

CITY OF LOS ANGELES
INTERDEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

Date: November 23, 2022

To: Bertram Moklebust, Division Manager
Permit Case Management Division

From: *for Norman Mundy*
Maria Martin, Manager
Environmental Management Group

Subject: California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Review: Summary of Relevant Findings and Mitigation Measures for Bellanca Avenue from Arbor Vitae Street to its Southerly Terminus (Project) W.O. VAC- E1401401

The CEQA lead agency, the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority adopted the *Final Environmental Impact Statement / Final Environmental Impact Report for the Crenshaw / LAX Transit Corridor*¹ (the Final FEIS/FEIR) on September 22, 2011. The vacation of Bellanca Avenue from Arbor Vitae Street to its southerly terminus, totaling approximately 60,000 square feet of public roadway vacation for the construction of Site #14 for the Maintenance Facility (a 17.6-acre site within the City of Los Angeles) is an element of the project and was analyzed in the Final EIS/EIR. Vacation of this segment of public right-of-way would provide a larger storage and maintenance facility for light rail trains.

The Environmental Management Group has reviewed CEQA documentation as it relates to the requested street vacation. The relevant findings of the Final EIS/EIR (which has incorporated public review comments) and all applicable mitigation measures are summarized below:

Visual Quality

Direct Impacts

The Crenshaw/LAX Transit Corridor Project would require a new maintenance facility that would store vehicles and serve as a service and maintenance location. A maintenance facility would generally represent the same or less intense use as the existing industrial uses. The site plan for the preferred maintenance site alternative locates the main service building in the middle of the site with ancillary facilities, such as security, parking areas, and storage buildings, on the periphery of the sites. The contrast in scale, massing and open space would be consistent with the existing buildings and open space surrounding the preferred maintenance site alternative. There are no scenic resources, including, but not limited to historic buildings or designated scenic highways, that are near the preferred maintenance site alternative. No particularly unique visual elements, landforms, or topographic features exist on or immediately surrounding the preferred maintenance site alternative.

1

[https://www.dropbox.com/sh/8f6vcle7l6k32s5/AABNEoNX9qcrvQa31u5xWQTYa/Reports%20and%20Info/201108-Final%20Environmental%20Impact%20Statement%20-%20Final%20Environmental%20Impact%20Report%20\(FEIS-FEIR\)?dl=0&subfolder_nav_tracking=1](https://www.dropbox.com/sh/8f6vcle7l6k32s5/AABNEoNX9qcrvQa31u5xWQTYa/Reports%20and%20Info/201108-Final%20Environmental%20Impact%20Statement%20-%20Final%20Environmental%20Impact%20Report%20(FEIS-FEIR)?dl=0&subfolder_nav_tracking=1)

The project would include security lighting for all buildings and facilities. Additional ornamental lighting may also be installed to accent buildings. Lighting fixtures would typically be mounted on low scale poles or on the facades of buildings. It is expected that this lighting (which typically is at the level of 1 to 2 foot-candles) would not spill over outside the site boundaries nor would it create glare that could adversely affect any adjacent residences. The maintenance facility buildings would be up to two stories or an estimated 35 feet in height. The longest shadows cast by a 35-foot building would occur during the Winter Solstice at 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. This shadow length would not affect residences near any of the four sites.

Utility poles exist along all the arterials adjacent to the preferred maintenance site alternative. Overhead wires would be present as part of the maintenance facility; they would generally be consistent with the surrounding utility poles and transmission lines. Development of a maintenance facility at the preferred maintenance site alternative would not have a negative effect on the visual environment as it would fit within the context of the existing uses, would not obstruct views or vistas, or any of the aesthetic resources. The preferred maintenance site alternative would result in no adverse effects to visual resources.

Indirect Impacts

The maintenance facility would occur in a generally industrial area and would not indirectly alter the character or development of land in the surrounding area. Therefore, no indirect visual impacts are anticipated to result for the preferred maintenance site alternative.

Impacts

There are no scenic resources located on or in close proximity to the maintenance site that would be affected. The area on and surrounding the maintenance site facility is industrial in character and would not degrade the visual character or quality of the site or surrounding area. Therefore, no significant visual impacts would occur to the visual environment and/or resources from the preferred maintenance site alternative.

The loss of landscaping and vegetation would result in a significant impact to visual quality to residences along La Colina Drive and along Crenshaw Boulevard from 60th to 48th Street. With implementation of mitigation, no adverse effects are anticipated.

Reference: Final EIS/EIR Chapter 5.5, Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences of the Maintenance Facility; Final EIS/EIR Executive Summary, Table ES.5. Mitigation Measures for the LPA.; Attachment A: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to Ensure Fulfillment of All Environmental and Related Commitments in the FEIS, Crenshaw / LAX Transit Corridor Project, September / October 2011.

Mitigation Measure

V-1: To minimize visual clutter, integrate system components, and reduce the potential for conflicts between the transit system and adjacent communities, design of the system stations and components shall follow the recommendations and principles developed in the project urban design explorations. These principles include, but are not limited to: 1) preserve and enhance the unique cultural identity of each station area and its surrounding community by implementing art and landscaping; and 2) promote a sense of place, safety, and walkability by providing street trees, walkways or sidewalks, lighting, awnings, public art, and/or street furniture. Prior to final design, community input shall also be used to help achieve these guidelines.

V-2: At locations where existing land uses or vegetation is removed and neighboring uses are exposed to new views of the transit system, additional landscaping shall be provided within the right-of-way or in remnant acquisition parcels to create a buffer between the uses, but not necessarily to completely screen uses. Community input from adjacent residences or sensitive land uses shall be incorporated to the greatest extent feasible on the landscaping design elements to be incorporated.

V-3: Mature trees that are removed during construction of the Crenshaw / LAX Transit Corridor Project shall be relocated or replaced with a tree of similar species, or if inappropriate for climate conditions, a species that is low-water use and compliant with the applicable City's landscape ordinance. Replacement should occur in consultation with the Los Angeles Bureau of Street Services Street Tree Division and with the City of Inglewood Department of Public Works.

V-4: Where practical and appropriate, additional landscaping and enhanced design features will be used to minimize the visual image of the TPSS sites and other ancillary facilities.

