	Monitoring Phase	Monitoring Frequency	Action(s) Indicating Compliance
MM-CUL-B: Archaeological Resources Worker Training Program. To mitigate unknown historical resources within the Area of Direct Impacts and mitigate potential impacts to them, a qualified archaeologist shall be hired by the Project Sponsor to develop and conduct a worker training program for the Project with input from El Pueblo (as it pertains to the Alameda Station) and Los Angeles State Historic Park staff (as it pertains to the Chinatown/State Park Station) prior to the start of ground-disturbing activities. The training shall be prepared by an archaeologist who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Archaeology and will be adjusted to the specific details at the two parks. The training shall provide information to construction workers about the known locations of archaeological resources and potential areas that may be sensitive for archaeological resources associated with the Project. Participation in the training by Los Angeles State Historic Park and El Pueblo staff, will be encouraged. In the event construction crews are phased or rotated, additional training shall be conducted for the new construction workers conducting ground-disturbing activities. The qualified archaeologist shall retain documentation demonstrating that the appropriate construction workers attended the worker training program. An appropriate presentation shall be prepared by a qualified archaeologist which shall describe and illustrate resources likely to be encountered by Project excavation and outline the protocol to be followed in the event of a find. If any archaeological resources are encountered during ground-disturbing activities, work shall be temporarily halted in the vicinity of the find, and the Construction Contractor shall contact the qualified archaeologist to examine and evaluate the resource in accordance with the provisions of CEQA as outlined by the CRMMP.	Project Sponsor Qualified Archaeologist Construction Contractor	Metro and/or the City of Los Angeles and/or California Department of Parks and Recreation	Pre-Construction Construction	Once, Pre-Construction Periodic Field Inspections during Construction	Archaeological Resources Worker Training Program by Qualified Archaeologist Inclusion of requirement in Construction Plan Training Submittal of Compliance Report
MM-CUL-C: Archaeological Testing Plan for 19-000887 and 19-004320 (Alameda Station). To mitigate impacts to Resources 19-000887 and 19-004320, both of which include portions of the Zanja, an NRHP-eligible	Project Sponsor Qualified Archaeologist	Metro and/or the City of Los Angeles	Pre-Construction Construction	Once, Pre-Construction and as Determined by Archaeological Testing Plan and/or Data	Archaeological Testing Plan

Project Design Feature or Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Monitoring / Enforcement Agency	Monitoring Phase	Monitoring Frequency	Action(s) Indicating Compliance
archaeological site, and where avoidance is not feasible, an archaeological testing plan and data recovery plan for the Area of Direct Impacts, which is located north of the Placita de Dolores, shall be prepared prior to ground-disturbing activities and implemented after the paving is removed. Although the proposed Project is designed to not impact the portion of the Zanja Madre within 19-000887, there is the potential to encounter either previously unrecorded portions of the Zanja or artifact refuse from the overall site. Therefore, a testing plan shall be prepared for the portions of the sites that will be impacted outside of the known Zanja location. Within the Project Area of Direct Impacts, 19-000887 overlaps unevaluated 19-004320 which will, therefore, also be included in the testing plan. The testing plan shall be prepared in consultation with El Pueblo de Los Angeles Historical Monument Authority specific to these resources at the Alameda Station. The testing plan shall propose limited archaeological excavations of a portion of the site overlapping the Area of Direct Impacts and contain maps showing the overlap of the sites with the project Area of Direct Impacts. The test excavations are intended to identify the location, integrity, and significance of archaeological deposits that may be impacted by the proposed Project. The testing plan shall outline excavation locations and methods, such as where and in what soils mechanical excavations may or may not be used, screen sizes, and the criteria thresholds that would require data recovery. The testing plan shall be implemented once the paving has been removed and far enough in advance of construction for there to be sufficient time to carry out the plan and to prepare a plan for and conduct a data recovery program if needed. If significant archaeological remains are encountered that appear to contribute to the significance of the overall site during the test excavations and avoidance/preservation in place is not feasible, data	Construction Contractor			Recovery Plan (proof of compliance)	If Significant Archaeological Remains Are Discovered, Data Recovery Plan

Project Design Feature or Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Monitoring / Enforcement Agency	Monitoring Phase	Monitoring Frequency	Action(s) Indicating Compliance
recovery excavations will be required, and a data recovery plan shall be prepared and implemented. The data recovery plan shall detail the treatment of the surviving archaeological remains, if testing identifies any. The data recovery plan will specify a statistically significant sample of the site to be excavated and shall describe the specific tools, screening size, and methods to be used. The plan shall describe how structural remains, if any, will be exposed and mapped. Laboratory studies planned for the analysis of the finds shall also be described.					
MM-CUL-D: Archaeological Testing Plan for LAUS Forecourt. To mitigate impacts to Resource 19-001575, an NRHP-eligible archaeological site, an archaeological testing plan and data recovery plan for the Area of Direct Impacts shall be prepared and implemented prior to ground-disturbing activities. The testing plan shall propose limited archaeological excavations of a portion of the site overlapping the Area of Direct Impacts. The test excavations are intended to identify the location, integrity, and significance of archaeological deposits that may be impacted by the proposed Project. The testing plan shall outline excavation locations and methods, such as where and in what soils mechanical excavations may or may not be used, screen sizes, and the criteria threshold that would require data recovery. If significant archaeological remains are encountered that appear to contribute to the site's NRHP and CRHR eligibility during the test excavations and avoidance/preservation in place is not feasible, data recovery excavations will be required, and the data recovery plan shall be implemented. The data recovery plan shall specify a statistically significant sample of the site to be excavated and shall describe the specific tools, screening size, and methods to be used. The plan shall describe how structural remains, if any, will be exposed and mapped. Laboratory studies planned for the analysis of the finds shall also be described.	Project Sponsor Qualified Archaeologist Construction Contractor	Metro and/or the City of Los Angeles	Pre-Construction Construction	Once, Pre-Construction and as Determined by Archaeological Testing Plan and/or Data Recovery Plan (proof of compliance)	Archaeological Testing Plan If Significant Archaeological Remains Are Discovered, Data Recovery Plan

Project Design Feature or Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Monitoring / Enforcement Agency	Monitoring Phase	Monitoring Frequency	Action(s) Indicating Compliance
MM-CUL-E: Archaeological Testing Plan for Los Angeles State Historic Park. To mitigate unavoidable impacts to Resource 19-003120, an NRHP-eligible archaeological site, an archaeological testing plan and data recovery plan for the Area of Direct Impacts shall be prepared and implemented prior to ground-disturbing activities. The testing plan shall be prepared in consultation with California State Parks and SHPO (per PRC § 5024.5). The testing plan shall propose limited archaeological excavations of a portion of the site overlapping the Area of Direct Impacts. The test excavations are intended to identify the location, integrity, and significance of archaeological deposits that may be impacted by the proposed Project; and will specifically be used to confirm and define potential foundations for the Southern Pacific Railroad office/freight house that are shown in Sanborn fire insurance maps to overlap the Area of Direct Impacts for the station. The plan shall outline excavation locations and methods, such as where and in what soils mechanical excavations may or may not be used, screen sizes, and the criteria thresholds that would require data recovery. If significant archaeological remains are encountered that appear to contribute to the site's NRHP and CRHR eligibility during the test excavations and avoidance/preservation-in-place is not possible, data recovery excavations will be required, and the data recovery plan shall be implemented. The plan shall specify a statistically significant sample of the site to be excavated and shall describe the specific tools, screening size, and methods to be used. The plan shall describe how structural remains, if any, will be exposed and mapped. Laboratory studies planned for the analysis of the finds shall also be described.	Project Sponsor Qualified Archaeologist Construction Contractor	Metro and/or the City of Los Angeles and/or California Department of Parks and Recreation	Pre-Construction Construction	Once, Pre-Construction and as Determined by Archaeological Testing Plan and/or Data Recovery Plan (proof of compliance)	Archaeological Testing Plan If Significant Archaeological Remains Are Discovered, Data Recovery Plan
MM-CUL-F: Redesign of Placement of Park Amenity Structures to Avoid Archaeological Features at Los Angeles State Historic Park Station. After implementation of CUL-E, if it is found that the Los Angeles State Historic Park amenities (e.g., concessions and restroom) at the Los	Project Sponsor Qualified Archaeologist	Metro and/or the California Department of Parks and Recreation	Pre-Construction	Once, Pre-Construction	If Necessary, Reconfiguration of Locations of Los Angeles State Historic

Project Design Feature or Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Monitoring / Enforcement Agency	Monitoring Phase	Monitoring Frequency	Action(s) Indicating Compliance
Angeles State Historic Park have the potential to impact any significant features found during the testing phase of CUL-E, the location of the Los Angeles State Historic Park amenity structures will be reconfigured to avoid and/or diminish impacts to those features as feasible.	Construction Contractor				Park Amenity Structures
Geology and Soils					
MM-GEO-A: Prepare a Site-Specific Final Geotechnical Report: The Project Sponsor shall engage a California-registered geotechnical engineer to prepare and submit a site specific- final geotechnical investigation and report to the City of Los Angeles for review, consistent with the requirements of the CBC, applicable Los Angeles amendments, and California Geological Survey Special Publication 117 (as amended). A site-specific geotechnical exploration program, along with associated laboratory testing, is necessary to complete a design-level evaluation of the geologic hazards and conditions, seismic hazards, grading conditions, and foundation capacities. The site-specific final geotechnical report shall provide a description of the geological and geotechnical conditions at the site; the findings, conclusions, and mitigation recommendations for potential geologic and seismic hazards; and design-level geotechnical recommendations in support of grading and foundation design. Additionally, the geotechnical report shall include recommended measures to reduce potential impacts related to landslides, subsidence, liquefaction, differential settlement, expansive soils, soil corrosivity, or other potential ground failures induced by the proposed Project. The submittal and approval of the final geotechnical report shall be a condition of the grading and construction permits issued by the City of Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety. The Project Sponsor shall implement the recommendations contained in the approved report during project design and construction.	Project Sponsor Geotechnical Engineer	Metro and/or the City of Los Angeles (Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety)	Pre-Construction Construction	Once, Plan Check (proof of compliance) Periodic Field Inspections during Construction	Approval of the Site-Specific Final Geotechnical Report by Geotechnical Engineer by the City of Los Angeles (Department of Building and Safety) Issuance of Applicable Building Permit(s) Issuance of Certificate of Occupancy

Project Design Feature or Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Monitoring / Enforcement Agency	Monitoring Phase	Monitoring Frequency	Action(s) Indicating Compliance
MM-GEO-B: Prepare a Paleontological Resources Monitoring and Mitigation Plan (PRMMP): A PRMMP shall be developed by a qualified paleontologist meeting the criteria established by the Society for Vertebrate Paleontology. The plan shall apply to paleontologically sensitive deposits, including older Quaternary alluvium and Puente formation deposits, that may be impacted by the proposed Project, as determined by a qualified paleontologist in consultation with the construction team and guided by geotechnical coring. The qualified paleontologist shall supervise the paleontological monitor, who shall be present during construction excavations into older Quaternary alluvial deposits and Miocene Puente formation deposits. Monitoring shall consist of visually inspecting fresh exposures of rock for larger fossil remains, and where appropriate, collecting wet or dry screened sediment samples of promising horizons for smaller fossil remains. The frequency of monitoring inspections shall be determined by the paleontologist, and shall be based on the rate of ground-disturbing activities, the material being excavated, and the depth of excavation; and if found, the abundance and type of paleontological materials. If any paleontological materials are found, the paleontological monitor shall temporarily divert or redirect ground-disturbing activities in the area of the exposed fossil to facilitate evaluation, and if necessary, salvage. The paleontologist shall assess the discovered material(s) and provide a recommendation(s), if necessary, for the preservation, conservation, or relocation of the resource, as appropriate. The Project Sponsor shall comply with the recommendations of the evaluating paleontologist, and ground-disturbing activities may resume once the paleontologist's recommendations have been implemented to the paleontologist's satisfaction. If paleontological materials are found, the paleontologist shall prepare a report identifying the resource and the recommendations proposed and implemented, within 1 year of completion of the	Project Sponsor Qualified Paleontologist Construction Contractor	Metro and/or City of Los Angeles	Pre-Construction Construction	Once, Plan Check (proof of compliance) To Be Determined in Consultation with Qualified Paleontologist	Monitoring and Mitigation Plan (PRMMP) by Qualified Paleontologist In the Event that Paleontological Materials are Found, Report Prepared and Submitted to the Los Angeles County Natural History Museum within 1 Year of Completion of Fieldwork

Project Design Feature or Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Monitoring / Enforcement Agency	Monitoring Phase	Monitoring Frequency	Action(s) Indicating Compliance
fieldwork. A copy of the report shall be submitted to the Los Angeles County Natural History Museum.					
Greenhouse Gas Emissions					
GHG-PDF-A: Green Power. Electrical power for the operation of the proposed Project's aerial gondola system and associated stations, junction, and towers would come from renewable resources. The proposed Project shall achieve this through applying to LADWP's Green Power Program or other available LADWP (or equivalent) programs that provide renewable electricity.	Project Operator	Metro and/or the City of Los Angeles	Prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy	Once, prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy	Compliance Certificate Issuance of Certificate of Occupancy
Hazards and Hazardous Materials					
MM-HAZ-A: Prepare a Soil and Groundwater Management Plan: The Project Sponsor shall retain a qualified environmental consultant to prepare a Soil and Groundwater Management Plan prior to any re-grading, decommissioning, or construction activities. The Soil and Groundwater Management Plan would be prepared and implemented to specify methods for handling and disposal in the event contaminated groundwater, contaminated soil, or structures, are encountered during project construction. The Soil and Groundwater Management Plan shall provide a summary of the environmental conditions at each Project component site, including stations and towers. The Soil and Groundwater Management Plan shall include methods and procedures for sampling and analyzing soils and/or groundwater in order to classify them as either hazardous or non-hazardous, and if identified as hazardous, shall include additional methods and procedures for the proper handling and removal of impacted soils and/or groundwater for off-site disposal and/or recycle. Methods and procedures in the Soil and Groundwater Management Plan shall be in accordance with current federal, state, and local regulations and be protective of workers and the environment. This Soil and Groundwater Management Plan shall be submitted to the LADBS for review prior to	Project Sponsor Qualified Environmental Consultant Construction Contractor	Metro and/or the City of Los Angeles (Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety)	Pre-Construction Construction	Once, Plan Check (proof of compliance) Periodic Field Inspections during Construction	Approval of Soil and Groundwater Management Plan by Qualified Environmental Consultant by the City of Los Angeles (Department of Building and Safety) Issuance of Building Permits Compliance Certificate Issuance of Certificate of Occupancy

Project Design Feature or Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Monitoring / Enforcement Agency	Monitoring Phase	Monitoring Frequency	Action(s) Indicating Compliance
commencement of demolition and construction activities and as a condition of the grading, construction, and/or demolition permit(s). Contract specifications shall mandate full compliance with all applicable local, state, and federal regulations (including but not limited to, as applicable, OSHA Safety and Health Standards, Cal/OSHA requirements, federal, state and local waste disposal regulations, SCAQMD Rule 1166, as well as any other applicable requirements of the California Department of Toxic Substances, the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board, and the City of Los Angeles) related to the identification, excavation, transportation, and disposal of hazardous materials, including those encountered in excavated soil and dewatered groundwater.					
MM-HAZ-B: Hazardous Materials Abatement: Prior to demolition of the existing building at 1201 North Broadway, a licensed abatement contractor will conduct hazardous materials abatement, which would remove, dispose of, and transport hazardous materials in accordance with federal, state, and local regulations. The licensed abatement contractor would be required to comply with Cal/OSHA regulations governing asbestos standards and lead paint standards (California Code of Regulations Article 4 Sections 1529, 15208, and 1532), OSHA 29 Code of Federal Regulations 1926.62 regarding lead in construction, and OSHA 29 Code of Federal Regulations 1926.1101 regarding asbestos exposure. The contractor would also be required to comply with SCAQMD Rule 1403, related to asbestos emissions during building demolition activities. Safe work measures would be taken during the hazardous materials abatement, including wetting the area to prevent possible release of hazardous materials into the air and removing dust with high-efficiency particulate air vacuums and/or disposable wet wipe towels.	Project Sponsor Licensed Abatement Contractor Construction Contractor	Metro and/or the City of Los Angeles	Pre-Construction (prior to Demolition of 1201 North Broadway)	Once, Plan Check Periodic Field Inspections during Pre-Construction (prior to Demolition of 1201 North Broadway)	Compliance Certificate by Licensed Abatement Contractor Issuance of Applicable Demolition Permit for 1201 North Broadway