Geotechnical / Subsurface / Seismic / Hazardous Materials

Hazardous Materials and Substances

The maintenance facility would not be located on a State-listed contaminated site and would use a limited amount of hazardous materials, primarily from cleaning and painting. These materials would be used in controlled situations, such as a spray booth, and would be transported and disposed in accordance with Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) guidelines. Therefore, a less-than-significant impact would occur to hazards and hazardous materials. Two schools are located near the preferred maintenance site alternative; however, the potential for exposure to contaminated materials would be limited to the confines of the project site in a controlled environment. The Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) is also located near the maintenance site alternative; however, the potential for a safety hazard to people working on the site would be remote and therefore, potential impacts are less-than-significant.

During project construction phases, the primary concern for the locally preferred alternative (LPA) or minimum operable segments (MOS) would be the potential for encountering hazardous materials during grading and excavation within the Harbor Subdivision. It is possible that contaminated soil and/or groundwater may be encountered in the areas of the proposed at-grade, below-grade, and aerial alignments along the entire section. The construction work for the at-grade alignments would generally be contained to the upper 5 feet of soil, thereby constraining the volume of unearthed contaminated soil and eliminating the possibility of encountering contaminated groundwater. The below-grade areas would probably consist of cut-and-fill activities to approximately 70 feet below-grade, which would result in encountering large quantities of soil and increasing the possibility of encountering contaminated soil and possibly contaminated groundwater. A geotechnical investigation was conducted during the advanced conceptual engineering for the project. The investigation found that a conventional shoring system is feasible for supporting excavations in the cut-and-cover sections of the alignment. A brace shoring system would be required when in proximity to traffic or structures.

A hazardous substances investigation was conducted during the advanced conceptual engineering for the project. Sixty five soil samples were collected along the alignment and tested for hazardous materials (metals, volatile organic compounds, petroleum hydrocarbons). One area near the Harbor Subdivision and Crenshaw Boulevard was found to contain an elevated level of Arsenic at approximately 10 feet. However, the level of Arsenic (28mg/kg) is still considered non-hazardous because it is below ten times the screening threshold limit (50mg/kg). Construction activity would be conducted in accordance with all federal and State regulatory requirements that are intended to prevent or manage hazards. Therefore, the LPA and MOSs would not result in adverse effects related to hazardous materials. The mitigation measures that follow provide the recommended methods for safely approaching potential hazardous materials encountered during the course of the project.

Geology and Soils

The preferred maintenance site alternative is located two miles from the Newport-Inglewood Fault Zone. The use of this site would not result in an increased exposure to the risk associated with fault lines, nor would it exacerbate pre-existing seismic conditions. The site would be vulnerable to damage from ground shaking during an earthquake. However, the project would be subject to the California Building Standards Code that requires structures be designed to minimize the damage from potential fault activity. Therefore, the potential for ground deformation would be minimal and a less-than-significant impact would occur.

The preferred maintenance site alternative is not located in areas mapped as susceptible to landslides. The alignment is relatively flat, and the potential for landslides along the alignment is remote. Therefore, no significant impacts related to landslides are anticipated.

The preferred maintenance site alternative is in a flat, highly urbanized area, with an extensive drainage system and impervious surfaces. The sites are not subject to high levels of wind or rain, factors that may contribute to soil erosion. Construction and operation of the maintenance facility would not affect the existing drainage system and would not contribute to the loss of topsoil during operation. The preferred maintenance site alternative is not located on expansive soils, which would create substantial risks to life or property. In addition, the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems is not anticipated due to the location of the site in a developed area, where existing sewer lines would be utilized. Therefore, a less-than-significant impact would occur related to the loss of topsoil, erosion, expansive soils, and the support of the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems

Impacts

There is potential for ground deformation to have an adverse effect for the LPA. With implementation of mitigation, no adverse effects are anticipated. The LPA is susceptible to liquefaction in two areas. The first area mapped as being susceptible to liquefaction is south of the I-10 Freeway, along the eastern slopes of the Baldwin Hills. The second area is the portion of the LPA along the Harbor Subdivision. Therefore, there would be a potential for liquefaction in these areas. With implementation of mitigation, no adverse effects are anticipated.

Additionally, there is potential for encountering hazardous materials during grading and excavation within the Harbor Subdivision. It is possible that contaminated soil and/or groundwater may be encountered in the areas of the proposed at-grade, below-grade, and aerial alignment along the entire section. With implementation of mitigation, no adverse effects would occur.

The demolition of structures on the maintenance facility site may expose workers to lead-based paint; implementation of mitigation measure S-GEO-4 and adherence to all OSHA worker safety standards and best management practices will reduce the risks to less than significant.

Reference: Final EIS/EIR Chapter 5.9, Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences of the Maintenance Facility; Final EIS/EIR Executive Summary, Table ES.5. Mitigation Measures for the LPA.; Attachment A: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to Ensure Fulfillment of All Environmental and Related Commitments in the FEIS, Crenshaw / LAX Transit Corridor Project, September / October 2011. 4.15.2.10 & 4.17.1.9 of Final Environmental Impact Statement/ Final Environmental Impact Report 4.0 – Affected Environment/Environmental Consequences of the Alignment and Stations, August 2011.

Mitigation Measure

CON27: Soil Mitigation Plan – A soil mitigation plan should be prepared after final construction plans are prepared showing the lateral and vertical extent of soil

excavation during construction. The soil mitigation plan should establish soil reuse criteria, establish a sampling plan for stockpiled materials, describe the disposition of materials that do not satisfy the reuse criteria, and specify guidelines for imported materials. The soil mitigation plan should include a provision that during grading or excavation activities, soil should be screened for contamination by visual observations and field screening for volatile organic compounds with a PID. Soil samples that are suspected of contamination based on field observations and PID readings shall be analyzed for suspected chemicals by a California certified laboratory. If hazardous soil is found, it shall be removed, transported to an approved disposal location, and remediated or disposed according to state and federal laws. Other contaminated but nonhazardous soil may be reused on site applications such as bridge embankments or underneath paved areas provided the public is protected from coming into contact with the contaminated soils and the specific use is agreed to by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC).

S-GEO-4: There is a potential for lead based paint and asbestos containing building materials to be present at the maintenance facility sites. An asbestos survey and lead based paint survey shall be conducted on all sites where on-site structures would be demolished or significantly renovated.

GEO2: All hazardous materials, drums, trash, and debris shall be removed and disposed of in accordance with regulatory guidelines set forth by the Department of Toxic Substances Control in Title 22 Division 4.5 of the California Code of Regulations. Waste would be disposed of by a licensed hazardous waste transporter at an authorized and licensed disposal facility or recycling facility utilizing properly completed Uniform Hazardous Waste Manifest forms. A Department of Health Services certified laboratory shall sample waste to determine the appropriate disposal facility.

GEO3: A health and safety plan shall be developed for sensitive receptors with potential exposure to the constituents of concern identified in the preliminary Geotechnical Report contained in Appendix H.

GEO4: Historical and present site usage along the many areas of the proposed alignment included businesses that stored hazardous materials and/or waste and used USTs from at least the 1920s to the present. It is possible that areas with soil and/or groundwater impacts may be present that were not identified in this report, or were considered a low potential to adversely impact the subject property. In general, observations shall be made during future development activities for features of concern or areas of possible contamination such as, but not limited to, the presence of underground facilities, buried debris, waste drums, tanks, soil staining or odorous soils. Further investigation and analysis may be necessary, should such materials be encountered.

GEO5: Best Management Practices (BMPs) identified in Appendix F required as part of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit and application of

SCAQMD Rule 403 shall be implemented for the proposed project to not only reduce potential soil erosion, but also to maintain soil stability and integrity during grading, excavation, below grade construction, and installation of foundations for aerial structures, and maintenance and operations facilities. BMPs would comply with applicable Uniform Building Codes and include, but are not limited to, scheduling excavation and grading activities during dry weather, covering stockpiles of excavated soils with tarps or plastic sheeting, and debris traps on drains.

GEO6: The design of the project shall adhere to the design specifications of the geotechnical study for maintaining structural integrity under static and seismic loading and operational demands.

Water Resources

The operation of a maintenance facility would require water supply. The preferred maintenance site alternative may include restroom facilities or irrigation systems for landscaping. Since much of the site would be occupied with light rail tracks, the building square footage and amount of landscaping would be less than what currently exists. The water demand would be equal or less than the existing uses, which include a food distribution warehouse and a car rental facility requiring car washes. With the implementation of standard water conservation measures, such as water saving devices for irrigation, lavatories, and other water-using facilities, the effect of the project on the municipal water supply would be negligible. Therefore, no adverse impacts are anticipated related to water supply for the preferred maintenance site alternative.

There are no local surface water bodies located in the immediate vicinity of the preferred maintenance site alternative. Therefore, no adverse effects to local surface water bodies are anticipated for the preferred maintenance site alternative.

The preferred maintenance site alternative is located in highly urbanized areas, consisting of mostly impervious surfaces with drainage structures. Operation of the maintenance facility is not anticipated to result in adverse effects to groundwater resources.

The preferred maintenance site alternative is not located within designated 100-year floodplains. Drainage would be properly conveyed away from the site so as not to induce ponding or flooding on the selected sites or adjacent properties. With the implementation of a drainage control plan, no adverse effects to flooding would occur. During operation of this maintenance facility site, storm runoff would be conveyed to treat storm water runoff before it is discharged off-site. No long term adverse effects to water quality are anticipated for the preferred maintenance site alternative.

Impacts

The preferred maintenance site alternative would not significantly impact water resources. Although, the maintenance facility would require the use of water, the facility

would have less than 500,000 square feet of floor space and would not require a water supply assessment. Existing supplies would be adequate to serve the project.

Construction of the Maintenance facility and the LPA may potentially increase sediment and erosion in or near disturbed areas. For general construction activities, the proposed project is required to comply with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Construction Permit to discharge stormwater associated with construction activity. To address and reduce water quality adverse effects, the project is required to prepare a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program (SWPP) in accordance with the General Construction Stormwater Permit. BMPs identified in Appendix F will be identified in the SWPP to reduce or eliminate pollutants in stormwater discharges from the construction site. A Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) would also be prepared to address the quality and quantity of stormwater runoff generated on-site during project operation and the incorporation of permanent treatment BMPs into the project. Implementation of temporary and permanent treatment BMPs would minimize adverse effects to water quality due to the construction of the proposed project.

The project is not located in an area susceptible to floods, or other water-related hazards, subsidence, or where high groundwater tables exist that could affect water quality. Therefore a less-than-significant impact to water resources is anticipated. In addition, Mitigation Measures S-WQ1 through S-WQ4 would ensure that no significant long term impacts to drainage patterns or surface water or groundwater quality would occur. The development of a drainage control plan and SUSMP as prescribed in Mitigation Measures S-WQ2 and S-WQ4 would ensure that drainage flows are properly treated and conveyed. Therefore, with implementation of the proposed mitigation measures, a less-than-significant impact would remain on water resources for the preferred maintenance site alternative.

No indirect impacts to water resources are anticipated to result from the preferred maintenance site alternative.

Reference: Final EIS/EIR Chapter 5.10, Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences of the Maintenance Facility; Final EIS/EIR Executive Summary, Table ES.5. Mitigation Measures for the LPA.; Attachment A: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to Ensure Fulfillment of All Environmental and Related Commitments in the FEIS, Crenshaw / LAX Transit Corridor Project, September / October 2011. 4.15.2.11 of Final Environmental Impact Statement/ Final Environmental Impact Report 4.0 – Affected Environment/Environmental Consequences of the Alignment and Stations, August 2011.

Mitigation Measure

WQ1: During project construction and operation, remediation shall be required at maintenance facilities and vehicle storage areas, where a potential exists for grease

and oil contamination to flow into storm drains. Various types of ditch structures, including grease traps, sediment traps, detention basins, and / or temporary dikes may be used to control possible pollutants. These facilities shall be constructed pursuant to guidance published in Section 402 of the Clean Water Act and shall follow the most current guidance within the NPDES program.

WQ2: The flood capacity of existing drainage or water conveyance features within the project study corridor shall not be reduced in a way that causes ponding or flooding during storm events. A drainage control plan shall be developed during project design to ensure that drainage is properly conveyed from the study area and does not induce ponding on adjacent properties.