Project Design Feature or Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Monitoring / Enforcement Agency	Monitoring Phase	Monitoring Frequency	Action(s) Indicating Compliance
Land Use and Planning					
MM-LUP-A: Obtain a Los Angeles State Historic Park General Plan Amendment. Pursuant to Public Resources Code 5002.2, the proposed Project shall obtain an amendment to the Los Angeles State Historic Park General Plan to allow transit uses within the Los Angeles State Historic Park General Plan.	Project Sponsor	Metro and/or California Department of Parks and Recreation	California Department of Parks and Recreation Approval Process	Once, at the Conclusion of the California Department of Parks and Recreation Approval Process	Approval of the Los Angeles State Historic Park General Plan Amendment
Noise					
NOI-PDF-A: Gondola Cabin Noise Control Features. The Project's gondola cabins shall include the following features: - Gondola cabins shall be designed with an interior-to-exterior noise reduction rating of no less than Sound Transmission Class (STC) 35. - If heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) units are included in the gondola cabin design, they shall be designed with a sound power level of no more than 71 dBA.	Project Sponsor Gondola Cabin Manufacturer	Metro and/or the City of Los Angeles	Prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy	Once, prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy	Compliance Certificate by Gondola Cabin Manufacturer Issuance of Certificate of Occupancy
MM-NOI-A: Prepare a Construction Noise Management Plan. Prior to the issuance of grading permits for the proposed Project, the Project Sponsor shall design a Construction Noise Management Plan to minimize the construction-related noise impacts to off-site noise-sensitive receptors. The Construction Noise Management Plan shall include the following measures to reduce noise levels: Noise Barriers: Temporary construction noise barriers between the Project construction area and affected receptors shall be installed as identified below. The noise barriers shall be designed to have a sound transmission class (STC) rating of at least 25 and should have the ability to provide a range of noise reduction between 5 dBA and 15 dBA when the construction equipment is located below the elevation level of the noise barrier and there is no line-of-sight between the construction equipment and the noise-sensitive receptors. Specific locations and heights for the temporary noise	Project Sponsor Qualified Noise Consultant Construction Contractor	Metro and/or the City of Los Angeles	Pre-Construction Construction	Once, Plan Check (proof of compliance) Periodic Field Inspections during Construction	Submittal of Construction Noise Management Plan by Qualified Noise Consultant Issuance of Applicable Grading Permits Compliance Certificate by Qualified Noise Consultant

Project Design Feature or Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Monitoring / Enforcement Agency	Monitoring Phase	Monitoring Frequency	Action(s) Indicating Compliance
barriers shall include the following by Project components: • Alameda Station ○ For the entire duration of construction, the Project shall provide a 24-foot tall temporary noise barrier between the Project construction site and NSR 3 [Mozaic Apartments]. ○ For the entire duration of construction, the Project shall provide an 8-foot temporary noise barrier between the Project construction site and NSR 1A [Union Station] and NSR 1B [First Five LA]. ○ During the Foundations and Columns phase, the Project shall provide a 10-foot temporary noise barrier between the Project construction activities occurring within Alameda Street and NSR 1A [Union Station], NSR 1B [First Five LA], NSR 2 [El Pueblo], and NSR 3 [Mozaic Apartments]. ○ During a portion of the Structural Steel and Gondola Equipment Erection phase and during a portion of the Vertical Circulation, Hardscaping, Landscaping, and Interior Work phase, temporary platforms will be installed to facilitate construction activities. While the temporary platforms are installed, the Project shall provide a 10-foot temporary noise barrier on the temporary platforms between the Project construction site and NSR 3. • Alameda Tower ○ For the entire duration of construction, the Project shall provide an 8-foot temporary noise barrier between the Project construction site and NSR 4 [The California Endowment]. ○ During a portion of the Structural Steel and Gondola Equipment Erection phase, temporary platforms will be installed to facilitate construction activities. While the temporary platforms are installed, the Project shall provide					

Project Design Feature or Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Monitoring / Enforcement Agency	Monitoring Phase	Monitoring Frequency	Action(s) Indicating Compliance
a 10-foot temporary noise barrier on the temporary platforms between the Project construction site and NSR 4. • Alpine Tower ○ For the entire duration of construction, the Project shall provide an 8-foot temporary noise barrier between the Project construction site and NSR 6 [Chinatown Senior Lofts] and NSR 7 [Homeboy Industries]. ○ During a portion of the Structural Steel and Gondola Equipment Erection phase, temporary platforms will be installed to facilitate construction activities. While the temporary platforms are installed, the Project shall provide a 10-foot temporary noise barrier on the temporary platforms between the Project construction site and NSR 6 and NSR 7. ○ NSR 5 [Future Residential] is currently an undeveloped City-owned parking lot and is proposed for future multi-family residential uses. If NSR 5 is occupied by residential units at the time of Project construction, the following noise barriers shall be provided: ▪ For the entire duration of construction, the Project shall provide an 8-foot temporary noise barrier between the Project construction site and NSR 5. ▪ During the Foundations and Columns and Structural Steel and Gondola Equipment Erection phases, the Project shall provide a 24-foot temporary noise barrier between the Project construction site and occupied residential units at NSR 5 [Future Residential]. ▪ During a portion of the Structural Steel and Gondola Equipment Erection phase, temporary platforms will be installed to facilitate construction activities. While the temporary platforms are installed, the					

Project Design Feature or Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Monitoring / Enforcement Agency	Monitoring Phase	Monitoring Frequency	Action(s) Indicating Compliance
Project shall provide a 10-foot temporary noise barrier on the temporary platforms between the Project construction site and NSR 5. • Chinatown/State Park Station ○ For the entire duration of construction, the Project shall provide an 8-foot temporary noise barrier between the Project construction site and NSR 9 [Blossom Plaza], NSR 10 [Future Residential Development], NSR 11 [Capitol Milling], and NSR 14S [Los Angeles State Park]. The noise barrier will include a gate that may be temporarily opened for access during construction hours along Spring Street for construction access. ○ For the entire duration of construction, the Project shall provide a 10-foot temporary noise barrier between the Chinatown / State Park Station and NSR 8 [College Station] and NSR 12 [Future Residential Development]. ○ During a portion of the Structural Steel and Gondola Equipment Erection phase, temporary platforms will be installed to facilitate construction activities. While the temporary platforms are installed, the Project shall provide a 10-foot temporary noise barrier on the temporary platforms between the Project construction site and NSR 8, NSR 12, and NSR 14S. • Broadway Junction ○ For the entire duration of construction, the Project shall provide a 24-foot temporary noise barrier between the Project construction site and NSR 13 [Future Development], NSR 14N [Los Angeles State Historic Park], and NSR 17 [Low Rise Residential]. ○ During the Demolition phase and the Foundations and Columns phase, the Project shall provide a 24-foot temporary noise barrier					

Project Design Feature or Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Monitoring / Enforcement Agency	Monitoring Phase	Monitoring Frequency	Action(s) Indicating Compliance
between the Project construction site and NSR 16 [Cathedral High School]. ○ During the Structural Steel and Gondola Equipment Erection phase and the Vertical Circulation, Hardscaping, Landscaping, and Interior Work phase, the Project shall provide an 8-foot temporary noise barrier between the Project construction site and NSR 16 [Cathedral High School] ○ During a portion of the Structural Steel and Gondola Equipment Erection phase and during a portion of the Vertical Circulation, Hardscaping, Landscaping, and Interior Work phase, temporary platforms will be installed to facilitate construction activities. While the temporary platforms are installed, the Project shall provide a 10-foot temporary noise barrier on the temporary platforms between the Project construction site and NSR 13, NSR 14 N, NSR 16, and NSR 17. ● Stadium Tower ○ During the Foundations and Columns phase, the Project shall provide an 8-foot temporary noise barrier between the Project construction site and NSR 16 [Cathedral High School] and NSR 17 [Low Rise Residential]. ○ During a portion of the Structural Steel and Gondola Equipment Erection phase, temporary platforms will be installed to facilitate construction activities. While the temporary platforms are installed, the Project shall provide a 10-foot temporary noise barrier on the temporary platforms between Project construction and NSR 16 and NSR 17. ● Equipment Maintenance: Construction equipment shall be properly maintained per manufacturers' specifications to prevent noise due to worn or improperly maintained parts and shall be fitted with the best available noise suppression devices (i.e., mufflers, lagging, and/or motor enclosures).					

Project Design Feature or Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Monitoring / Enforcement Agency	Monitoring Phase	Monitoring Frequency	Action(s) Indicating Compliance
All impact tools shall be shrouded or shielded, and all intake and exhaust ports on power equipment shall be muffled or shielded. • Electrical Sources: When possible, on-site electrical sources shall be used to power equipment rather than diesel generators. • Sensitive Uses: Fixed and/or stationary equipment (e.g., generators, compressors, concrete mixers) shall be located away from noise-sensitive receptors. • Community Outreach: The following shall be implemented to reduce impacts to the local community related to disturbances from construction noise: ○ Noise Disturbance Coordinator: A noise and vibration disturbance coordinator shall be established. The noise disturbance coordinator shall be responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise. The noise and vibration disturbance coordinator shall determine the cause of the complaint (e.g., starting too early, bad muffler, etc.) and shall be required to implement reasonable measures to address the complaint. Construction hours, allowable workdays, and the phone number of the job superintendent shall be clearly posted at all construction entrances to allow surrounding property owners to contact the job superintendent if necessary. In the event a complaint is received, appropriate corrective actions shall be implemented, and a report of the action provided to the reporting party. ○ Construction Notice: The construction contractor shall provide a construction notice to residents within 500 feet of the construction site for each Project component prior to initiation of construction activities. The construction site notice shall include job site address, anticipated equipment to be used and duration of construction activities, permit					

Project Design Feature or Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Monitoring / Enforcement Agency	Monitoring Phase	Monitoring Frequency	Action(s) Indicating Compliance
number, name and phone number of the job superintendent, construction hours, and the City telephone number where violations can be reported. The notice will also include the phone number of the noise disturbance coordinator. • Limit Idling Equipment: Construction equipment shall not idle for longer than 5 minutes, as required by section 2485 of the California Code of Regulations.					
MM-VIB-A: Vibration Monitoring: Prior to the issuance of grading permits for the proposed Project, the Project Sponsor shall design a Vibration Monitoring Plan. The Plan shall provide for: • Vibration Monitoring Equipment: the placement of vibration monitoring equipment approximately 26 feet away from the Avila Adobe (1970s addition), El Grito mural wall, and The Old Winery by a qualified professional for real-time vibration monitoring for construction work at the Alameda Station requiring heavy equipment or ground compaction devices. • Modification of Vibration Equipment: the monitoring devices shall notify the construction crew if vibration levels are within 0.1 PPV, in/sec, of the vibration damage threshold. The construction crew shall modify the construction equipment to ensure that the vibration damage threshold is not exceeded.	Project Sponsor Qualified Vibration Consultant Construction Contractor	Metro and/or the City of Los Angeles	Pre-Construction Construction	Once, Plan Check (proof of compliance) Periodic Field Inspections during Construction	Submittal of Vibration Monitoring Plan by Qualified Vibration Consultant Issuance of Grading Permits Compliance Certificate by Qualified Vibration Consultant
MM-VIB-B: Force-Adjustable Ground Compaction Devices: For construction work occurring at the Alameda Station in proximity to the Avila Adobe (1970s addition), El Grito Mural, and The Old Winery: • At a distance of 26 feet or more from the Avila Adobe (1970s addition), El Grito Mural and The Old Winery, any ground compacting equipment, including vibratory rollers and plate compactors, shall be calibrated onsite prior to use to ensure vibration levels remain below the assumed reference level of 0.21 PPV, in/sec, at 25 feet. If the ground compacting equipment cannot achieve the	Project Sponsor Qualified Vibration Consultant Construction Contractor	Metro and/or the City of Los Angeles	Construction	Once, Plan Check (proof of compliance) Periodic Field Inspections during Construction	Inclusion of requirement in Construction Plan Issuance of Building Permits Compliance Certificate by Qualified Vibration Consultant

Project Design Feature or Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Monitoring / Enforcement Agency	Monitoring Phase	Monitoring Frequency	Action(s) Indicating Compliance
assumed reference level, equipment with less vibration (less than 0.21 PPV, in/sec, at 25 feet), non-vibrating equipment, or hand tools shall be required for ground compaction activities. Any ground compaction or excavation/drilling operations within 26 feet of the Avila Adobe (1970s addition), El Grito Mural or The Old Winery structures must be completed with non-vibrating equipment or hand tools.					
Transportation					
TRA-PDF-A: Additional Visibility Enhancements: Subject to the approval of the Los Angeles Department of Transportation, as a best practice to further enhance pedestrian visibility at the Chinatown/State Park Station, stripe a high visibility crosswalk and add upgraded lighting for the driveway crossing south of the Los Angeles State Historic Park.	Project Sponsor Transportation Engineer Construction Contractor	Metro and/or the City of Los Angeles (Los Angeles Department of Transportation)	Prior to Completion of Construction	Once, Prior to Completion of Construction	Approval of Additional Visibility Enhancements by the City of Los Angeles (Los Angeles Department of Transportation) Submittal of Compliance Report Certificate of Occupancy
MM-TRA-A: Visibility Enhancements: Prior to the completion of construction of the proposed Project, and in coordination with and subject to the approval of LADOT, the Project Sponsor shall design the following visibility enhancements at the following locations: - Alameda Tower – Implement a no right turn on red restriction to prohibit vehicles from making a right turn on red from westbound Alhambra Avenue to northbound Alameda Street. - Chinatown/State Park Station – Implement an operational strategy or design to channelize pedestrians walking from the Los Angeles State Historic Park to the crosswalk across the existing driveway south of the Park to prevent pedestrians from crossing the driveway west of columns supporting the Chinatown/State Park Station to ensure crossings occur in the crosswalk where	Project Sponsor Transportation Engineer Construction Contractor	Metro and/or the City of Los Angeles (Los Angeles Department of Transportation) and California Department of State Parks (as to the Chinatown/State Park Station)	Prior to Completion of Construction	Once, Prior to Completion of Construction	Approval of Visibility Enhancements by the City of Los Angeles (Los Angeles Department of Transportation) and California Department of State Parks (as to the Chinatown/State Park Station) Submittal of Compliance Report Certificate of Occupancy

Project Design Feature or Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Monitoring / Enforcement Agency	Monitoring Phase	Monitoring Frequency	Action(s) Indicating Compliance
visibility is sufficient. The ultimate design or operational method of channelization (such as station staff directing pedestrians towards the crosswalk or a physical method such as a gate) would be coordinated with State Parks. The mitigation measure would be implemented during the construction phase and would be completed prior to proposed Project operations.					
MM-TRA-B: Construction Traffic Management Plan: Prior to the issuance of a building permit for the proposed Project, a detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), including street closure information, detour plans, haul routes, and a staging plan, shall be prepared and submitted to the City for review and approval. The CTMP shall formalize how construction will be carried out and identify specific actions that will be required to reduce effects on the surrounding community. The CTMP shall be based on the nature and timing of the specific construction activities at each of the Project construction sites. This coordination will ensure construction activities of the concurrent related projects and associated hauling activities are managed in collaboration with one another and the proposed Project. The CTMP may be updated as construction progresses to reflect progress at the various Project construction sites. The CTMP will include, but not be limited to, the following elements as appropriate: • As traffic lane, parking lane, and sidewalk closures are anticipated, worksite traffic control plans, approved by the City of Los Angeles, shall be developed and implemented to route vehicular traffic, bicyclists, and pedestrians around any such closures. • Visibility to open pedestrian crossings will be maintained, or temporary or permanent measures consistent with Mitigation Measure TRA-A shall be implemented if determined to be appropriate in coordination with LADOT. In absence of measures to mitigate or eliminate visual obstructions for	Project Sponsor Transportation Engineer Construction Contractor	Metro and/or the City of Los Angeles (Los Angeles Department of Transportation)	Pre-Construction	Once, Plan Check (proof of compliance)	Approval of Construction Traffic Management Plan by City of Los Angeles (Los Angeles Department of Transportation) Inclusion of requirement in Construction Plan

Project Design Feature or Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Monitoring / Enforcement Agency	Monitoring Phase	Monitoring Frequency	Action(s) Indicating Compliance
pedestrians crossing the street, pedestrian crossings may be closed or relocated to more visible locations. - Existing school crossings, as denoted by yellow crosswalk striping consistent with the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) along proposed detour routes, shall be evaluated in coordination with LADOT to determine if crossing guards should temporarily be assigned. If it is determined that crossing guards should be assigned, on days/times when detours are active, the proposed Project shall fund crossing guards during morning school arrival and afternoon school departure periods during periods when adjacent schools are in session. If school crossings along detour routes are unsignalized, temporary traffic signals will be evaluated in coordination with LADOT and would be implemented by the proposed Project if deemed necessary. - As partial and full street closures are anticipated at various locations during portions of the Project construction, detour plans, approved by the City of Los Angeles, shall be developed and implemented to route vehicular traffic and bicyclists to alternative routes during these periods. - Ensure that access will remain accessible for land uses in proximity to the Project alignment and component sites during project construction. In some cases, alternative access locations would be provided or supervised temporary access through the worksite would be accommodated during construction phases where access is hindered, such as foundation construction. - Coordinate with the City and emergency service providers to ensure emergency access is provided to the Project alignment and component sites and neighboring businesses and residences. Emergency access points will be marked accordingly in consultation with LAFD, as necessary.					