WQ3: A dewatering permit shall be required if groundwater is encountered during tunneling operations. If contaminated groundwater is encountered during construction, the contractor shall stop work in the vicinity of the suspect find, cordon off the area, and contact the appropriate hazardous waste coordinator and maintenance hazardous spill coordinator at Metro and immediately notify the Certified Unified Program Agencies (City of Los Angeles Fire Department, County of Los Angeles Fire Department, and Los Angeles RWQCB) responsible for hazardous materials or waste incidents. Coordination with the Los Angeles RWQCB shall be initiated immediately to develop an investigation plan and remediation plan for expedited protection of public health and environment. Contaminated groundwater is prohibited from being discharged to the storm drain system. The contractor shall properly treat or dispose of hazardous or toxic materials, according to local, state, and federal regulations. Potential treatment methods include, but are not limited to, extraction, treatment and reinjection, bioremediation, recirculating wall technology, deep well treatment, vapor extraction, and natural attenuation.

WQ4: The study area currently drains indirectly to Ballona Creek and Dominguez Creek through the MS4. Treatment control BMPs shall be incorporated into the project design. The project shall consider placing the treatment BMPs in series or in a complimentary system to increase the control of pollutants to the maximum extent practicable. The systems shall be designed to efficiently and effectively handle and treat dry and wet weather flows to the maximum extent practicable. A SUSMP and appropriate drainage control plan shall be implemented to select and place appropriate permanent treatment BMPs.

WQ5: During construction of the Project, on-site integrated management strategies that employ green infrastructure strategies to capture runoff and remove pollutants shall be implemented to the extent feasible and cost effective. Green infrastructure strategies include, but are not limited to, a variety of physical, chemical, and biological processes that focus on conveying runoff to bioretention areas, swales, or vegetated open spaces.

Historic, Archaeological, and Paleontological Resources

The area of potential effects (APE) for the preferred maintenance site alternative was delineated to ensure inclusion of significant cultural resources that may be directly or indirectly affected by the project, and are listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) or the California Register. The direct APE for the preferred maintenance site alternative includes areas of direct ground disturbance, as well as areas with permanent site improvements and areas for staging and temporary construction activities.

There are no properties that are eligible for the California Register within the APE for the maintenance facility. The construction and operation of a maintenance facility is not anticipated to disturb or alter any archaeological, historical, or paleontological resources. Therefore, less-than-significant impacts are anticipated for the preferred maintenance site alternative.

Impacts

Discovery of unknown archaeological or paleontological resources is possible during excavation activities. With implementation of mitigation, no adverse effects are anticipated.

Reference: Final EIS/EIR Chapter 5.12, Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences of the Maintenance Facility; Final EIS/EIR Executive Summary, Table ES.5. Mitigation Measures for the LPA.; Attachment A: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to Ensure Fulfillment of All Environmental and Related Commitments in the FEIS, Crenshaw / LAX Transit Corridor Project, September / October 2011. 4.15.2.13 of Final Environmental Impact Statement/ Final Environmental Impact Report 4.0 – Affected Environment/Environmental Consequences of the Alignment and Stations, August 2011.

Mitigation Measure

CR2: Paleontological monitoring:

- A qualified paleontologist shall produce a Paleontological Monitoring and Mitigation Plan (PMMP) for the proposed project and supervise monitoring of construction excavations. Paleontological resource monitoring shall include inspection of exposed rock units during active excavations within sensitive geologic sediments. The monitor shall have authority to temporarily divert grading away from exposed fossils to professionally and efficiently recover the fossil specimens and collect associated data. All efforts to avoid delays in project schedules shall be made.
- All project-related ground disturbances that could potentially affect previously undisturbed Quaternary older alluvial deposits shall be monitored by a qualified paleontological monitor under the supervision of a qualified paleontologist on a full-time basis because these geologic units are determined to have a high

paleontological sensitivity. Very shallow surficial excavations (less than 5 feet) within areas of previous disturbance or areas mapped as Quaternary younger alluvial deposits or Artificial fill shall be monitored on a part-time basis to ensure that underlying sensitive units (i.e. older alluvium) are not adversely affected. The location of subsurface sensitive sediments shall be determined by the qualified paleontologist upon review of project grading plans.

- Paleontological monitors shall be equipped with the necessary tools for the rapid removal of fossils and retrieval of associated data to prevent construction delays. This equipment shall include handheld global positioning system (GPS) receivers, digital cameras and cell phones as well as a tool kit containing specimen containers and matrix sampling bags, field labels, field tools (awls, hammers, chisels, shovels, etc.) and plaster kits. At each fossil locality, field data forms shall be used to record pertinent geologic data, stratigraphic sections shall be measured, and appropriate sediment samples shall be collected and submitted for analysis.
- Any collected fossils shall be transported to a paleontological laboratory for processing where they will be prepared to the point of curation, identified by qualified experts, listed in a database to facilitate analysis and repositied in a designated paleontological curation facility (such as the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County).
- The qualified paleontologist shall prepare a final monitoring and mitigation report to be filed, at a minimum with Metro and the repository. The final report shall include, but not be limited to, a discussion of the results of the mitigation and monitoring program, an evaluation and analysis of the fossils collected (including an assessment of their significance, age and geologic context), an itemized inventory of fossils collected, a confidential appendix of locality and specimen data with locality maps and photographs, an appendix of curation agreements and other appropriate communications, and a copy of the project-specific paleontological monitoring and mitigation plan.

Safety and Security

The preferred maintenance site alternative would be located within a city block with multiple and separate access points for motor vehicles and light rail trains. A sheriff/security facility would provide adequate security for the maintenance yard. The preferred maintenance site alternative would not create the potential for adverse safety conditions by limiting the provision of police, fire, or emergency services. The preferred maintenance site alternative would have a less-than-significant impact on safety and security.

Construction would involve excavation, and on-site construction equipment which would pose a temporary safety threat to traffic and pedestrians. Concrete barriers with fencing would be placed around the perimeter of the site to restrict access and eliminate the threat to safety and security of anyone not directly involved in construction activity. Construction sites located near schools may pose an additional risk to students who

pass by on their way to or from school. It is assumed that all additional related activity would be implemented in accordance with all Federal and State requirements and permits during the construction process.

Impacts

No impact; mitigation from construction and operation of the entire project are included to ensure impacts remain less than adverse.

Reference: Final EIS/EIR Chapter 5.15, Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences of the Maintenance Facility; Final EIS/EIR Executive Summary, Table ES.5. Mitigation Measures for the LPA.; Attachment A: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to Ensure Fulfillment of All Environmental and Related Commitments in the FEIS, Crenshaw / LAX Transit Corridor Project, September / October 2011. 4.15.2.16 of Final Environmental Impact Statement/ Final Environmental Impact Report 4.0 – Affected Environment/Environmental Consequences of the Alignment and Stations, August 2011.

Mitigation Measure

SS1: All stations and parking facilities shall be equipped with monitoring equipment and/or be monitored by Metro security personnel on a regular basis.

SS2: Metro shall implement a security plan for LRT operations that shall include both in-car and station surveillance by Metro security or other local jurisdiction security personnel and establish well lit pedestrian station and parking areas that minimize shadows and provide visibility for security personnel to monitor activity.

SS3: All stations shall be lit to a standard of no less than two footcandles to minimize shadows and ensure that all pedestrian pathways leading to / from sidewalks and parking facilities shall be well illuminated.

SS4: Metro shall coordinate and consult with the LAPD, the LA County Sheriff's Department, the Inglewood Police Department, and the LAX Police to develop safety and security plans for the alignment, parking facilities, and station areas which satisfy the requirements necessary for the appropriate policing jurisdiction to effectively patrol the area.

SS5: The station design shall be undertaken to avoid obstructions to visibility or observation and discrete locations favorable to crime; pedestrian access to at-grade, below-grade, and above-grade station entrances / exits shall be accessible at ground-level with clear sight lines.

SS6: Metro shall implement appropriate measures to ensure pedestrian crossing safety at all locations with adjacent schools, churches, and high pedestrian areas to satisfy the requirements determined by the CPUC.

SS7: Metro shall conduct a Hazard Analysis that establishes a design basis for warning devices that satisfies the requirements set forth by the California Public Utilities Commission.

SS9: To discourage crossing the alignment and enhance safety, such as near the Faithful Central Bible Church, Metro shall provide fencing along either side of the alignment, between the parking lot and church buildings and provide pedestrian safety devices at designated crossings.

Transportation & Traffic

Project Trip Generation, Congestion Management Program traffic impact analysis

The proposed maintenance facility is not expected to add more than 50 vehicles per hour (vph) at either of the two closest congestion management program (CMP) monitoring intersections at Manchester Avenue / Sepulveda Boulevard and Manchester Avenue / La Brea Avenue during the morning or afternoon peak hours. As a result, no further CMP arterial monitoring analysis is required. Based on the incremental project trip generation estimates and the project trip assignment, the proposed project would not add sufficient new traffic to exceed the freeway analysis criteria at these locations. Because incremental project-related traffic in any direction during either weekday peak hour is projected to be below the minimum criterion of 150 vph, no further CMP freeway analysis is required. Therefore, no adverse effects on CMP arterials and freeways would occur for the preferred maintenance site alternative.

Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities

The area surrounding the preferred maintenance site alternative are located in industrial areas and are not in close proximity to any activity centers, such as commercial/retail or entertainment centers. The area surrounding the preferred maintenance site alternative does not contain any designated bicycle lanes or high levels of pedestrian activity. Therefore, no adverse effects to pedestrian and bicycle facilities would occur for the preferred maintenance site alternative.

Construction Impacts to Transportation & Traffic

It is anticipated that all LRT-related construction would result in temporary adverse effects to traffic at all locations. In the Harbor Subdivision between Arbor Vitae Street and Hindry Avenue and Oak Street and Inglewood Avenue, there are nine grade crossing locations. Construction of the LRT would require intermittent off-peak lane reductions and closures of these crossings for 6 to 18 months and cause traffic to divert to other locations. Commercial traffic diversion would primarily be affected by the closures at Arbor Vitae Street, Manchester Avenue, and Hindry Avenue. Limited on-street parking is available at both Manchester Avenue and Hindry Avenue. Construction of the grade crossings would likely result in the temporary loss of on-street parking adjacent to these crossings for 6 to 18 months. Some parking may also be lost as a

result of construction. However, the most adverse impact is the disruption of normal business operations as a result of intermittent site access.

Impacts

Disruption from cut-and-cover construction activities would be more extensive, the duration of reduced number of roadway travel lanes, road closures, traffic diversion, and modified access to business properties, and loss of on-street parking would be greater. These effects would further decrease business visibility and access to businesses by suppliers and customers, and would result in an adverse effect on corridor businesses and commercial property owners. Even with implementation of all applicable traffic and transportation related mitigation measures, temporary impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Reference: Final EIS/EIR Chapter 5.1, Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences of the Maintenance Facility; Final EIS/EIR Executive Summary, Table ES.5. Mitigation Measures for the LPA.; Attachment A: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to Ensure Fulfillment of All Environmental and Related Commitments in the FEIS, Crenshaw / LAX Transit Corridor Project, September / October 2011. Chapter 3 – Transportation Impacts of the Alignment and Stations, Final EIS/EIR Crenshaw / LAX Transit Corridor Project, August 2011

Mitigation Measure

T1: Metro shall coordinate with the local jurisdictions to designate and identify haul routes for trucks and to establish hours of operation. The selected routes should minimize noise, vibration, and other impacts.

T2: Metro shall prepare a traffic management plan to facilitate the flow of traffic in and around the construction zone. This traffic management plan shall identify a community liaison and shall include the following measures:

- Schedule as much of construction – related travel as possible (i.e., deliveries, hauling, and worker trips) during the off-peak hours;
- Develop detour routes to facilitate traffic movement through construction zones without significantly increasing cut-through traffic in adjacent residential areas;
- Where feasible, temporarily re-stripe roadway to maximize the vehicular capacity at those locations affected by construction closures;
- Where feasible, temporarily remove on-street parking to maximize the vehicular capacity at those locations affected by construction closures;
- Where feasible, traffic control officers should be at major intersections during peak hours to minimize delays related to construction activities;
- Develop and implement an outreach program to inform the general public about the construction process and planned roadway closures;
- Develop and implement a program with business owners to minimize impacts to businesses during construction activity, including but not limited, to signage programs.

T4: Metro shall coordinate with local school districts to disclose potential impacts to school bus routes.

T5: Project contractors shall provide alternate off-street parking for their employees during the construction period, in order to minimize the loss of parking to adjacent commercial districts.

T6: Project contractors shall prohibit parking for their employees in adjacent residential neighborhoods, in order to minimize the impacts to nearby residents.