Project Design Feature or Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Monitoring / Enforcement Agency	Monitoring Phase	Monitoring Frequency	Action(s) Indicating Compliance
- Conduct bi-monthly construction management meetings with City staff and other surrounding construction-related project representatives (i.e., construction contractors) whose projects will potentially be under construction at around the same time as the Project, or as otherwise determined appropriate by City Staff. - Provide off-site truck staging in a legal area furnished by the construction truck contractor. - Schedule deliveries and pick-ups of construction materials during non-peak travel periods to the extent possible and coordinate to reduce the potential of trucks waiting to load or unload for protracted periods. - During construction activities when construction worker parking cannot be accommodated at the Project component sites, identify alternate parking location(s) for construction workers and the method of transportation to and from the Project component sites (if beyond walking distance) for approval by the City 30 days prior to commencement of construction. - Provide all construction contractors with written information on where their workers and their subcontractors are permitted to park and provide clear consequences to violators for failure to follow these regulations.					
MM-TRA-C: Temporary Disaster Route Plan: Prior to the issuance of a building permit for the proposed Project, and in coordination with and subject to the approval of LADOT, the Project Sponsor shall submit a temporary disaster route plan to LADOT, which shall include street closure information and detour plans in order to facilitate the movement of emergency vehicles through the study area and minimize effects on emergency response during a disaster. Construction activities and temporary lane closures could quickly be halted in event of an emergency to allow emergency vehicles to travel through the work zones. In addition	Project Sponsor Transportation Engineer Construction Contractor	Metro and/or the City of Los Angeles (Los Angeles Department of Transportation)	Pre-Construction	Once, Plan Check (proof of compliance)	Approval of Construction Traffic Management Plan by City of Los Angeles (Los Angeles Department of Transportation) Inclusion of requirement in Construction Plan

Project Design Feature or Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Monitoring / Enforcement Agency	Monitoring Phase	Monitoring Frequency	Action(s) Indicating Compliance
to detours, the temporary disaster route plan could also include temporary operational measures that would be implemented by the City during a disaster, including temporary contra-flow lanes or reversing directions to flush vehicles during a disaster situation. The temporary disaster route plan would be prepared for the following locations: During those periods when construction of the Alameda Station, the Chinatown/State Park Station, and the Alameda and Alpine Towers require partial closure of one direction or full closure of both directions of Alameda Street or Spring Street.					
Tribal Cultural Resources					
MM-TCR-A Native American Monitor. Because of the potential to encounter tribal cultural resources, a Native American monitor shall be retained to monitor project-related, ground-disturbing construction activities (e.g., boring, grading, excavation, drilling, trenching) that occur after existing pavement and structures are removed at the location of the Alameda Station. If cultural resources are encountered elsewhere along the alignment during construction that, in the opinion of the archaeological Principal Investigator (as defined in 32 CFR Section 767.8), are likely of Native American origin, then Native American monitoring may be extended to include the area of the find. The Principal Investigator will make the recommendation to the Project Sponsor and Metro if it seems the Native American monitoring should be extended. The appropriate Native American monitor shall be selected based on ongoing coordination with consulting tribes and shall be identified in the CRMMP. The CRMMP is described in Mitigation Measure CUL-A. Specifically, the CRMMP and Native American monitoring would be applicable to ground disturbance activities extending into native soils at the location of the Alameda Station and, if cultural resources are encountered elsewhere along the alignment during construction that, in the opinion of the archaeological	Project Sponsor Qualified Native American Monitor Construction Contractor	Metro and/or the City of Los Angeles	Pre-Construction Construction	Once, Plan Check (proof of compliance) To Be Determined by the Archaeological Principal Investigator	Cultural Resources Monitoring and Mitigation Plan If Cultural Resources That May Be of Native American Origin Are Discovered, Data Recovery Plan

Project Design Feature or Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Monitoring / Enforcement Agency	Monitoring Phase	Monitoring Frequency	Action(s) Indicating Compliance
Principal Investigator, are likely of Native American origin. Monitoring procedures and the role and responsibilities of the Native American monitor shall be outlined in the CRMMP. In the event the Native American monitor identifies cultural or archeological resources, the monitor shall be given the authority to temporarily halt construction (if safe) within 50 feet (15 meters) of the discovery to investigate the find and contact the archaeological Principal Investigator. The Native American monitor and consulting tribe(s) shall be provided an opportunity to participate in the documentation and evaluation of the find. If a data recovery plan is prepared, the consulting tribe(s) shall be provided an opportunity to review and provide input on the plan.					
Utilities and Service Systems					
MM-USS-A: Development of a Utility Relocation Plan: Before the start of construction-related activities, including the relocation of utilities, the Project Sponsor shall coordinate with the Los Angeles Department of Water & Power, the Los Angeles Sanitation & Environment Department, the Southern California Gas Company, and Metro to prepare a Utility Relocation Plan. The Project Sponsor shall also coordinate with the utility companies to minimize impacts to services throughout the Project and obtain their approval of the Utility Relocation Plan. The Utility Relocation Plan shall be prepared, reviewed, and approved by a licensed civil engineer and, at a minimum, include the following: - Plans that identify the utility infrastructure elements, including access for utility providers and easements, as applicable, that require relocation as a result of the proposed Project; - Safety measures to avoid any human health hazards or environmental hazards associated with capping and abandoning some utility infrastructure, such as natural gas lines or sewer lines; and	Project Sponsor Civil Engineer Construction Contractor	Metro and/or the City of Los Angeles (Los Angeles Department of Water & Power, the Los Angeles Sanitation & Environment Department) and Southern California Gas Company	Pre-Construction	Once, Pre-Construction (proof of compliance)	Approval of the Utility Relocation Plan

Project Design Feature or Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Monitoring / Enforcement Agency	Monitoring Phase	Monitoring Frequency	Action(s) Indicating Compliance
Timing for completion of the utility relocation, which shall be scheduled to minimize disruption to the utility companies and their customers.					
Wildfire					
WFR-PDF-A: The Project will prepare a Fire Protection Plan, which will be implemented during construction of the Broadway Junction, Stadium Tower, and Dodger Stadium Station. The Fire Protection Plan will include the following measures that shall be implemented to the extent applicable in order to further reduce risks associated with ignition of wildland fire: - Prior to the start of any construction activities, a Fire Prevention Program Superintendent shall be designated to interface with the LAFD and coordinate fire watch and site fire prevention and response. - In exceedance of regulatory requirements, the Fire Prevention Program Superintendent shall prohibit hot work construction activities during Red Flag Warnings, which are issued for a stated period of time by the National Weather Service using pre-determined criteria to identify particularly critical wildfire danger in a particular geographic area. - Prior to the start of any hot work construction activities, the Fire Prevention Program Superintendent will implement tiered fire watches with increased staff tasked with monitoring for ignitions during hot work activities (fire watch). The fire watch shall be provided during hot work and shall continue to monitor for a minimum of 30 minutes following completion of the hot work activities. The Fire Prevention Program Superintendent may determine during construction that this monitoring period be increased based on the potential for weather conditions that may increase the potential for sparks to be carried by the wind and result in ignition (i.e., the potential for high wind events, high temperature, and/or low relative humidity).	Project Sponsor Fire Consultant Construction Contractor	Metro and/or the City of Los Angeles (LAFD)	Pre-Construction Construction	Once, Plan Check (proof of compliance) Period Field Inspection during Construction by Fire Prevention Program Superintendent	Fire Protection Plan by the Fire Consultant Training Records Provided to the City, LAFD, and Metro

Project Design Feature or Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Monitoring / Enforcement Agency	Monitoring Phase	Monitoring Frequency	Action(s) Indicating Compliance
• Prior to the start of any construction activities, the construction manager in coordination with the Fire Prevention Program Superintendent shall provide site fire safety training for all construction crew members, including on the regulatory requirements set forth in Section 3.20.2, the proper use of firefighting equipment, and procedures to be followed in the event of a fire. Project staff shall be trained prior to the start of construction to identify and report to the appropriate authority potential fire safety hazards, including the presence of sparks or smoke. The construction manager shall maintain training records which will be available for review by Metro, the City, and LAFD. • Prior to the start of construction, the construction area shall be cleared of all dead and downed vegetation and dead or dry leaves and pine needles from the ground. Trees within the construction area shall either be removed or trimmed to keep branches a minimum of 10 feet from other trees. Vegetation within the construction area shall be controlled through periodic cutting and spraying of weeds. • Ongoing fire safety inspections and patrols of the construction site shall be integrated into Project site security procedures for the duration of construction. The assigned fire patrols shall verify the proper tools and equipment are on site, serve as a lookout for fire starts, including participating in a fire watch to make sure no residual fire exists following the completion of the construction activity. • Each construction area shall be equipped with fire extinguishers and firefighting equipment sufficient to extinguish small flames. • The Fire Prevention Program Superintendent shall provide outreach and orientation services to responding fire stations including pre-staging measures prior to the start of hot work construction activities.					

Project Design Feature or Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Monitoring / Enforcement Agency	Monitoring Phase	Monitoring Frequency	Action(s) Indicating Compliance
Any fire ignited on site shall be promptly reported to LAFD.					
WFR-PDF-B: Prior to the start of construction, the Project shall provide a fuel modification zone surrounding the Stadium Tower construction site starting from the construction area perimeter of either 70 feet or until the nearest paved roadway that thins or removes all vegetation, dead or dry leaves and pine needles from the ground, and trims or remove trees to keep branches a minimum of 10 feet from other trees. The Stadium Tower construction site plan shows a buffer zone of 70 feet or to nearest paved roadway.	Project Sponsor Construction Contractor	Metro and/or the City of Los Angeles (LAFD)	Pre-Construction	Once, Plan Check (proof of compliance)	Field Inspection Issuance of Applicable Building Permit for Stadium Tower
WFR-PDF-C: During operation of Broadway Junction, Stadium Tower, and Dodger Stadium Station, security monitoring by staff and cameras shall be implemented. Project staff shall be trained to identify and report to the appropriate authority potential fire safety hazards, including the presence of sparks or smoke. Any fire ignited on site shall be promptly reported to LAFD.	Project Operator	Metro and/or the City of Los Angeles	Prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy	Once, prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy	Inclusion of requirement in Emergency Operations Plan Issuance of Certificate of Occupancy

This page intentionally left blank.

Section 8.0 | Acronyms

Acronym/Abbreviation	Definition
°F	degrees Fahrenheit
µg/L	Microgram per Liter
µg/m ³	Micrograms per Cubic Meter
3S	Tricable Detachable Gondola System
AAM	Annual Arithmetic Mean
AB	Assembly Bill
ACC	Advanced Clean Cars
ACM	Asbestos Containing Material
ACRES	Assessment, Cleanup, and Redevelopment Exchange System
ADA	Americans with Disabilities Act
ADP	Alameda District Specific Plan
AERMOD	American Meteorological Society/Environmental Protection Agency Regulatory Air Dispersion Model
Alquist-Priolo Act	Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act
ALS	Advanced Life Support
ANSI	American National Standards Institute
APCD	Air Pollution Control District
APE	Area of Potential Effect
API	Area of Potential Impact
AQMD	Air Quality Management District
AQMP	Air Quality Management Plan
ART	Aerial Rapid Transit
ARTIC	Anaheim Regional Transportation Intermodal Center
ARTT LLC	Aerial Rapid Transit Technologies LLC
ASCE	American Society of Civil Engineers
ATCM	Airborne Toxic Control Measure
AUF	Acoustic Use Factor
AVO	Average Vehicle Occupancy
AVTA	Antelope Valley Transit Authority
BACM	Best Available Dust Control Measures
Basin Plan	Basin Plan for Coastal Watersheds of Los Angeles and Ventura Counties
bgs	Below Ground Surface
BMP	Best Management Practice
BRT	Bus Rapid Transit
BSA	Biological Survey Area
BTEX	Benzene, Toluene, Ethylbenzene and Xylene
BTU	British Thermal Unit
C & D	Construction and Demolition

Acronym/Abbreviation	Definition
CA MUTCD	California Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices
CAA	Clean Air Act
CAAP	Climate Action and Adaptation Plan
CAAQS	California Ambient Air Quality Standard
CAFE	Corporate Average Fuel Economy
Cal EPA	California Environmental Protection Agency
Cal/OSHA	California Division of Occupational Safety and Health
CalEEMod	California Emissions Estimator Model
CALFIRE	California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection
CalGEM	California Department of Conservation Geologic Energy Management Division
CALGreen	California Green Building Standards Code
CalReycle	California Department of Resources, Recycling, and Recovery
Caltrans	California Department of Transportation
CAM	The Chinese American Museum
CAP	Criteria Air Pollutant
CARB	California Air Resources Board
CASGEM	California Statewide Groundwater Elevation Monitoring
CASP	Cornfield-Arroyo Seco Specific Plan
CBC	California Building Code
CC&Rs	Covenants, Conditions, Restrictions and Easement for Chavez Ravine
CCAA	California Clean Air Act
CCCC	California Climate Change Center
CCR	California Code of Regulations
cd/m ²	Candelas per Square Meter
CDFW	California Department of Fish and Wildlife
CE	Commuter Express
CEC	California Energy Commission
Central Basin	Central Subbasin
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act
CERS	California Environmental Reporting System
CESA	California Endangered Species Act
CFC	California Fire Code
CFGF	California Fish and Game Code
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CGP	Construction General Permit
CH ₄	Methane
CHL	California Historical Landmarks
CHRIS	California Historical Resources Inventory Systems