Construction – Visual and Aesthetics

During construction of the LPA, the project area's visual quality may be altered from the start of the Crenshaw/Exposition Station to the Aviation/Century Station where the alignment ends. The coordination of construction scheduling for the covered trench adjacent to the LAX south runways would be facilitated by night-time construction windows, when the airport operates in an over-ocean operation. That is when planes land and takeoff to the west. Planes landing and taking off to the west would not be affected by any nighttime lighting used during construction. An adverse impact from glare may occur to approaching planes at night when planes are not operating in the over-ocean operation (approximately twilight-midnight) without mitigation (CON3). Construction of the alignment would be interrupted if construction lighting conflicts with the runway approach lighting directing aircraft into LAX.

Multi-family residences and motels are located along Crenshaw Boulevard, while single-family residences are located along La Colina Drive. The stockpiling of dirt and materials, although covered, would be visible to these residential and other sensitive uses located adjacent to Crenshaw Boulevard and the Harbor Subdivision. The placement of concrete barriers with fencing would be visible along the perimeter of construction areas. Mature vegetation, including trees, would be removed from some areas. Temporary lighting may be necessary for nighttime construction of certain project elements or in existing highway rights-of-way (to minimize disruption to daytime traffic). This temporary lighting may potentially affect residential areas by exposing residents to glare from unshielded light sources or by increasing ambient nighttime light levels. Therefore, potentially adverse effects are anticipated.

Impacts

Temporary construction lighting may potentially affect residential areas by exposing residents to glare from unshielded light sources or by increasing ambient nighttime light levels. With implementation of mitigation, no adverse effects would occur.

Visual quality may be altered from the stockpiling of materials at construction staging areas. With implementation of mitigation, no adverse effects would occur.

Reference: Final EIS/EIR Chapter 5.5, Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences of the Maintenance Facility; Final EIS/EIR Executive Summary, Table ES.5. Mitigation Measures for the LPA.; Attachment A: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to Ensure Fulfillment of All Environmental and Related Commitments in the FEIS, Crenshaw / LAX Transit Corridor Project, September / October 2011. 4.15.2.6 of Final Environmental Impact Statement/ Final Environmental Impact Report 4.0 – Affected Environment/Environmental Consequences of the Alignment and Stations, August 2011.

Mitigation Measure

CON1: Visually obtrusive erosion control devices, such as silt fences, plastic ground cover, and straw bales shall be removed as soon as the area is stabilized.

CON2: Stockpile areas should be located in less visibly sensitive areas and, whenever possible, not be visible from the road or to residents and businesses.

CON3: During nighttime construction activities, lighting shall be aimed downward and away from residential and other sensitive uses adjacent to the alignment and stations.

Air Quality

Localized Operational Concentrations

Direct Impacts

The operation of a maintenance facility would not be a substantial source of on-site criteria pollutant emissions. Off-site criteria pollutant emissions would result from truck trips and employee commute trips. Substantial particulate matter emissions would be generated by truck trips and not employee trips. Operation of the maintenance facility would result in approximately seven truck trips per day. Seven trips would not generate enough emissions to adversely affect localized particulate matter concentrations.

None of the analyzed intersections under each alternative would exceed the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) screening thresholds for carbon monoxide (CO) concentrations. In addition, the project is listed in a conforming Regional Transportation Plan. A detailed localized CO analysis is not necessary. Localized CO concentrations would not exceed federal standards. Therefore, the operation of the maintenance facility would not result in an adverse impact related to localized CO concentrations for the preferred maintenance site alternative.

Indirect Impacts

No indirect impacts related to localized concentrations are anticipated to result from the operation of the maintenance facility.

Toxic Air Contaminants

Direct Impacts

The greatest source of transit-related toxic air contaminant emissions is diesel vehicles. The maintenance facility would service electrically powered LRT vehicles and would result in approximately seven truck trips per day. Therefore, the proposed project would not generate substantial particulate matter or mobile source air toxic emissions. Therefore, operation of the maintenance facility would not result in an adverse impact related to toxic air contaminants for the preferred site alternative.

Indirect Impacts

No indirect impacts related to toxic air contaminants are anticipated to result from the operation of the maintenance facility.

Odors

Direct Impacts

The project would not include any land use or activity that typically generates adverse odors. Therefore, the operation of the maintenance facility would not result in an adverse impact related to odors.

Indirect Impacts

No indirect impacts related to odors are anticipated to result from the operation of the maintenance facility.

Global Warming and Greenhouse Gases

Direct Impacts

Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions were estimated for construction and operational activity. Construction activity would generate 1,754 metric tons per year of GHG emissions for up to two years. Operational activity would generate a maximum of 4,529 metric tons per year of GHG emissions, including 2,755 metric tons per year from electricity use. The SCAQMD recommends that construction emissions be annualized over a 30-year project lifetime to estimate total project emissions. Therefore, the maintenance facility would generate a maximum of 4,587 metric tons per year of GHG emissions. The 4,587 metric tons per year of GHG emissions generated by the maintenance facility would not exceed the 10,000 metric tons per year threshold. Therefore, the preferred maintenance site alternative would not result in an adverse impact related to GHG emissions.

Indirect Impacts

No indirect impacts related to GHG emissions and climate change are anticipated to result from the preferred maintenance site alternative.

Transportation Conformity

Project level conformity is demonstrated by showing that it will not cause localized exceedances of CO, particulate matter (both 2.5 and 10 microns respectively) (PM_{2.5}), and/or PM₁₀ standards. Based on the analysis contained in the Localized Operational Concentrations analysis, the preferred maintenance site alternative would not result in a CO hotspot associated with on-road vehicles (i.e., employee vehicles and truck trips).

The maintenance facility would service electrically-powered light railcars. These vehicles would not be a substantial source of particulate emissions. In addition, similar to the on-road analysis, employee vehicles and truck trips would not generate substantial localized emissions at the facility. The maintenance facility would not result in a PM₁₀ or PM_{2.5} hotspot. The operation of the maintenance facility would be consistent with project-level conformity guidance.

Temporary Construction Impacts

Construction of the LPA would generate pollutant emissions from the following activities: 1) demolition, 2) grading, 3) mobile emissions related to construction workers traveling to and from construction areas, 4) mobile emissions related to the delivery and hauling of construction supplies and debris to and from construction sites, and 5) stationary emissions related to fuel consumption by on-site construction equipment. The SCAQMD significance thresholds are in pounds per day. As such, emissions have been estimated using an analysis of worst-case daily emissions. Detailed construction information was not available at the time of analysis. The emissions were based on broad, conservative, and reasonable construction activities. It was assumed that construction activities, would result in the simultaneous operation of 20 pieces of heavy-duty equipment per day, 200 heavy-duty truck roundtrips per day, and disturb 4,000 cubic yards of soil per day. The LPA would generate fugitive dust and equipment emissions from excavation activity and NO_x emissions associated with the transport of excavated material.

Construction-related air quality impacts would be temporary; with the implementation of mitigation measures, no substantial adverse construction effects are anticipated.

Impacts

Impacts associated with operational air quality would not be adverse. Construction of the LPA would generate fugitive dust and equipment emissions from excavation activity and NO_x emissions associated with the transport of excavated material. Regional construction emissions would exceed the NO_x significance threshold and localized emissions would exceed the NO_x, PM_{2.5}, and PM₁₀ significance thresholds.

Reference: Final EIS/EIR Chapter 5.6, Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences of the Maintenance Facility; Final EIS/EIR Executive Summary, Table ES.5. Mitigation Measures for the LPA.; Attachment A: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to Ensure Fulfillment of All Environmental and Related Commitments in the FEIS, Crenshaw / LAX Transit Corridor Project, September / October 2011. 4.15.2.7 of Final Environmental Impact Statement/ Final Environmental Impact Report 4.0 – Affected Environment/Environmental Consequences of the Alignment and Stations, August 2011

Mitigation Measure

CON4: Water or a stabilizing agent shall be applied to exposed surfaces in sufficient quantity to prevent generation of dust plumes.

CON5: Track-out shall not extend 25 feet or more from an active operation and track-out shall be removed at the conclusion of each workday.

CON6: Contractors shall be required to utilize at least one of the measures set forth in South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 403 section (d)(5) to remove bulk material from tires and vehicle undercarriages before vehicles exit the project site.

CON7: All haul trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials shall maintain at least 6 inches of freeboard in accordance with California Vehicle Code Section 23114.

CON8: All haul trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials shall be covered (e.g., with tarps or other enclosures that would reduce fugitive dust emissions).

CON9: Traffic speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.

CON10: Operations on unpaved surfaces shall be suspended when winds exceed 25 mph.

CON11: Heavy equipment operations shall be suspended during first and second stage smog alerts.

CON12: On-site stockpiles of debris or rusty materials shall be covered at all times when not being used. On-site stockpiles of dirt shall be watered at least two times per day or covered at all times when not being used.

CON13: Contractors shall maintain equipment and vehicle engines in good condition and in proper tune per manufacturer's specifications.

CON14: Contractors shall utilize electricity from power poles rather than temporary diesel or gasoline generators, as feasible.

CON15: Heavy-duty trucks shall be prohibited from idling in excess of five minutes, both on- and off-site.

CON16: Construction parking shall be configured to minimize traffic interference.

CON17: Construction activity that affects traffic flow on the arterial system shall be limited to off-peak hours, as feasible.

CON18: Construction staging and vehicle parking, including workers' vehicles, shall be prohibited on streets adjacent to sensitive receptors such as schools, daycare centers, senior facilities, and hospitals.

CON19: The construction process shall utilize an on-site rock crushing facility with water control to suppress dust, when feasible.

CON20: Portable generators shall be low-emitting and use ultra low sulfur diesel (<15 parts per million) or gasoline.

CON21: Construction equipment shall use a combination of low sulfur diesel (<15 parts per million) and exhaust emission controls.

CON22: The construction process shall use equipment having the minimum practical engine size (i.e., lowest appropriate horsepower rating for the intended job).

CON23: Contractors shall be prohibited from tampering with construction equipment to increase horsepower or defeat emission control devices.

CON24: Metro shall designate a person to ensure the implementation of air quality mitigation measures through direct inspections, records reviews, and complaint investigations.

Noise and Vibration

Operational Noise and Vibration

The majority of noise sources would be located within the maintenance and storage facility buildings. The main building would house the wheel truing machine, and the service and inspection area. Additional sources of noise include safety alarms for heavy equipment, such as hoists and cranes. The blow down/exterior cleaning building would house the car wash. The painting shop/body repair shop would house the paint compressors and the body repair work equipment. If openings are necessary, building shell and openings would be designed and oriented to control noise at nearby noise sensitive land uses. The remaining exterior noise sources at the maintenance and storage facility include outdoor inspections (e.g., train horn tests), special track work (e.g., noise generated from wheel contact with rail), and crossovers and switches.

Based on the FTA *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment* (May 2006), it was estimated that maintenance facility light rail activity would generate a vibration level of 67.0 VdB at 40 feet. The nearest sensitive receptor would be 275 feet east of the maintenance facility site, and would experience a vibration level of 49.9VdB. This would be less than the most stringent threshold of 65 VdB. Therefore, the preferred maintenance site alternative would result in a less-than-significant impact related to operational vibration. No indirect impacts related to operational vibration are anticipated to result from the preferred maintenance site alternative.

Temporary Construction Noise and Vibration Impacts

Noise from removal of existing track and construction of the right-of-way along the Harbor Subdivision Railroad between Crenshaw Boulevard and Century Boulevard,

would be generated by heavy equipment. It is anticipated that the average construction noise level from combined operations would be 89 dBA L_{eq} . Construction activity would occur as close as 50 feet from existing structures along the alignment. Construction noise levels at these receptors will vary based on distance. For example, construction noise would be approximately 89 dBA L_{eq} at 50 feet, 83 dBA L_{eq} at 100 feet, and 77 dBA L_{eq} at 200 feet. These noise levels would continue to dissipate by 6 dBA every doubling of distance. Construction noise levels will vary greatly depending on the construction activity. For example, activity occurring in a trench would result in lower noise levels than at-grade activity because the trench would block noise waves from reaching the receptors. Construction noise levels would exceed existing ambient noise levels by at least 5 dBA at nearby land uses. These noise levels, while temporary, are anticipated to be adverse.

Potential effects of construction vibration would result in annoyance to nearby occupied buildings. Common vibration-producing equipment used during at-grade construction activities include: jackhammers, pavement breakers, auger drills, bulldozers, and backhoes. Pavement breaking and soil compaction would produce the highest levels of vibration. Potential effects of construction vibration would result in annoyance to nearby occupied buildings. These estimated vibration levels would be similar to the construction methods and means used for the LPA, MOSs, and design options. Construction-related vibration impacts would be temporary, but would result in a significant impact. With the implementation of mitigation measures, no substantial adverse construction effects are anticipated.