Acronym/Abbreviation	Definition
CLA	Chief Legislative Analyst
CNDDDB	California Natural Diversity Database
CNEL	Community Noise Equivalent Level
CNG	Compressed Natural Gas
CNPS	California Native Plant Society
CO	Carbon Monoxide
CO ₂	Carbon Dioxide
CO _{2e}	CO ₂ Equivalents
ColWMP	Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan
Cortese	Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites
CPUC	California Public Utilities Commission
CRHR	California Register of Historical Resources
CRMMP	Cultural Resources Monitoring and Mitigation Plan
CRPR	California Rare Plant Ranks
CTMP	Construction Traffic Management Plan
CUP	Conditional Use Permit
CUPA	Certified United Program Agency
CVC	California Vehicle Code
CWA	Clean Water Act
CY	Cubic Yards
dB	Decibel
dBA	A-Weighted Decibel
DBE	Disadvantaged Business Enterprises
DBH	Diameter at Breast Height
DCA	Department of Cultural Affairs
DEIR	Draft Environmental Impact Report
DGS	Department of General Services
DHS	Department of Health Services
DoD	Department of Defense
DOORS	Diesel Off-Road Online Reporting System
DPM	Diesel Particulate Matter
DPR	California Department of Parks and Recreation
DSE	Dodger Stadium Express
DTLA 2040	Downtown Community Plan
DTSC	Department of Toxic Substances Control
DVBE	Disabled Veteran Business Enterprises (DVBE)
DWR	Department of Water Resources
EDR	Environmental Data Resources, Inc.
EFCs	Equity Focus Communities
EIR	Environmental Impact Report

Acronym/Abbreviation	Definition
EISA	Energy Independence and Security Act
El Pueblo	El Pueblo de Los Angeles
EMD	Emergency Management Department
EMS	Emergency Medical Service
EOB	Emergency Operations Board
EOO	Emergency Operations Organization
EOP	Emergency Operation Plan
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
ESA	Endangered Species Act (from Biological Resources)
ESA	Environmental Site Assessment (from Hazards and Hazardous Materials)
EV	Electric Vehicle
fc	Footcandles
FEIR	Final Environmental Impact Report
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FHSZ	Fire Hazard Severity Zones
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
FIRMS	Flood Insurance Rate Maps
FMP	Floodplain Management Plan
FPP	Fire Protection Program
ft	Feet
FT	Foothill Transit
FTA	Federal Transit Administration
General Plan	City of Los Angeles General Plan
GHG	Greenhouse Gas
GIS	Geographic Information System
GPA	GPA Consulting
GPD	Gallons per Day
GSA	Groundwater Sustainability Agency
GSP	Groundwater Sustainability Plan
GWh	Gigawatt Hours
GWP	Global Warming Potential
HABS	Historic American Building Survey
HAER	Historic American Engineering Record
HCD	California Department of Housing and Community Development
HCM	Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monument
HDM	Highway Design Manual
HEPA	High-Efficiency Particulate Air
HFC	Hydrofluorocarbons
HIC	Non-Cancer Chronic Hazard Index
HIN	High Injury Network

Acronym/Abbreviation	Definition
HMBP	Hazardous Materials Business Plan
HOV	High Occupancy Vehicle
hp	Horsepower
HPOZ	Historic Preservation Overlay Zone
HRA	Health Risk Assessment
HRTR	Historical Resources Technical Report
HSC	Health and Safety Code
HSR	California High-Speed Rail
HVAC	Heating, Venting, and Air Conditioning
Hz	Hertz
I-5	Interstate 5
IEPR	Integrated Energy Policy Report (IEPR)
IES	Illuminating Engineering Society
IFC	The International Fire Code
IGP	Industrial General Permit
IPaC	Information for Planning and Conservation
IRP	Integrated Resource Plan
ISTEA	Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act
ITS	Intelligent Transportation Systems
Kizh Nation	Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation
KOP	Key Observation Points
kWh	Kilowatt Hours
LA ART LLC	LA Aerial Rapid Transit Technologies LLC
LABOE	Los Angeles Bureau of Engineering
LACDPW	Los Angeles County Department of Public Works
LACDRP	Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning
LACTMA	Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
LADOT	Los Angeles Department of Transportation
LADWP	Los Angeles Department of Water and Power
LAFC	Los Angeles Fire Code
LAFC	Los Angeles Football Club
LAFD	City of Los Angeles Fire Department
LAGBC	Los Angeles Green Building Code
LAHCM	Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monument
LAMC	Los Angeles Municipal Code
LAPD	Los Angeles Police Department
LAPL	Los Angeles Public Library
LARAP	Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks
LARIAC	Los Angeles Region Imagery Acquisition Consortium
LARWQCB	Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board

Acronym/Abbreviation	Definition
LASAN	Los Angeles Sanitation & Environment Department
LASD	Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department
LASHP	Los Angeles State Historic Park
LAUS	Los Angeles Union Station
LAUSD	Los Angeles Unified School District
LAWA	Los Angeles World Airports
LAX	Los Angeles International Airport
LBP	Lead-based paints
lbs	Pounds
LCFS	Low Carbon Fuel Standards
LED	Light-Emitting Diode
LEED	Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design
LHMP	Local Hazard Mitigation Plan
LID	Low Impact Development
LinkUS	Link Union Station Project
LOS	Level of Service
LOSSAN	Los Angeles-San Diego-San Luis Obispo Rail Corridor
LOTUS	Lotus v. Department of Transportation
LRA	Local Responsibility Area
LRT	Light Rail Transit
LRTP	Long-Range Transportation Plan
LSAA	Lake or Streambed Alteration Agreement
LST	Localized Significance Threshold
LU	Landscape Units
LUST	Leaking Underground Storage Tank
L_v	Vibration Velocity Level
MBS	Moving Beyond Sustainability Plan
MBTA	Migratory Bird Treaty Act
MCL	Maximum Contaminant Level
Metro	Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
MFR	Multi-Family Residential
mg/kg	Milligrams per Kilogram
MGD	Million Gallons per Day
MICR	Maximum Incremental Cancer Risk
MLB	Major League Baseball
MLD	Most Likely Descendant
MM	Mitigation Measure
MMBTu	Million British Thermal Unit
MOA	Mode of Access
MPO	Metropolitan Planning Organization

Acronym/Abbreviation	Definition
MRZ	Mineral Resources Zone
MS4	Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems
msl	Mean Sea Level
MT	Metric Tons
MT CO ₂ e/year	Metric Tons of Carbon Dioxide Equivalent Per Year
MTA	Metropolitan Transit Authority
MUTCD	Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices
MW	Megawatts
MWD	Metropolitan Water District
MWh	Megawatt Hours
N ₂ O	Nitrous Oxide
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission
NESHAP	National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants
NFPA	National Fire Protection Association
NHM	Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act of 1966
NHTSA	National Highway Traffic Safety Administration
NO	Nitric Oxide
NO ₂	Nitrogen Dioxide
NOI	Notice of Intent
NOP	Notice of Preparation
NO _x	Nitrogen Oxides
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NPS	National Park Service
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
NSR	Noise-Sensitive Receptors
O ₃	Ozone
OCS	Overhead Contact Lines
OCTA	Orange County Transportation Authority
OEHHA	Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment
OHSU	Oregon Health and Science University
OPR	Office of Planning and Research
OSHA	Occupational Safety and Health Administration
OVA	Organic Vapor Analyzer
Park General Plan	Los Angeles State Historic Park General Plan
Pb	Lead
PDF	Project Design Feature
PFC	Perfluorocarbons
pLAn	Sustainable City Plan

Acronym/Abbreviation	Definition
PM	Particulate Matter
PM ₁₀	Respirable Particulate matter
PM _{2.5}	Fine Particulate Matter
PPHPD	Passengers Per Hour Per Direction
ppm	Parts per Million
ppmv	Parts per Million by Volume
PPOP	Plans, Programs, Ordinances, or Policies
PPV	Peak Particulate Velocity
PRC	Public Resources Code
PRMMP	Paleontological Resources Monitoring and Mitigation Plan
PUC	Public Utilities Code
RCNM	Roadway Construction Noise Model
RCRA	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
RCTC	Riverside County Transportation Commission
REC	Recognized Environmental Condition
RIO	Los Angeles River Improvement Overlay
RMS	Root Mean Square
ROG	Reactive Organic Gases
ROW	Right-of-Way
RPS	Renewable Portfolio Standard
RTP	Regional Transportation Plan
RTP/SCS	Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy
RWQCB	Los Angeles Regional Water Control Board
SAFE	Safe Affordable Fuel-Efficient
SANBAG	San Bernardino Association of Governments
SARA	Superfund Amendment and Reauthorization Act
SB	Senate Bill
SBE	Small Business Enterprises
SCAG	Southern California Association of Governments
SCAQMD	South Coast Air Quality Management District
SCCIC	South Central Coastal Information Center
Scoping Plan	Climate Change Scoping Plan: A Framework for Change
SCRIP	Southern California Regional Interconnector Project
SCRRA	Southern California Regional Rail Authority
SCS	Sustainable Communities Strategy
SCT	Santa Clarita Transit
SEA	Significant Ecological Area
sf	Square Feet
SF ₆	Sulfur Hexafluoride
SFR	Single-Family Residential

Acronym/Abbreviation	Definition
SGMA	Sustainable Groundwater Management Act
SIC	Standard Industrial Classification
SIP	State Implementation Plan
SLA	Surplus Land Act
SLF	Sacred Lands File
SLIC	Spills, Leaks, Investigations, and Cleanups
SLTRP	Strategic Long-Term Resource Plan
SMMC	Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy
SO ₂	Sulfur Dioxide
SoCalGas	Southern California Gas Company
SOHP	State Office of Historic Preservation
SOP	Standardized Operating Procedures
SO _x	Sulfur Oxides
SP	Special Publication
SPL	Sound Pressure Levels
SR	State Route
SR-110	State Route 110
SRA	State Responsibility Area
SSC	Species of Special Concern
SSMP	Sewer System Management Plan
SSO	Sanitary Sewer Overflow Response Plan
Stafford Act	Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act
SUSMP	Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan
SWITRS	Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System
SWPPP	Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan
SWRCB	State Water Resources Control Board
TAC	Toxic Air Contaminants
TAG	Transportation Assessment Guidelines
TCE	Temporary Construction Easements
TCM	Transportation Control Measures
TCO	Tribal Control Officer
TCR	The Climate Registry
TCR	Tribal Cultural Resource
TDS	Total Dissolved Solid
TIMS	Transportation Injury Mapping System
TNC	Transportation Network Company
TNM	Traffic Noise Model
TPH	Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons
TRB	Transportation Research Board
TSM	Transportation Systems Management

Acronym/Abbreviation	Definition
TVM	Ticket Vending Machines
UCLA	University of California, Los Angeles
UDOT	Utah Department of Transportation
UPRR	Union Pacific Railroad
USACE	United States Army Corps of Engineers
USDOT	United States Department of Transportation
USEPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
USFWS	United States Fish and Wildlife Service
USGBC	United States Green Building Council
USGS	United States Geological Survey
UST	Underground Storage Tank
VCP	Voluntary Cleanup Program
VCTC	Ventura County Transportation Commission
VdB	Decibel Notation for Vibration Level
VHFHSZ	Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone
VMT	Vehicle Miles Traveled
VOC	Volatile Organic Compound
WBE	Women Business Enterprises
WQCMUR	Water Quality Compliance Master Plan for Urban Runoff
WRD	Water Replenished District of Southern California
WSAB	West Santa Ana Branch Transit corridor
ZET	Zero Emissions Transit
ZEV	Zero Emission Vehicle
ZIMAS	Zoning Information and Map Access System
ZNE	Zero Net Energy

Section 9.0 | List of Preparers

For ease of reference, this section, providing the lead agency and list of preparers for the Final EIR, reincorporates the preparers from Section 8.0, List of Preparers, of the Draft EIR, and includes additions for preparers of the Final EIR.

9.1 LEAD AGENCY

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Contacts: *Cory Zelmer, Deputy Executive Officer*
 Anthony Jusay, Transportation Planner
 Michael Cortez, Community Relations Manager
 Martha Butler, Senior Director
 Daniel Clark, Administrative Analyst
 Kimberly Sterling, Senior Transportation Planner
 Elizabeth Carvajal, Senior Director
 Andrina Dominguez, Senior Environmental Specialist
 Stacy Sinclair, Environmental Specialist
 Anthony Crump, Deputy Executive Officer – Community Relations
 Holly Rockwell, Senior Executive Officer
 Gary Byrne, Principal Transportation Planner
 Ginny Brideau, Community Relations Manager

9.2 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT PREPARATION

Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.

Contacts: *Kim Avila, Project Manager*
 Jessie Barkley, Assistant Project Manager
 Danae Hall, Assistant Project Manager
 Laura Worthington-Forbes, Senior Project Coordinator
 Steve Peterson, Senior Project Coordinator
 Reina Calder, Project Analyst
 Jessica Mauck, Cultural and Visual Resources
 Olivia Chan, Air Quality and Noise
 Chris Jones, Senior Environmental Planner
 Dennis Kearney, Senior Environmental Planner
 Mia Berg, Environmental Planner
 Taylor Blanford, Environmental Planner
 Cameron Bauer, Environmental Planner
 Mayra Garcia, Environmental Planner
 Tyler Lindberg, Environmental Planner
 Amanda McCallum, Document Production
 Cindy Dalen-Slade, Document Support
 Brison Coldiron, Document Support

AECOM

Contacts: David DeRosa, Project Manager
David Rader, Project Manager, Public Outreach
Fareeha Kibriya, Environmental Planner
Jaime Guzman, Senior Project Manager
Cristina Lowery, Deputy Project Manager
Vicky Rosen, Deputy Project Manager
Allie Beauregard, Environmental Planner
Lauren Lockwood, Environmental Planner
Hannah Allington, Environmental Planner
Jessica Fernandes, Environmental Planner
Jessie Kang, Environmental Planner
Shannon Ledet, Senior Environmental Planner
Natalie Thompson, Environmental Planner
Kathalyn Tung, Environmental Planner
Olivia Gastaldo, Environmental Planner
Dalis De La More, Environmental Planner
Barry Molnaa, Environmental Permitting & Planning Operations Lead

Archaeology, Paleontology, and Cultural Resources

Contacts: Marc Beherec, Archaeologist
Christy Dolan, Archaeologist

Biological Resources

Contacts: Art Popp, Biologist
Michael Kuehn, Biologist

Geological Resources

Contacts: Jessica Himebauch, Senior Geologist
Kristen Geleckas, Environmental Geologist

GIS and Graphics

Contacts: Brian Fogle, Graphics
Jang Seo, GIS and Graphics

Hydrology and Water Quality

Contacts: Mark Williams, Environmental Compliance

Noise and Acoustics

*Contacts: Chris Kaiser, Acoustics and Noise Control Specialist, Environment
George Hitterman, Acoustician I
Jim Cowan, Principal Engineer – Acoustics and Noise Control
Paul Burge, Senior Noise Specialist
Yona Simonson, Noise Specialist*

Public Outreach

*Contacts: Jessica Sisco, Stakeholder Engagement
Paola Pena, Stakeholder Engagement*

Additional Support Staff

*Contacts: Lukas Yanni, Support Staff
Frances Glaser, Support Staff*

9.3 TECHNICAL SUBCONSULTANTS**Geology and Soils****ENGEO Incorporated**

*Contacts: Jeff Braun, P.E., PMP, Associate
Bahareh Heidarzadeh, PhD, P.E., Associate
J. Brooks Ramsdell, PG, CEG, Associate
Uri Eliahu, P.E., G.E., President*

Noise and Acoustics**Acoustical Engineering Services**

*Contacts: Sean Bui, P.E., Principal
Amir Yazdanniyaz, P.E., Principal*

Transportation**Fehr & Peers**

*Contacts: Michael Kennedy, AICP, Principal
Tom Gaul, Principal
Ribeka Toda, P.E., Senior Engineer
Diwu Zhou, P.E., Senior Engineer
Claude Strayer, P.E., Senior Associate
Michael Kao, Senior Planner*

Historical Resources**GPA Consulting**

Contacts: *Laura O’Neill, Senior Architectural Historian*
 Amanda Duane, Senior Architectural Historian
 Emily Rinaldi, Associate Architectural Historian

Teresa Grimes

Contacts: *Teresa Grimes, Principal*

Historic Resource Group

Contacts: *Peyton Hall, FAIA, Principal Architect Emeritus*
 Christine Lazzaretto, Managing Principal