Impacts

No direct or indirect operational noise and vibration impacts are anticipated from the preferred maintenance site. Construction-generated noise levels may potentially result in adverse short-term effects. Potential effects of construction vibration would result in annoyance to nearby occupied buildings. The vibration levels expected from construction equipment associated with this project is not anticipated to result in either architectural or structural damage to nearby buildings. With implementation of mitigation, no adverse effects would occur.

Construction activity would exceed the 5-dBA significance threshold at multiple sensitive receptors for the maintenance facility.

Reference: Final EIS/EIR Chapter 5.7, Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences of the Maintenance Facility; Final EIS/EIR Executive Summary, Table ES.5. Mitigation Measures for the LPA.; Attachment A: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to Ensure Fulfillment of All Environmental and Related Commitments in the FEIS, Crenshaw / LAX Transit Corridor Project, September / October 2011. 4.15.2.8 of Final Environmental Impact Statement/ Final Environmental Impact Report 4.0 – Affected Environment/Environmental Consequences of the Alignment and Stations, August 2011

Mitigation Measure

CON25: The construction contractor shall develop a Noise and Vibration Control Plan demonstrating how to achieve the more restrictive of the Metro Design Criteria noise limits and the noise limits of the city noise control ordinance. The Plan should also show how to achieve FTA vibration limits. The plan shall include measurements of existing conditions, a list of the major pieces of construction equipment that will be used, and predictions of the noise and vibration levels at the closest noise-sensitive receptors (residences, hotels, schools, churches, temples, and similar facilities). The Noise and Vibration Control Plan will need to be approved by Metro prior to initiating construction. Where the construction cannot be performed in accordance with the requirements of Metro, the contractor shall investigate alternative construction measures that would result in lower noise and vibration levels. The contractor shall conduct monitoring to demonstrate compliance with contract noise limits. In addition, the contractor shall coordinate with the View Park Preparatory Accelerated and St. John the Evangelist School administrators to avoid disruptive activities during school hours.

CON26: The construction contractor shall utilize a combination of the following options of best management practices for noise abatement to comply with the Metro Design Criteria:

- The contractor shall utilize specialty equipment equipped with enclosed engines and/or high-performance mufflers as commercially available.
- The contractor shall locate equipment and staging areas as far from noise-sensitive receptors as possible.
- The contractor shall limit unnecessary idling of equipment.
- The contractor shall install temporary noise barriers as determined by the Noise Control Plan.
- The contractor shall reroute construction-related truck traffic away from residential streets to the extent permitted by the relevant municipality.
- The contractor shall avoid impact pile driving near noise-sensitive receptors (residences, hotels, schools, churches, temples, and similar facilities where possible. Where geological conditions permit their use, drilled piles or a vibratory pile driver is generally quieter.

S-CON24: Noise barriers (e.g. sound attenuation blankets or solid walls) shall be placed such that the line-of-sight is blocked between sensitive receptors (e.g., residential and institutional land uses) and the project site, as feasible.

S-CON-25: During the early stages of construction plan development, natural and artificial barriers, such as ground elevation changes and existing buildings, shall be considered for use as shielding against construction noise.

S-CON-26: The contractor shall comply with Standard Specification 1565, FTA noise criteria and all local sound control and noise level rules, regulations and ordinances that apply to any work performed pursuant to the contract. Each internal combustion engine

used for any purpose on the job or related to the job shall be equipped with a muffler of a type recommended by the manufacturer. No internal combustion engine shall be operated without a muffler.

S-CON-27: Grading and construction contractors shall use quieter equipment as opposed to noisier equipment (such as rubber-tired equipment rather than metal-tracked equipment) as much as possible.

S-CON-28: The contractor shall submit a noise plan for construction activity associated with the preferred maintenance site alternative. The plan shall be prepared by a qualified acoustical engineer and shall be approved by the resident engineer before construction is initiated. The noise control plan shall include an inventory of the equipment, the estimated noise level at 50 feet for each major piece of equipment, calculations of the noise levels at impacted sensitive receptors, and noise reduction measures for sensitive receptor locations where the predicted noise levels exceed the ambient noise level by 5 dBA. Impacted receptors include, but may not be limited to, residences to the west of the preferred maintenance site alternative.

Construction – Economic and Fiscal

No significant impacts are anticipated during the construction and buildout of the Maintenance Facility site. Temporary inconveniences such as the disruption to the flow of customers, employees, materials and supplies to and from corridor businesses may occur; as such, the appropriate mitigation measures listed below will be implemented to minimize impacts.

Impacts

Disruption from cut-and-cover construction activities would be more extensive, the duration of reduced number of roadway travel lanes, road closures, traffic diversion, and modified access to business properties, and loss of on-street parking would be greater. These effects would further decrease business visibility and access to businesses by suppliers and customers, and would result in an adverse effect on corridor businesses and commercial property owners. With implementation of mitigation, no adverse effects would occur.

Reference: Final EIS/EIR Executive Summary, Table ES.5. Mitigation Measures for the LPA.; Attachment A: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to Ensure Fulfillment of All Environmental and Related Commitments in the FEIS, Crenshaw / LAX Transit Corridor Project, September / October 2011.

Mitigation Measure

CON28: Nearby business owners and commercial property owners shall be notified of the schedule for specific planned construction activities, changes in traffic flow, and required short-term modifications to property access.

CON29: General notices shall be provided to local government, transit agencies, major institutions, and other organizations of the schedule for planned construction activities.

CON30: Methods shall be developed by which business owners can convey their concerns about construction activities and the effectiveness of mitigation measures during the construction period so activities can be modified to reduce adverse effects.

CON31: Advance notice shall be provided to affected property owners if utilities would be disrupted for short periods of time and scheduled major utility shut-offs during low-use periods of the day.

CON33: Public information campaigns shall be conducted to encourage patronage of corridor businesses during the construction period.

CON34: Metro shall make provisions for temporary signage and advertising during construction to maintain access for residents and help businesses that are partially blocked or that have inconvenient access due to construction activity. Where there is a significant limited English proficiency population, signage shall be provided in various languages (as appropriate).

If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact Billy Ho of my staff at (213) 485-5745.

MEM/bh