Air Quality/HRA, Energy, Greenhouse Gas Emissions**Ramboll US Consulting, Inc.**

Contacts: *Eric Lu, P.E., Managing Principal*
 Emily Weissinger, P.E., Senior Managing Consultant
 Haley Grassi, P.E., Managing Consultant
 Shannon Lee, Managing Consultant
 Elizabeth Tom, Senior Consultant
 Luke Pramod, EIT, Consultant

Wildfire**Reax Engineering**

Contacts: *David Rich, PhD.*

Gondola Systems**SCJ Alliance**

Contacts: *Michael Deiparine, Senior Project Manager*

Utilities**Kimley-Horn**

Contacts: *Jeff Baumgardner, P.E., Civil Engineer*
 Robert Blume, P.E., Senior Project Manager

Construction**PCL Construction Services, Inc.**

Contacts: *Austin Wheelon, Preconstruction Manager*
 Jeyre Lewis, MS, Manager, Special Projects

Structural Engineering***Nabih Youssef Associates Structural Engineers***

*Contacts: Nabih Youssef, S.E., P.E., President
Ryan Wilkerson, S.E., C.E., Principal*

Planning***Johnson Fain***

*Contacts: Juan Carlos Begazo, AIA, Principal
Shuangdi Dou, Urban Designer*

SCJ Alliance

Contacts: Shareefa Abdulsalam, Senior Urban Designer

Design***RIOS***

*Contacts: Naseema Asif, Studio Director, Architecture
Russell Dykann, Technical Director, Architecture*

Lighting***Francis Krahe & Associates, Inc.***

*Contacts: Francis Krahe, President
Jacob Graige, Project Designer
Jason Grandpre, Senior Construction Manager*

Arborist***Carlberg Associates***

*Contacts: Cy Carlberg, Registered Consulting Arborist
Scott McAllaster, Certified Arborist
Daniel Cowell, Certified Arborist*

Airspace Analysis***VMC LLC***

*Contacts: Angela Merrifield, President
Robert Varani, PMP, CM, Vice President*

9.4 RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES CONSULTED

City of Los Angeles

Department of Planning

Contacts: Milena Zasadzien, Major Projects, Senior City Planner
Kathleen King, Major Projects, City Planner
Ken Bernstein, Office of Historic Resources and Urban Design Studio, Principal City Planner and Manager
Lambert Giessinger, Office of Historic Resources, Historic Preservation Architect
Michelle Levy, Urban Design Studio, Senior City Planner

El Pueblo de Los Angeles Historical Monument Authority

Contacts: Arturo Chavez, General Manager
Edgar Garcia, Assistant General Manager

Department of Transportation

Contacts: Tomas Carranza, Transportation Principal and Planning & Land Use Review Engineer
Wes Pringle, Transportation Engineer
Eileen Hunt, Transportation Engineering Associate III
Connie Llanos, Interim GM

Bureau of Engineering

Contacts: Ted Allen, City Engineer and Executive Director

Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety

Contacts: Frank Laura, Director of Government and Community Relations

Los Angeles Department of Water and Power

Contacts: Katherine Rubin, Director of Corporate Environmental Affairs
Jane Hauptman, Manager of Environmental Planning and Assessment
Nadia Parker, Environmental Supervisor
Kathryn Laudeman, Environmental Engineering Associate

Los Angeles Fire Department

Contacts: Hani Malki, Senior Fire Protection Engineer
Eric French, Captain I, Fire Development Services Section
Oscar Salgado, Acting Fire Protection Engineer

California Department of Parks and Recreation

Contacts: Brian Dewey, Assistant Deputy Director
James Newland, Historian/Planner
Amy Schuessler, Architect

9.5 TRUSTEE AGENCIES CONSULTED

California Department of Fish and Wildlife

*Contacts: Felicia Silva, Environmental Scientist
Erinn Wilson-Olgin, Environmental Program Manager | South Coast Region
Frederic Rieman, Environmental Scientist*

9.6 PROJECT SPONSOR

LA Aerial Rapid Transit Technologies LLC

This page intentionally left blank.

Section 10.0 | References

SECTION 1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

32 CFR Section 767.8.

California Code of Regulations, Article 4, Sections 1529, 5208, and 1532.

California Code of Regulations, Section 2485.

California Code of Regulations, Sections 3150 through 3191.

California Geological Survey Special Publication 117 (as amended).

California Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21083.2(i).

California State Department of Parks and Recreation, Los Angeles State Historic Park Bike and Pedestrian Bridge Study, Feasibility Study, 2019.

California State Department of Parks and Recreation, Los Angeles State Historic Park General Plan and Final Environmental Impact Report, June 2005.

California Streets and Highways Code Section 660.

Civil Code Section 801.

Government Code Section 14666.

Government Code Sections 65864 through 65869.5.

LAMC Section 11.5.7.

LAMC Sections 13.11 and 12.32.S.

LAMC Section 12.24.M.

Los Angeles Charter and Administrative Code, Sec. 13.4. Applicability.

Los Angeles Charter and Administrative Code, Sec. 390. Franchises.

Los Angeles Charter and Administrative Code, Sec. 22.109. Board of Cultural Affairs Commissioners Control over Works of Art.

OSHA 29 CFR Sections 1926.62 and 1926.1101.

Public Resources Code 5002.2.

Public Resources Code Section 5003.17.

Public Utilities Code Section 130252.

Public Utilities Code Section 130521.

SCAQMD Rule 1403.

Secretary of Interior Standards for Archaeology (36 CFR § 61).

Secretary of Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (60 FR 35843).

Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Architectural and Engineering Documentation (68 FR 43159).

SECTION 2.0 INTRODUCTION

49 U.S.C. § 5302(7).

Cal. Pub. Res. Code § 21168.6.9(a)(1)(A)-(F).

Senate Bill (SB) 44, effective January 1, 2022.

SECTION 3.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2019 California Green Building Standards Code. 2019. Available at: https://calgreenenergyservices.com/wp/wp-content/uploads/2019_california_green_code.pdf. Accessed November 2023.

American Nat'l Standards Inst., ANSI B77.1-2017 Passenger Ropeways – Aerial Tramways, Aerial Lifts, Surface Lifts, Tows and Conveyors – Safety Standard. On May 5, 2022, ANSI B77.1-2022 was approved and is in publication. The aerial clearance requirements of ANSI B77.1 are unchanged in the revision from 2017 to 2022. Please note that this material is either covered under a NDA, otherwise confidential, and/or copyrighted. Available for purchase at: https://webstore.ansi.org/standards/ansi/ansib772022?source=blog&gl=1*qi2wyz*gcl_au*MjEwNDI2MDE2Ny4xNjk1NzY4MTA5.

ANSI/ASHRAE 62.1, recognized standard for ventilation and indoor air quality. Please note that this material is either covered under a NDA, otherwise confidential, and/or copyrighted. Available for purchase at: <https://www.ashrae.org/technical-resources/bookstore/standards-62-1-62-2>.

British Broadcasting Corporation. 2023. London cable car: Social media helps boost passenger numbers – TfL. Available at: <https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-england-london-65080236>. Accessed November 2023.

California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment. CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Map. Available at: <https://oehha.ca.gov/calenviroscreen/maps-data>. Accessed August 2022.

California State Transportation Agency. 2020. Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program, Fourth Round Selected Project– Project Detail Summary, April 2020. Available at: <https://calsta.ca.gov/-/media/calsta-media/documents/2020-tircp-detailed-project-award-summary.pdf>. Accessed March 2022.

California Streets and Highways Code, Section 660.

City of Inglewood. Inglewood Transit Connector Project Final Environmental Impact Report. Available at: https://www.cityofinglewood.org/DocumentCenter/View/17236/ITC_FEIR_Feb2022. Accessed November 2023.

- City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning. 2023. Downtown Los Angeles Community Plan Update. Available at: <https://planning.lacity.org/plans-policies/community-plan-update/downtown-los-angeles-community-plan-update#about>. Accessed August 2023.
- City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning. 2003. Central City Community Plan, January 2003. Available at: <https://planning.lacity.org/plans-policies/community-plan-area/central-city>. Accessed March 2022.
- City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning. Central City North Community Plan. Available at: <https://planning.lacity.org/plans-policies/community-plan-area/central-city-north>. Accessed March 2022.
- City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning. 2004. Silver Lake-Echo Park-Elysian Valley Community Plan, August 2004. Available at: <https://planning.lacity.org/plans-policies/community-plan-area/silver-lake-echo-parkelysian-valley> Accessed August 2022.
- City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks. 2006. Elysian Park Master Plan, June 2006. Available at: <https://www.elysianpark.org/the-master-plan>. Accessed August 2022.
- City of Los Angeles. El Pueblo de Los Angeles Historical Monument, About Us. Available at: <https://elpueblo.lacity.org/about-us>. Accessed March 2022.
- City of Los Angeles. El Pueblo de Los Angeles Historical Monument, History. Available at: <https://elpueblo.lacity.org/history-el-pueblo>. Accessed March 2022.
- Civil Code Section 801.
- Communication with Cesar Dockweiler who is responsible for design, implementation and operation of Mi Teleférico in La Paz, April 10, 2020.
- Dale, Steven, et al. Cable Car Confidential: The Essential Guide to Cable Cars, Urban Gondolas & Cable Propelled Transit. Creative Urban Projects, 2013. Please note that this material is either covered under a NDA, otherwise confidential, and/or copywritten. Available for purchase at: <https://www.gondolaproject.com/cable-car-confidential/>.
- Doppelmayr Garaventa Group. 2020. 10-MGD Emirates Air Line. Available at: <https://www.doppelmayr.com/ko/%EC%A0%9C%ED%92%88/references/10-mgd-emirates-air-line/>. Accessed November 2023.
- Doppelmayr Garaventa Group. 35-TGD BUGA Koblenz. Available at: <https://www.doppelmayr.com/de/systeme/referenzen/35-tgd-buga-koblenz/>. Accessed November 2023.
- Doppelmayr Garaventa Group. 2010. 3S Installation BUGA Koblenz 2011. Available at: <https://newsroom.doppelmayr.com/en/doppelmayr/news/3s-installation-buga-koblenz-2011/>. Accessed November 2023.
- Doppelmayr Garaventa Group. 2019. Doppelmayr completes the world's biggest urban ropeway network. Available at: <https://newsroom.doppelmayr.com/en/doppelmayr/news/doppelmayr-completes-the-world-news/>. Accessed November 2023.

- Doppelmayr Garaventa Group. 2018. Doppelmayr opens the world's longest ropeway. Available at: <https://newsroom.doppelmayr.com/en/doppelmayr/press/doppelmayr-opens-the-world/>. Accessed November 2023.
- Doppelmayr Garaventa Group. 2018. First trip on the Línea Celeste Section 1 and Línea Blanca. Available at: <https://newsroom.doppelmayr.com/en/doppelmayr/news/first-trip-on-the-l%C3%ADnea-celeste-section-1-and-l%C3%ADnea-blanca/>. Accessed November 2023.
- Doppelmayr Garaventa Group. Doppelmayr wins next contract in Mexico City. Available at: https://www.doppelmayr.com/en/news-en/cablebus_linea_3/. Accessed November 2023.
- Doppelmayr Garaventa Group. Mexico City celebrates its urban Doppelmayr ropeway. Available at: <https://www.doppelmayr.com/en/press/gondelbahn-cablebus-mexico-city/>. Accessed November 2023.
- ESPN.com. 2019. MLB Attendance Report – 2019. Available at: http://www.espn.com/mlb/attendance/_/year/2019. Accessed March 2022.
- Government Code Section 14666.
- Government Code Sections 65864 through 65869.5.
- Intertraffic. 2019. Speeding up the Mobility Transition: Victor Jasso Interview (Mexicable). Available at: <https://www.intertraffic.com/news/infrastructure/speeding-up-in-mobility-victor-jasso-mexicable/>. Accessed November 2023.
- Intuit.com. Intuit Dome. Available at: <https://www.intuit.com/intuitdome/>. Accessed November 2023.
- LAMC Section 11.5.7.
- LAMC Section 12.24.M.
- LAMC Sections 13.11 and 12.32.S.
- Los Angeles Charter and Administrative Code, Sec. 13.4. Applicability.
- Los Angeles Charter and Administrative Code, Sec. 22.109. Board of Cultural Affairs Commissioners Control over Works of Art.
- Los Angeles Charter and Administrative Code, Sec. 390. Franchises.
- Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority. Crenshaw/LAX Transit Project. Available at: https://www.metro.net/projects/crenshaw_corridor/. Accessed March 2022.
- Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority. 2018. Los Angeles Union Station Forecourt and Esplanade Improvements Project Final Environmental Impact Report. Available at: https://www.dropbox.com/sh/55np14p60s3tch0/AABwyW69bkWUScao1ov2-kD2a/Environment%20Documents?dl=0&subfolder_nav_tracking=1. Accessed March 2022.
- Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority. Los Angeles Union Station Master Plan. This document is no longer available online. The Transforming Los Angeles Union Station summary is

- available at: <http://libraryarchives.metro.net/DPGTL/unionstation/2015-transforming-los-angeles-union-station-summary-report.pdf>. Accessed November 2023.
- Major League Baseball. Dodger Stadium History. Available at: <https://www.mlb.com/dodgers/ballpark/information/history>. Accessed March 2022.
- Mi Teleférico. 2021. Trans-Americas Journey. Available at: <https://trans-americas.com/mi-teleferico-cable-cars-la-paz-bolivia/>. Accessed November 2023.
- Nunez, Lorenzo. 2021. Cablebus Lines 1 and 2 to Begin Operating in July. Available at: <https://mexicobusiness.news/infrastructure/news/cablebus-lines-1-and-2-begin-operating-july>. Accessed November 2023.
- OHSU News. 2017. Portland Aerial Tram Turns 10. Available at: <https://news.ohsu.edu/2017/01/28/portland-aerial-tram-turns-10>. Accessed November 2023.
- Personal communication with Mr. Frederic Demoulin, Urban Ropeways Project Manager, Leitner-Poma of America, Inc., on August 12, 2022.
- POMA. 2010. Aerial Tramway – Airtram Roosevelt Island. Available at: <https://www.poma.net/en/work/airtram-roosevelt-island/>. Accessed November 2023.
- POMA. 3S Aerial Tramway – TELEO. Available at: <https://www.poma.net/en/work/teleo/>. Accessed November 2023.
- Portland Aerial Tram. Learn More. Available at: <http://www.gobytram.com/about>. Accessed November 2023.
- Public Resources Code Section 5002.2.
- Public Resources Code Section 5003.
- Public Resources Code Section 5003.17.
- Public Utilities Code Sections 130521-130252.
- Roosevelt Island Operating Corporation. Aerial Tramway Vital Statistics. Available at: <https://rioc.ny.gov/173/Aerial-Tramway-Vital-Statistics>. Accessed November 2023.
- Roosevelt Island Operating Corporation. History. Available at: <https://rioc.ny.gov/169/History>. Accessed November 2023.
- Segura, Edgar. 2023. Así es la nueva Línea 2 del Mexicable: De Ecatepec a Indios Verdes en 29 minutos. Available at: <https://www.chilango.com/ciudadania/otros-ciudadania/linea-2-mexicable-ecatepec-ndios-verdes-horario-precio-estaciones/>. Accessed August 2023.
- Sistema de Transporte Masivo y Teleférico. Mexicable Línea 2: "Indios Verdes - Hank González" (En Construcción). Available at: <https://masivoedomex.blogspot.com/2020/07/mexicable-linea-2.html>. Accessed November 2023.

- Southern California Association of Governments. 2020-2045 Regional Transportation Plan/ Sustainable Communities Strategy, or “Connect SoCal.” available at: https://scag.ca.gov/sites/main/files/file-attachments/0903fconnectsocal-plan_0.pdf?1606001176. Accessed August 2022.
- Staten Island NY Local News. 2015. Staten Island Tram would require new technology to make trips to Manhattan. Available at: https://www.silive.com/news/2015/06/staten_island_tram_would_requi.html. Accessed November 2023.
- The Gondola Project. 2017. System Dossier: Mexicable. Available at: <https://www.gondolaproject.com/2017/07/07/system-dossier-mexicable/>. Accessed August 2023.
- The Institute for Sustainable Infrastructure. Envision Rating System. Available at: <https://sustainableinfrastructure.org/envision/use-envision/>. Accessed November 2023.
- Title 8, California Code of Regulations, Sections 3150 through 3191.
- Title 24, California Code of Regulations, residential ventilation requirements standards.
- United States Green Building Council Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design for New Construction v4.1. Available at: <https://www.usgbc.org/leed/v41>. Accessed November 2023.

SECTION 4.0 COSTS AND FINANCING

No reference materials.

SECTION 5.0 CORRECTIONS AND ADDITIONS

29 CFR Section 1926.62, 1926.1101.

36 CFR Part 61.

36 CFR Part 68.

California Code of Regulations Article 4 Sections 1529, 5208, and 1532.

California Code of Regulations Title 14 Section 4306.

California Government Code Sections 65000-66499.58.

City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning. 2023. Downtown Los Angeles Community Plan Update. Available at: <https://planning.lacity.org/plans-policies/community-plan-update/downtown-los-angeles-community-plan-update>. Accessed September 2023.

City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning. 2023. CPC-2023-2306-GPA-VZC-HD-MCUP-SPR. Available at: <https://planning.lacity.org/pdiscaseinfo/search/encoded/MjY2MjM10>. Accessed September 2023.

City of Los Angeles. 2023. Task Order Solicitation (TOS) No. 94 for the El Pueblo Master Plan (Work Order No. E1909106).

- Grimshaw. 2023. Grimshaw to transform LA Chinatown parking lot into all-electric mass timber office building. Available at: https://grimshaw.global/assets/uploads/130_West_College_Street_Grimshaw_Press_Release_1.pdf. Accessed September 2023.
- Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LA Metro). 2023. Metro Board of Directors, Zero-Emission Bus Program Update Board Report.
- Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority. 2023. Free rides across the Metro system this weekend to celebrate the debut of the new A and E Lines, 3 new stations and the opening of the Regional Connector. Available at: <https://thesource.metro.net/2023/06/13/free-rides-across-the-metro-system-this-weekend-to-celebrate-the-debut-of-the-new-a-and-e-lines-3-new-stations-and-the-opening-of-the-regional-connector/>. Accessed September 2023.
- Sharp, Steven. 2023. Five-story office building planned at 130 W College Street in Chinatown. Available at: <https://la.urbanize.city/post/five-story-office-building-planned-130-w-college-street-chinatown>. Accessed September 2023.
- Tal, Gil, Handy, Susan, and Boarnet, Marlon G. 2013. Policy Brief on the Impacts of Transit Access (Distance to Transit) Based on a Review of the Empirical Literature.
- The California Endowment. 2023. Annual Report 2023. Available at: <https://www.calendow.org/annual-report/>. Accessed September 2023.
- Topographic-map.com. 2023. Los Angeles topographic map. Available at: <https://en-gb.topographic-map.com/>. Accessed June 2023.

SECTION 6.0 RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

- Acoustical Engineering Services (AES). 2023. Noise Calculation Worksheets, Urban Canyon Effects Calculations.
- Administration of Governor Gavin Newsom. 2022. Pathways to 30x30 California. Available at: https://resources.ca.gov/-/media/CNRA-Website/Files/Initiatives/30-by-30/Final_Pathwaysto30x30_042022_508.pdf. Accessed July 2023.
- AECOM. 2023. Memo documenting AECOM's inquiry into public hearing translator comments.
- American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO). 2018. A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets. Available at: <https://store.transportation.org/Common/DownloadContentFiles?id=1776>. Accessed August 2023.
- American National Standards Institute, ANSI B77.1-2017 Passenger Ropeways – Aerial Tramways, Aerial Lifts, Surface Lifts, Tows and Conveyors – Safety Standard. On May 5, 2022, ANSI B77.1-2022 was approved and is in publication. The aerial clearance requirements of ANSI B77.1 are unchanged in the revision from 2017 to 2022. Please note that this material is either covered under a NDA, otherwise confidential, and/or copywritten. Available for purchase at: https://webstore.ansi.org/standards/ansi/ansib772022?source=blog&gl=1*qi2wyz*gcl_au*MjEwNDI2MDE2Ny4xNjk1NzY4MTA5.

- American National Standards Institute (ANSI). 2022. ANSI B77.1-2022, 3.3.2.5.7. Evacuation. Please note that this material is either covered under a NDA, otherwise confidential, and/or copywritten. Available for purchase at: https://webstore.ansi.org/standards/ansi/ansib772022?source=blog&_gl=1*qi2wyz*_gcl_au*MjEwNDI2MDE2Ny4xNjk1NzY4MTA5.
- American Planning Association (APA). 2015. Olvera Street Great Places. Available at: <https://www.planning.org/greatplaces/streets/2015/olverastreet.htm>. Accessed August 2023.
- American Planning Association (APA). 2023. Great Places In America. Available at: <https://www.planning.org/greatplaces/>. Accessed August 2023.
- Axios. 2023. Medellín and the Power of Public Transportation. Available at: <https://www.axios.com/2023/02/07/medellin-mass-transit>. Accessed September 2023.
- Bakersfield Citizens for Local Control v. City of Bakersfield (2004) 124 Cal.App.4th 1184.
- Banff Adventures. 2016. Reaching to the Sky - The Historic Banff Gondola. Available at: <https://www.banffadventures.com/News/ArtMID/461/ArticleID/37/Reaching-to-the-Sky-The-Historic-Banff-Gondola>. Accessed June 2023.
- Berkeley Keep Jets Over the Bay Committee v. Board of Port Com'rs (2001) 91 Cal.App.4th 1344.
- California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA). 2021. CalEEMod® Appendix A: Calculation Details for CalEEMod®. Available at: <http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/caleemod/user-guide-2021/appendix-a2020-4-0.pdf?sfvrsn=6>. Accessed: August 2023.
- California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA). 2021. CalEEMod® User Guide Version 2020.4.0. Available at: http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/caleemod/user-guide-2021/01_user-39-s-guide2020-4-0.pdf?sfvrsn=6. Accessed: August 2023.
- California Civil Code Section 801.
- California Code of Civil Procedure Section 1240.110.
- California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 753.5.
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). 2022. California Natural Diversity Data Base (CNDDB). Full report for Los Angeles, Burbank, Pasadena, Mt. Wilson, Hollywood, El Monte, Inglewood, South Gate, and Whittier quadrangles. Generated May 10, 2022. Please note that this material is either covered under a NDA, otherwise confidential, and/or copywritten.
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). 2023. California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB). Available at: <https://wildlife.ca.gov/Data/CNDDB>. Accessed August 2023.
- California Department of Housing and Community Development. 2021. Surplus Land Act Guidelines. Available at: https://www.hcd.ca.gov/community-development/docs/sla_guidelines_final.pdf. Accessed August 2023.
- California Department of Parks and Recreation. 2023. California State Parks Listing. Available at: https://www.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=21805. Accessed July 2023.

- California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). 2013. Section 4.4.1.6 Tolerances. Available at: <https://dot.ca.gov/-/media/dot-media/programs/environmental-analysis/documents/env/tens-sep2013-a11y.pdf>. Accessed August 2023.
- California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). 2013. Technical Noise Supplement to the Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol Section 2.1.4.4. Available at: <https://dot.ca.gov/-/media/dot-media/programs/environmental-analysis/documents/env/tens-sep2013-a11y.pdf>. Accessed August 2023.
- California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). 2014. California Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (CA MUTCD), Revision 7. Available at: <https://dot.ca.gov/programs/safety-programs/camutcd>. Accessed August 2023.
- California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). 2020. Highway Design Manual, 7th Edition. Available at: <https://dot.ca.gov/programs/design/manual-highway-design-manual-hdm>. Accessed August 2023.
- California Fish and Game Code Section 711.4.
- California Government Code Section 54220, et seq.
- California Government Code Section 14666.
- California Government Code Section 11005.2.
- California Government Code Sections 65000-66499.58.
- California Labor Code Section 7341.
- California Natural Resources Agency (CNRA). 2022. Pathways to 30x30 California. Available at: <https://www.californianature.ca.gov/pages/30x30>. Accessed August 2023.
- California Natural Resources Agency (CNRA). 2009. Final Statement of Reasons for Regulatory Action. Available at: https://resources.ca.gov/CNRALegacyFiles/ceqa/docs/Final_Statement_of_Reasons.pdf. Accessed August 2023.
- California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment. 2020. CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Maps. Available at: <https://oehha.ca.gov/calenviroscreen/maps-data>. Accessed September 2023.
- California Office of Planning and Research (OPR). California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. 2023. Available at: https://www.califaep.org/docs/CEQA_Handbook_2023_final.pdf. Accessed August 2023.
- California Public Resources Code Section 5001.
- California Public Resources Code. Section 5001.2.
- California Public Resources Code Section 5002.
- California Public Resources Code Section 5003.
- California Public Resources Code. Section 5003.5.

- California Public Resources Code Section 5003.17.
- California Public Resources Code Section 5012.
- California Public Resources Code Section 5019.
- California Public Resources Code Section 5019.53.
- California Public Resources Code Section 5019.59.
- California Public Resources Code Section 21001.
- California Public Resources Code Section 21002.
- California Public Resources Code Section 21061.
- California Public Resources Code Section 21069.
- California Public Resources Code Section 21081.
- California Public Resources Code Section 21089.
- California Public Resources Code Section 21092.1.
- California Public Resources Code Section 21100.
- California Public Resources Code Section 21104.
- California Public Resources Code Section 21153(c).
- California Public Resources Code Section 21168.6.9.
- California Public Resources Code Section 21174.
- California Public Resources Code Section 30001.
- California Public Utilities Code Section 130000.
- California Public Utilities Code Sections 130050 and 130051.
- California Public Utilities Code Section 130105(f).
- California Public Utilities Code Section 130252.
- California Public Utilities Code Section 130521.
- California Public Utilities Code Section 180152.
- California Public Utilities Code Sections 30503, 130220.5(a).
- California Public Utilities Code Section 30600.
- California State Department of Parks and Recreation 2005. Los Angeles State Historic Park General Plan and Final Environmental Impact Report. Available at: <https://lastatehistoricpark.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/LASHP-General-Plan.pdf>. Accessed September 2023.
- California v. Ciraolo (1986) 476 U.S. 207.

- Center for Biological Diversity v. County of San Bernardino (2010) 185 Cal.App.4th 866.
- Cerda, et al. 2012. Reducing Violence by Transforming Neighborhoods: a Natural Experiment in Medellín, Colombia. Available at: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/22472117/>. Accessed September 2023.
- 36 CFR Part 800.
- City of Burnaby. 2019. Burnaby Mountain Gondola Transit Project. Available at: <https://pub-burnaby.escribemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=43307>. Accessed August 2023.
- City of Los Angeles. 2000. Central City North Community Plan. Available at: <https://planning.lacity.org/plans-policies/community-plan-area/central-city-north>. Accessed: March 2022.
- City of Los Angeles. 2001 General Plan Framework Element. Available at: <https://planning.lacity.org/plans-policies/framework-element>. Accessed: August 2023.
- City of Los Angeles. 2005. South Airfield Improvement Project Project-Level Tiered Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR). Available at: <https://www.lawa.org/en/lawa-our-lax/environmental-documents/documents-certified/south-airfield-improvement-project>. Accessed August 2023.
- City of Los Angeles. 2006. CEQA Thresholds Guide. Available at: <https://planning.lacity.org/eir/CrossroadsHwd/deir/files/references/A07.pdf>. Accessed August 2023.
- City of Los Angeles. 2008. Dodger Stadium: The Next 50 Years, Notice of Preparation. Available at: <https://planning.lacity.org/eir/nops/ENV-2008-1659.pdf>. Accessed August 2023.
- City of Los Angeles. 2015. Sewer System Management Plan. Available at: <https://planning.lacity.org/eir/CrossroadsHwd/deir/files/references/M216.pdf>. Accessed August 2023.
- City of Los Angeles. 2019 Dodger Stadium Centerfield Project. Available at <https://cityclerk.lacity.org/lacityclerkconnect/index.cfm?fa=ccfi.viewrecord&cfnumber=19-1096>. Accessed August 2023.
- City of Los Angeles. 2019. Inter-Departmental Correspondence – Transmittal – Recommendations for the Proposed Transfer of 901 and 903 Main Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012. Available at: https://clkrep.lacity.org/online/docs/2018/18-0930_rpt_CAO_03-29-2019.pdf#page=3. Accessed September 2023.
- City of Los Angeles. 2023. Commission, El Pueblo de Los Angeles Historical Monument. Available at: <https://elpueblo.lacity.gov/commission>. Accessed July 2023.
- City of Los Angeles. 2023. ZIMAS. Available at: <https://zimas.lacity.org/>. Accessed August 2023.
- City of Los Angeles. ZIMAS User Guide. Available at: <http://zimas.lacity.org/webhelp/pdf/ZimasUserGuide.pdf>. Accessed September 2023.
- City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning Office of Zoning Administrator. 1960. Z.A. Case No. 15430. Dodger Baseball Stadium Site – Chavez Ravine Area (Dodger Stadium Conditional Use Permit).

- CNBC. 2018. How Cable Cars are Revolutionizing Public Transport Almost 12,000 Feet Above Sea Level. Available at: <https://www.cnn.com/2018/12/07/how-cable-car-systems-are-revolutionizing-public-transport-in-la-paz.html>. Accessed September 2023.
- Continuing Education of the Bar. Practice Under the California Environmental Quality Act, Section 12.34. Please note that this material is either covered under a NDA, otherwise confidential, and/or copywritten. Available at: https://search.library.ucla.edu/permalink/01UCS_LAL/17p22dp/alma9960180853606533.
- Corey, Richard. 2018. Potrero Power Plant. Available at: http://docs.ppsmixeduse.com/ppp/AB_900/2018_0831_carb_ab900-determination.pdf. Accessed September 2023.
- Cornfield State Park Advisory Committee. 2003. Recommendations Report. Available at: <https://www.parks.ca.gov/pages/21491/files/RecommendationsReport.pdf>. Accessed August 2023.
- Dale, Steven. 2017. The Koblenz Rheinseilbahn, Part 1: Introduction. Available at: <https://www.gondolaproject.com/2010/09/13/the-koblenz-rheinseilbahn-part-1-introduction/>. Accessed August 2023.
- Del Valle, George. Principal Transportation Planner Metro Contract Services. 2022. Personal Communication.
- Dobson, Martin & Jo Ryan. 2000. Trees & Shrubs for Noise Control. Available at: <https://www.trees.org.uk/Trees.org.uk/files/8c/8c69f212-a82e-424b-96d1-c8ff6dc02403.pdf>. Accessed March 2023.
- Dodger Blue. 2019. Dodgers Break Franchise Record for Dodger Stadium Attendance. Available at: <https://dodgerblue.com/dodgers-franchise-record-dodger-stadium-attendance/2019/09/23/>. Accessed August 2023.
- Dodger Blue. 2022. Dodgers Attendance During 2022 Extended MLB Leading Streak. Available at: <https://dodgerblue.com/dodgers-attendance-during-2022-season-extended-mlb-leading-streak/2022/10/07/>. Accessed August 2023.
- Doppelmayr. 2019. Noise Measurements Bottom Station and Tower for 3K K-onnection Kaprun.
- Doppelmayr/Garaventa. 2023. Utilization: Linea Morada Section 1. Personal Communication.
- Dry Creek Citizens Coalition v. County of Tulare (1999) 70 Cal.App.4th 20.
- ESRI. 2023. USGS Protected Areas Database of the United States. <https://www.arcgis.com/home/item.html?id=e20f27c6af5a49b289bea1ba05b4986b>. Accessed July 2023.
- Eyestone Environmental. 2016. Crossroads Hollywood Project. Available at: https://planning.lacity.org/eir/CrossroadsHwd/Deir/Deir_EX/AgencyCorrespondence/Files/2016_11.18%200201pm%20-%20FW_20ARB%20Determination%20AB%20900.pdf. Accessed August 2023.

- Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). 2015. Guidelines for the Visual Impact Assessment of Highway Projects. Available at: https://www.environment.fhwa.dot.gov/env_topics/other_topics/VIA_Guidelines_for_Highway_Projects.pdf. Accessed August 2023.
- Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). 2017. Noise Fundamentals. Available at: https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environMent/noise/regulations_and_guidance/polguide/polguide02.cfm. Accessed August 2023.
- Federal Register. 1994. Executive Order 12898. Available at: <https://www.archives.gov/files/federal-register/executive-orders/pdf/12898.pdf>. Accessed August 2023.
- Federal Transit Administration (FTA). 2004. FTA Fiscal Year 2005 Apportionments, Allocations and Program Information. Available at: <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/FR-2004-12-29/pdf/04-28408.pdf>. Accessed August 2023.
- Federal Transit Administration (FTA). 2018. Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual. Available at: https://www.transit.dot.gov/sites/fta.dot.gov/files/docs/research-innovation/118131/transit-noise-and-vibration-impact-assessment-manual-fta-report-no-0123_0.pdf. Accessed August 2023.
- Federal Transit Administration (FTA). Section 5309 Grant Program. Available at: <https://www.transit.dot.gov/capital-investment-grants-5309>. Accessed August 2023.
- Fehr & Peers. 2022. Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit Project, Non CEQA Transportation Assessment.
- Fehr & Peers. 2022. Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit Project, Parking Study.
- Fehr & Peers. 2023. Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit Project, Parking Management Implementation Plan.
- Florida v. Riley (1989) 488 U.S. 445.
- Garcia, Sid. 2014. Metro buses get multi-camera video surveillance systems. Available at: <https://abc7.com/metro-bus-video-recording-camera-system-surveillance-cameras/143396/>. Accessed September 2023.
- Gobytram. Portland Aerial Tram – Learn More. Available at: <http://www.gobytram.com/about>. Accessed September 2023.
- Google Translate. Available at: <https://translate.google.com/?sl=auto&tl=en&text=les%20op%C3%A9rateurs%20d%E2%80%99Altiservice%2C%20%E2%80%99exploitant%20de%20T%C3%A9l%C3%A9o%2C%20ont%20notamment%20v%C3%A9rifi%C3%A9%20les%20cavaliers%2C%20ces%20pi%C3%A8ces%20m%C3%A9talliques%20qui%20maintiennent%20%E2%80%99%C3%A9cartement%20entre%20les%20c%C3%A2bles&op=translate>. Accessed September 2023.
- Golden Door Properties, LLC v. County of San Diego (2020) Cal.App.5th 467.
- Gric, R. & Nejez, J. 2017. The 3S Gondola Lift Is 25 Years Old. Available at: <https://en.isr.at/singleview-en-old/article/the-3s-gondola-lift-is-25-years-old>. Accessed August 2023.

- Gruen Associates. 1990. Dodger Stadium Transit Access Study. Available at: https://libraryarchives.metro.net/dpgtl/lactc/dodger_stadium_access_study.pdf. Accessed August 2023.
- He, Brian Yueshuai. Selected Publications. Available at: <https://www.brianyueshuaihe.com/publications>. Accessed August 2023.
- Hilda L. Solis. 2021. Revised Restorative Justice Village Master Plan. Available at: <https://file.lacounty.gov/SDSInter/bos/supdocs/153341.pdf>. Accessed March 2023.
- Homeboy Industries. 2022. Hope Village. Available at: <https://homeboyindustries.org/hiltonfoundation/initiatives/>. Accessed August 2023.
- Hymon, Steve. 2018. Metro and ARTT co-sign Letter of Intent to begin negotiations on developing gondola to Dodger Stadium. Available at: <https://thesource.metro.net/2018/12/06/metro-and-artt-co-sign-letter-of-intent-to-begin-negotiations-on-developing-gondola-to-dodger-stadium/#:~:text=Metro%20announced%20on%20Thursday%20that,to%20Dodgers%20Stadium%20a%20reality>. Accessed August 2023.
- Hymon, Steve. 2018. Metro receives Unsolicited Proposal for aerial rapid transit between Union Station and Dodger Stadium. Available at: <https://thesource.metro.net/2018/04/26/metro-receives-unsolicited-proposal-for-aerial-rapid-transit-between-union-station-and-dodger-stadium/>. Accessed August 2023.
- Institute for Sustainable Infrastructure. 2023. Envision Rating System of the Institute for Sustainable Infrastructure. Available at: <https://sustainableinfrastructure.org/envision/use-envision/>. Accessed August 2023.
- International Finance Corporation (IFC). 2020. A Cable Car Named Development. Available at: https://www.ifc.org/wps/wcm/connect/news_ext_content/ifc_external_corporate_site/news+and+events/news/cm-stories/bogota-cable-car. Accessed September 2023.
- Katz v. United States (1967) 389 U.S. 347.
- KFA Architecture. 2023. Homeboy Industries Campus. Available at: <https://kfalosangeles.com/project/homeboy-industries-campus/>. Accessed September 2023.
- LA Aerial Rapid Transit Technologies LLC. 2023. Memorandum Regarding LA ART Draft EIR Public Hearing No. 3 – Consultant Experiences During Protest.
- Laurel Heights Improvement Assn. v. Regents of the University of California (1993) 6 Cal.4th 1112.
- Leitner. 2021. Cablebus 2 Gondola Lift in Mexico City Now Ready for Operation. Available at: <https://www.leitner.com/en/company/news/detail/cablebus-2-gondola-lift-in-mexico-city-now-ready-for-operation>. Accessed September 2023.
- Leitner. 2023. Mexico: A New Chapter in the Ropeway Success Story. Available at: <https://www.leitner.com/en/company/news/detail/mexico-a-new-chapter-in-the-ropeway-success-story/>. Accessed September 2023.

- Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit. 2021. Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit Announces Proposed Community Access Program for Urban Gondola from Union Station to Dodger Stadium. Available at: <https://www.dropbox.com/s/x9hk62cd6g5fcd9/Community%20Fares%20Release.pdf?dl=0>. Accessed August 2023.
- Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit. 2022. Draft EIR Informational Workshop Boards (All Languages).
- Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit. 2022. LA ART Informational Workshop Slides – 10/22 (available in English, Spanish, Chinese-Simplified, Chinese-Traditional).
- Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LA Metro). 2023. Partnerships and Unsolicited Proposals. Available at: <https://www.metro.net/about/partnerships-ups/>. Accessed September 2023.
- Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LA Metro). Unsolicited Proposal Policy FAQs. Available at: https://uc46a024b217fbfe02a5f24938a2.dl.dropboxusercontent.com/cd/0/inline2/CGvGq5mY4NF3Cx-KEZc1RiAOBc11h_RS6ApDZStiNMv7l9mEJjBQ4ARqJHt2hwif-ly7KsAMQQidpxi4lgYtvaOhytPQphuMGBvwl87STcPr-erWYAr3mncq4ZW6DEMMu7ij1sBOmwte9iYCd4LhPEudpRLoT-sfdVPo7bsi5vAC9oMJmT_jVs-5yJzaMqnVNaZnbvoAOUr7OnqQMwY4lc8EMNJ43P4DtXUPuv5WOQ544t30zf3S9PMigsRyEOHXU7jd-MO-ehWbas9mm51Cr92e1zFKSRwNsnzHTX39XpJWEi6ZRZxt8A3FaCaPySND2dNVJWad7gfvUT-YS7ENBnWhcNE796gi0vPjp8Py6YQn5-ZlekyvjZyycgy2TGAjLg4/file. Accessed September 2023.
- Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LA Metro). December 3, 2018 Board Box Update.
- Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LA Metro). Metro Meeting Recordings - December 6, 2018 Metro Board of Directors meeting recording. Available at: https://metro.granicus.com/player/clip/987?view_id=2&redirect=true&h=7b1d4fe0fe92c06e7a30b6c30ed61f65. Accessed September 2023.
- Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LA Metro). Metro Meeting Recordings - April 18, 2019 Metro Executive Management Committee meeting recording. Available at: https://metro.granicus.com/player/clip/1091?view_id=2&redirect=true&h=e0352c04502d95aea37f5a74c40c717a. Accessed September 2023.
- Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LA Metro). Metro Meeting Recordings - April 25, 2019 Metro Board of Directors meeting recording. Available at: https://metro.granicus.com/player/clip/1099?view_id=2&redirect=true&h=5ebfcc7e9787667a4cbe355e03c58af1. Accessed August 2023.
- Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LA Metro). Metro Meeting Recordings - September 17, 2020 Metro Executive Management Committee meeting recording. Available at: https://metro.granicus.com/player/clip/1525?view_id=2&redirect=true&h=9ebfa1ab280794b112e1eb413ff7df27. Accessed September 2023.

- Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LA Metro). Metro Meeting Recordings - September 24, 2020 Metro Board of Directors meeting recording. Available at: https://metro.granicus.com/player/clip/1537?view_id=2&redirect=true&h=07f669d762b7a17f8a7c2791cea2c473. Accessed September 2023.
- Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LA Metro). Metro Meeting Recordings - June 17, 2021 Metro Executive Management Committee meeting recording. Available at: https://metro.granicus.com/player/clip/1854?view_id=2&redirect=true&h=5efbda9e4a22cf19e8a883ea3ab9c207. Accessed September 2023.
- Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LA Metro). Metro Meeting Recordings - June 24, 2021 Metro Board of Directors meeting recording. Available at: https://metro.granicus.com/player/clip/1868?view_id=2&redirect=true&h=4ef94c7f1b5274980b58496e97b14f50. Accessed September 2023.
- Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LA Metro). Metro Meeting Recordings – November 16, 2022 Metro Ad Hoc 2028 Olympics Committee meeting. Available at: https://metro.granicus.com/player/clip/2413?view_id=2&redirect=true&h=461b5c8f36092ebca0c1ed190e407b21. Accessed September 2023.
- Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LA Metro). 2010. Records Management Policy.
- Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LA Metro). 2023. Communications – Metro System Advertising.
- Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority. Los Angeles Union Station Master Plan. document is no longer available online. The Transforming Los Angeles Union Station summary is available at: <http://libraryarchives.metro.net/DPGTL/unionstation/2015-transforming-los-angeles-union-station-summary-report.pdf>. Accessed November 2023.
- Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LA Metro). 2021. Metro Adjacent Development Handbook. Available at: <https://www.dropbox.com/s/3cddvf2og5jo5v6/2021-Adjacent-Development-Review-Handbook.pdf?dl=0>. Accessed August 2023.
- Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LA Metro). 2018. Metro Design Criteria and Standards Adjacent Construction Design Manual. Available at: <https://www.dropbox.com/s/c02lklxuvphbah1/2018-Adjacent-Construction-Design-Manual.pdf?dl=0>. Accessed August 2023.
- Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LA Metro). 2018. Regular Board Meeting Agenda Item 4. Available at: https://metro.granicus.com/player/clip/987?view_id=2&redirect=true&h=7b1d4fe0fe92c06e7a30b6c30ed61f65. Accessed August 2023.
- Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LA Metro). 2023. Gentrification and Displacement. Available at: <https://www.metro.net/about/gentrification-displacement/>. Accessed August 2023.

- Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LA Metro). 2023. Advertising, Sponsorships & Filming. Available at: <https://www.metro.net/about/advertising-sponsorships-filming/>. Accessed August 2023.
- Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LA Metro). 2023. Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit Project Email from Cory Zelmer to info@smmc.ca.gov.
- Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LA Metro). 2022. Ad Hoc 2028 Olympics Committee. Available at: <https://datamade-metro-pdf-merger.s3.amazonaws.com/ad-hoc-2028-olympics-committee-6b993d455bc3.pdf>. Accessed August 2023.
- Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LA Metro). 2022. 2028 Games Mobility Concept Plan (Attachment A). Available at: <https://datamade-metro-pdf-merger.s3.amazonaws.com/ad-hoc-2028-olympics-committee-6b993d455bc3.pdf>. Accessed August 2023.
- Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LA Metro). 2020. 2020 Long Range Transportation Plan. Available at: <https://www.metro.net/about/plans/long-range-transportation-plan/>. Accessed September 2023.
- Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LA Metro). 2021. Metro Final Report: MSRC Contract MS21001 Dodger Stadium Express 2019 Season. Available at http://www.cleantransportationfunding.org/sites/default/files/projects-final-reports-2020-04/MS21001_Metro_Dodgers_Final_Report.pdf. Accessed August 2023.
- Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LA Metro). Metro Meeting Recordings - April 26, 2018 Metro Board of Directors meeting recording. Available at: https://metro.granicus.com/player/clip/835?view_id=2&redirect=true&h=6b017d810a04fe8d9fad7ce14cfa7a1f. Accessed September 2023.
- Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LA Metro). 2020. NexGen Bus Plan. Available at: <https://www.metro.net/about/plans/nextgen-bus-plan/>. Accessed: September 2023.
- Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LA Metro). 2020. Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan. Available at: https://libraryarchives.metro.net/DB_Attachments/200401_Attachment%20B%20-%20PTASP.pdf. Accessed September 2023.
- Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LA Metro). 2023. Metro Board Report Zero Emission Bus Program Update. Available at: <https://datamade-metro-pdf-merger.s3.amazonaws.com/2023-0207.pdf>. Accessed August 2023.
- Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LA Metro). 2023. First/Last Mile. Available at: <https://www.metro.net/about/first-last/>. Accessed September 2023.
- Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LA Metro). 2023. LA River Path Project. Available at: <https://www.metro.net/projects/lariverpath/>. Accessed September 2023.
- Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LA Metro). 2022. Rapid Equity Assessment. Available at:

- <https://www.dropbox.com/s/790jw2sumk42ra6/Rapid%20Equity%20Assessment%20Tool.pdf?dl=0>. Accessed September 2023.
- Los Angeles Department of City Planning. 2016. Mobility Plan 2035: An Element of the General Plan. Available at: https://planning.lacity.org/odocument/523f2a95-9d72-41d7-aba5-1972f84c1d36/Mobility_Plan_2035.pdf#page=14. Accessed September 2023.
- Los Angeles Department of Transportation. 2020. Transportation Assessment Guidelines (TAG). Available at: https://ladot.lacity.org/sites/default/files/documents/2020-transportation-assessment-guidelines_final_2020.07.27.pdf. Accessed August 2023.
- Los Angeles Department of Transportation. 2022. Transportation Assessment for the Proposed Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit Project Located Between Union Station and Dodger Stadium.
- Los Angeles Dodgers. 2019. Dodger Stadium Express Rider Counts. Please note that this material is either covered under a NDA, otherwise confidential, and/or copywritten.
- Los Angeles Dodgers. 2022. Car Service and Taxi. Available at: <https://www.mlb.com/dodgers/ballpark/transportation/car-service-and-taxi>. Accessed August 2023.
- Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 11.5.7.
- Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 12.05.
- Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 12.24.
- Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 14.4.4.
- Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 93.0117.
- Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 111.00.
- Lotus v. Department of Transportation (2014) 223 Cal.App.4th 645.
- Map Collaborator. 2023. California Protected Areas Database. Available at: <https://www.mapcollaborator.org/cpad/?base=map&y=34.02154&x=-118.41176&z=10&layers=notes%2Cpolygons%2Cuploads&opacs=100%2C25%2C90>. Accessed July 2023.
- Map Collaborator. 2023. California Conservation Easement Database. Available at: <https://www.mapcollaborator.org/cpad/?base=map&y=37.51844&x=-123.95874&z=6&layers=notes%2Cced&opacs=100%2C100>. Accessed September 2023.
- Matsuyuki, et al. 2020. Impact of Aerial Cable Car in Low-Income Area in Medellín, Colombia. Available at: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2352146520305676>. Accessed September 2023.
- Mexico News Daily. 2022. Passenger numbers on Mexico City Cablebus line 78% more than expected. Available at: <https://mexiconewsdaily.com/news/passenger-numbers-on-mexico-city-cablebus-line-78-more-than-expected/>. Accessed September 2023.

- My Beautiful Passport. 2022. Telecabine Lisboa: Portugal's Cable Car & Gondola Lift. Available at: <https://mybeautifulpassport.com/telecabine-lisboa-cable-car-portugal/#:~:text=Opening%20in%20the%20spring%20of,the%20river%20and%20modern%20architecture>. Accessed June 2023.
- National Ski Areas Association (NSAA). 2016. NSAA Ski Lift Safety Fact Sheet. Available at: <https://www.missionridge.com/sites/default/files/NSAA%20Lift%20Safety%20Fact%20Sheet%2001.2012.pdf>. Accessed August 2023.
- NZ Transport Agency. Assessment of Environmental Effects for the Basin Bridge Project, Wellington Northern Corridor RoNS. Available at <https://www.epa.govt.nz/assets/FileAPI/proposal/NSP000026/Applicants-proposal-documents/5f29d30124/AEE-Chapter-16.pdf>. Accessed August 2023.
- Ober Mountain. 2023. Aerial Tramway. Available at: <https://obergatlinburg.com/aerial-tramway/>. Accessed June 2023.
- Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA). 2008. Standard 1910.95 Occupational Noise Exposure. Available at: <https://www.osha.gov/laws-regs/regulations/standardnumber/1910/1910.95>. Accessed August 2023.
- Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA). Standard 5096 Exposure Limits for Noise. Available at: <https://www.dir.ca.gov/title8/5096.html>. Accessed August 2023.
- Otis, John. 2014. High in the Andes, Bolivia's Gondolas in the Sky Ease Congestion. Available at: <https://www.npr.org/sections/parallels/2014/10/22/358046982/high-in-the-andes-bolivias-gondolas-in-the-sky-ease-congestion>. Accessed August 2023.
- Palm Springs Aerial Tramway. 2022. History. Available at: <https://pstramway.com/about-us/history/>. Accessed June 2023.
- ParCitypatory. 2019. Connecting the Outskirts to City Centre with Cable Cars. Available at: <https://parcitypatory.org/2019/06/08/mexicable/>. Accessed September 2023.
- Périeré, Paul. 2022. À Toulouse, une maintenance spectaculaire pour le téléphérique Téléo. Available at: <https://www.leparisien.fr/haute-garonne-31/a-toulouse-une-maintenance-spectaculaire-pour-le-telepherique-teleo-10-08-2022-EOFH5CXWIBDSDEG6FP6KSK5XJE.php>. Accessed August 2023.
- Pilatus. 2023. Aerial Cableway Dragon Ride Facts. Available at: <https://www.pilatus.ch/en/discover/aerial-cableway/aerial-cableway-dragon-ride>. Accessed June 2023.
- Planning and Conservation League v. Department of Water Resources (2000) 83 Cal.App.4th 892.
- Poma. 2021. More About the Project. Available at: <https://www.poma.net/en/work/teleo/>. Accessed August 2023.
- Protect the Historic Amador Waterways v. Amador Water Agency (2004) 116 Cal.App.4th 1099.
- Quintana, Francisco. 2022. Assemblywoman Wendy Carrillo Announces \$5 Million in California State Budget Funds for Hope Village Project. Available at: <https://a52.asmdc.org/press->

- [releases/20221101-assemblywoman-wendy-carrillo-announces-5-million-california-state-budget](#). Accessed August 2023.
- Ramboll. 2018. Portrero Power Plant Mixed-Use development GHG Emissions Methodology and Documentation. Available at: http://docs.ppsmixeduse.com/ppp/AB_900/2018_0831_carb_ab900-determination.pdf. Accessed August 2023.
- Ritten. 2023. Renon Cable Car. Available at: <https://www.ritten.com/en/1202-railway>. Accessed August 2023.
- Roosevelt Island Operating Corporation. 2023. Tram History. Available at: <https://rioc.ny.gov/168/Tram-History#:~:text=The%20original%20Roosevelt%20Island%20aerial,was%20opened%20in%20May%201976>. Accessed June 2023.
- Rossi, F. and Nicolini, A. 2011. Noise Prediction Models for Gondola Ropeway Components. Noise Control Engineering Journal, pp 415-431. Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/257941072_Noise_prediction_models_for_gondola_ropeway_components. Accessed August 2023.
- Santorini View. 2023. Santorini Cable Car. Available at: <https://www.santorini-view.com/attractions/santorini-cable-car/#:~:text=Its%20construction%20started%20in%20the,prosperity%20and%20development%20of%20tourism>. Accessed June 2023.
- SCJ Alliance Consulting Services. 2022. Gondola Operating Scenarios and Power.
- SCJ Alliance Consulting Services. 2023. Photograph of Funivia del Renon.
- Seilbahnen International. 2022. The French City Toulouse Now has an Urban 3S Cable Car. Available at: <https://www.simagazin.com/en/si-urban-en/the-french-city-toulouse-now-has-an-urban-3s-cable-car/>. Accessed August 2023.
- Sequoyah Hills Homeowners Association v. City of Oakland (1993) 23 Cal.App.4th 704, 719.
- Shahan, C. 2014. The World's Longest Aerial Cable Car System. Available at: <https://cleantechnica.com/2014/10/05/the-worlds-longest-aerial-cable-car-system-bolivias-mi-teleferico/>. Accessed September 2023.
- Sharp, Steven. 2018. Homeboy Industries Plans Expansion of its DTLA Headquarters. Available at: <https://la.urbanize.city/post/homeboy-industries-plans-expansion-its-dtla-headquarters>. Accessed September 2023.
- Sharp, Steven. 2021. "Restorative Justice Village" Could Bring More Supportive Housing to Chinatown. Available at: <https://la.urbanize.city/post/restorative-justice-village-could-bring-more-supportive-housing-chinatown>. Accessed September 2023.
- Sharp, Steven. 2021. Homeboy Industries Expands into Affordable Housing. Available at: <https://la.urbanize.city/post/homeboy-industries-expands-affordable-housing>. Accessed September 2023.

- Sierra Club v. County of Fresno (2018) 6 Cal.5th 502.
- South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). 2008. Draft Guidance Document – Interim CEQA GHG Significance Threshold. Available at: [http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/ceqa/handbook/greenhouse-gases-\(ghg\)-ceqa-significance-thresholds/ghgattachmente.pdf?sfvrsn=2](http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/ceqa/handbook/greenhouse-gases-(ghg)-ceqa-significance-thresholds/ghgattachmente.pdf?sfvrsn=2). Accessed August 2023.
- South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). 2016. Air Quality Management Plan. Available at: <http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/clean-air-plans/air-quality-management-plans/2016-air-quality-management-plan/final-2016-aqmp/final2016aqmp.pdf>. Accessed: August 2023.
- South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). 2021. Quemetco Capacity Upgrade Project. Available at: https://files.ceqanet.opr.ca.gov/8174-2/attachment/7bvb1gECW7xJV9wgG2iJtxOnqiCHDXVYZLEIXRtEw6yx_ZV_m7nE0LafkaH0CyHRtX_pxr1rz99FgzFP0. Accessed August 2023.
- South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). 2022. Air Quality Management Plan. Available at <http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/clean-air-plans/air-quality-management-plans/2022-air-quality-management-plan/final-2022-aqmp/final-2022-aqmp.pdf?sfvrsn=16>. Accessed: August 2023.
- South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). 2023. Air Quality Modeling. Available at: <https://www.aqmd.gov/home/rules-compliance/ceqa/air-quality-modeling>. Accessed: August 2023.
- Stantec. 2023. Memo to Holly Rockwell Regarding Los Angeles Aerial Rapid Transit (LA ART) Project Transportation Analysis Peer Review.
- State of California Department of Justice Office of the Attorney General (OAG). Environmental Justice. Available at: <https://oag.ca.gov/environment/justice>. Accessed September 2023.
- State of California. 2013. Senate Bill 743. Available at: https://leginfo.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201320140SB743. Accessed August 2023.
- State of California and City of Los Angeles. 1988. Quitclaim Deed for El Pueblo de Los Angeles Historic Monument.
- Techxplore. 2021. Commuters Escape Mexico City Gridlock in New Cable Car. Available at: <https://techxplore.com/news/2021-07-commuters-mexico-city-gridlock-cable.html>. Accessed September 2023.
- Telluride Mountain Village. 2023. The Gondola. Available at: <https://www.telluride.com/discover/the-gondola/>. Accessed June 2023.
- The California Endowment v. Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority*. Case No. 22STCP01030 (Los Angeles Superior Court, 2023)

- The California Endowment. 2010. Building Healthy Communities Initiative. Available at: <https://www.buildinghealthycommunities.org/>. Accessed August 2023.
- The California Endowment. 2023. Building Healthy Communities: A Decade in Review. Available at: <https://www.calendow.org/learning/executive-summary>. Accessed August 2023.
- The California Endowment. 2023. Annual Report 2023. Available at: <https://www.calendow.org/annual-report/>. Accessed September 2023.
- The Gondola Project. 2016. Mexicable Murals: Mexico’s First Urban Cable Car. Available at: <https://www.gondolaproject.com/2016/08/31/mexicable-murals-mexicos-first-urban-cable-car/>. Accessed August 2023.
- The Gondola Project. 2018. Colombian Capital Opens First Urban Gondola. Available at: <https://www.gondolaproject.com/category/installations/transmicable/>. Accessed September 2023.
- The Gondola Project. 2021. Cablebus 2 Gondola Lift in Mexico City Officially Opens. Available at: <https://www.gondolaproject.com/2021/08/17/cablebus-2-gondola-lift-in-mexico-city-officially-opens/>. Accessed August 2023.
- The New York Times (NYTimes). 2016. Near Mexico City, Cable Car Lets Commuters Glide Over Traffic. Available at: <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/12/28/world/americas/mexico-city-mexicable.html>. Accessed September 2023.
- The New York Times (NYTimes). 2021. Frida Kahlo, Aztec Gods: Can Art Lift Up a Poor Neighborhood? Available at: <https://www.nytimes.com/2021/10/14/world/americas/mexico-city-iztapalapa-murals.html>. Accessed August 2023.
- The White House. 2023. Executive Order on Revitalizing Our Nation’s Commitment to Environmental Justice for All. Available at: <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/presidential-actions/2023/04/21/executive-order-on-revitalizing-our-nations-commitment-to-environmental-justice-for-all/>. Accessed September 2023.
- Translink. 2020. Burnaby Mountain Gondola. Available at: <https://www.translink.ca/plans-and-projects/projects/rapid-transit-projects/burnaby-mountain-gondola>. Accessed: September 2023.
- Translink. 2021. Burnaby Mountain Gondola: Route Selection Report. Available at: <https://www.translink.ca/-/media/translink/documents/plans-and-projects/rapid-transit/burnaby-mountain-gondola/route-selection-report/route-selection-report.pdf#view=fitH>. Accessed August 2023.
- Trenscat. 2023. E Teleferic de Montjuic. Available at: http://www.trenscat.com/tmb/telefericmontjuic_ct.html. Accessed August 2023.
- U.S. v. Houston (2016) 813 F.3d 282, 285.
- UCLA Mobility Lab. 2022. Mobility Analytics and Decision Sciences LA Sim: Dynamic Mesoscopic Network Modeling of LA. Available at: <https://mobility-lab.seas.ucla.edu/research/modeling-and-control-of-dynamic-complex-systems-in-smart-cities/>. Accessed August 2023.

- UCLA Mobility Lab. 2022. Study Finds Proposed Aerial Gondola to Dodger Stadium Will Do Little to Reduce Traffic and Emissions. Available at: <https://www.stopthegondola.org/ucla-study>. Accessed August 2023.
- UCLA Mobility Lab. 2023. Statement from the UCLA Mobility Lab Regarding LA Gondola Ridership Projection. Available at: <https://mobility-lab.seas.ucla.edu/>. Accessed September 2023.
- UCLA Mobility Lab. 2023. Tweet on January 13, 2023. https://twitter.com/ucla/status/1613998706851971075?s=46&t=p_Kv02sYuM0ssXkORDXW_eA. Accessed September 2023.
- UCLA Mobility Lab. Multiple. Publications. Available at: <https://mobility-lab.seas.ucla.edu/publications/>. Accessed August 2023.
- United States Code. Title 49 - Transportation.
- United States Code. Title 23, Section 138.
- United States Code. Title 49, Section 5302.
- United States Code. Title 49, Section 303.
- United States Code. Title 54, Section 306108.
- United States Code. National Historic Preservation Act, Section 106.
- United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA/EPA). 1974. Information on Levels of Environmental Noise Requisite to Protect Public Health and Welfare with an Adequate Margin of Safety. Available at: <https://nepis.epa.gov/Exe/ZyNET.exe/2000L3LN.TXT?ZyActionD=ZyDocument&Client=EPA&Index=Prior+to+1976&Docs=&Query=&Time=&EndTime=&SearchMethod=1&TocRestrict=n&Toc=&TocEntry=&QField=&QFieldYear=&QFieldMonth=&QFieldDay=&IntQFieldOp=0&ExtQFieldOp=0&XmlQuery=&File=D%3A%5Czyfiles%5CIndex%20Data%5C70thru75%5CTxt%5C00000001%5C2000L3LN.txt&User=ANONYMOUS&Password=anonymous&SortMethod=h%7C-&MaximumDocuments=1&FuzzyDegree=0&ImageQuality=r75g8/r75g8/x150y150g16/i425&Display=hpfr&DefSeekPage=x&SearchBack=ZyActionL&Back=ZyActionS&BackDesc=Results%20page&MaximumPages=1&ZyEntry=1&SeekPage=x&ZyPURL>. Accessed August 2023.
- United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA/EPA). 1981. Noise Effects Handbook: A Desk Reference to Health and Welfare Effects of Noise. Available at: <https://nepis.epa.gov/Exe/ZyNET.exe/9100OAJ.TXT?ZyActionD=ZyDocument&Client=EPA&Index=1981+Thru+1985&Docs=&Query=&Time=&EndTime=&SearchMethod=1&TocRestrict=n&Toc=&TocEntry=&QField=&QFieldYear=&QFieldMonth=&QFieldDay=&IntQFieldOp=0&ExtQFieldOp=0&XmlQuery=&File=D%3A%5Czyfiles%5CIndex%20Data%5C81thru85%5CTxt%5C00000018%5C9100OAJ.txt&User=ANONYMOUS&Password=anonymous&SortMethod=h%7C-&MaximumDocuments=1&FuzzyDegree=0&ImageQuality=r75g8/r75g8/x150y150g16/i425&Display=hpfr&DefSeekPage=x&SearchBack=ZyActionL&Back=ZyActionS&BackDesc=Results%20page&MaximumPages=1&ZyEntry=1&SeekPage=x&ZyPURL>. Accessed August 2023.

- United States Green Building Council (USGBC). 2023. LEED for Building Design and Construction. Available at: [https://www.usgbc.org/leed/rating-systems/new-buildings#:~:text=LEED%20for%20Building%20Design%20and%20Construction%20\(LEED%20BD%2BC\),sustainability%20feature%2C%20maximizing%20the%20benefits](https://www.usgbc.org/leed/rating-systems/new-buildings#:~:text=LEED%20for%20Building%20Design%20and%20Construction%20(LEED%20BD%2BC),sustainability%20feature%2C%20maximizing%20the%20benefits). Accessed August 2023.
- Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT). 2022. Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS: Executive Summary. Available at: https://littlecottonwoodeis.udot.utah.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/08/LCC_FEIS_00b_Summary.pdf. Accessed September 2023.
- Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT). 2023. Little Cottonwood Canyon Environmental Impact Statement. Available at: <https://littlecottonwoodeis.udot.utah.gov/>. Accessed September 2023.
- Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT). 2022. Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS. Project Overview and Final EIS Alternative Summary. Available at: <https://littlecottonwoodeis.udot.utah.gov/final-eis/>. Accessed September 2023.
- WBUR. 2017. An Aerial Tram Is One Mexican City's Solution To Traffic And Crime. Available at: <https://www.wbur.org/hereandnow/2017/04/26/mexico-ecatepec-aerial-tram>. Accessed September 2023.
- Zacatecas. 2021. Zacatecas Cable Car. Available at: <https://www.zacatecastravel.com/teleferico>. Accessed June 2023.