# *4.0 OTHER FEDERAL ENVIRONMENTAL REQUIREMENTS AND CEQA CONSIDERATIONS*

## 4.1 INTRODUCTION

This section provides an overview of pertinent Federal and State requirements, associated with implementation of the Mid-City/Westside Transit Project. Federal requirements include: 1) Executive Orders pertaining to Floodplains, Wetlands, Endangered Species, and Environmental Justice; 2) the National Historic Preservation Act; and 3) Section 4(f) requirements associated with Federal parklands. CEQA requirements pertain to the long-term implications of implementing a transit system project, including: 1) Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts; 2) Cumulative Impacts; 3) Growth-Inducing; and 4) Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes.

## 4.2 LONG-TERM IMPLICATIONS

### 4.2.1 Significant Environmental Effects Which Cannot Be Avoided if the Proposed Project is Implemented

According to the Section 15126.2(b) of the CEQA Guidelines:

> Significant Environmental Effects Which Cannot Be Avoided if the Proposed Project is Implemented. Describe any significant impacts, including those, which can be mitigated but not reduced to a level of insignificance. Where there are impacts that cannot be alleviated without imposing an alternative design, their implications and the reasons why the project is being proposed, notwithstanding their effect, should be described.

Environmental impacts associated with implementation of a project may not always be mitigated to a level that is considered less than significant (either through the imposition of project-specific mitigation measures or through the imposition of an alternative project design). In such cases, a Statement of Overriding Considerations must be prepared prior to approval of the project, in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Sections 15091 and 15093. Because implementation of the proposed project would create several significant, unavoidable impacts, a Statement of Overriding Considerations is required to describe the specific reasons for approving the project, based on information contained within the Final EIR/EIS, as well as any other information in the public record. The significant unavoidable impacts (either project-specific or cumulative) that would result from project implementation are summarized in the Executive Summary. A detailed discussion of each of these impacts can be found in Chapter 3.0 (Environmental Analysis).

### 4.2.2 Summary of Significant Cumulative Impacts

Although most temporary short-term construction impacts and most long-term operational impacts associated with the proposed alternatives could be mitigated to acceptable levels, construction of the proposed project in conjunction with future development surrounding the corridors could result in adverse cumulative impacts which could not be completely avoided or mitigated. Potential cumulative environmental impacts associated with the proposed alternatives include:

- Additional traffic on local arterial and collector streets near proposed stations;

- An increase in ground-borne noise and vibration; and
- Increased impacts to air quality.

Future traffic projections have been based on traffic growth rates provided by the Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) and Southern California Association of Government (SCAG). Construction and operation of the alternatives will involve localized traffic congestion in the station areas, although overall traffic volumes would be expected to decrease in the Study Area due to the expected increase in public transit patrons. Localized parking impacts would likely occur, however, overall parking supply in the Study Area is expected to increase since an increase in transit service and ridership should serve to support a reduction in overall traffic volumes and result in a correlated increase in available parking. Therefore, no cumulative long-term impacts to traffic or parking are expected as a result of the proposed alternatives.

Ambient measurements were taken for the noise and vibration analysis presented in the EIS/EIR. The cumulative impacts of noise and vibration within the corridor area will be the total noise and vibration resulting from all sources in future years. The overall impact of the alternatives on the surrounding area noise levels is negligible when compared to overall existing ambient noise levels. Because it requires a 100 percent increase in traffic volume to make a noticeable increase in noise, the anticipated increase in noise levels from this growth would be negligible.

Projected future emission rates from the California Air Resources Board and future traffic levels based on LADOT and SCAG growth rates were used in the air quality analysis. The regional air quality analysis demonstrates a net cumulative benefit to the region's ambient air quality resulting from increased public transit use. The anticipated reduction in automobile use due to the increase in transit use is considered beneficial to ambient air quality. Therefore, the project contributes to the expeditious implementation of the adopted Air Quality Management Plan.

### 4.2.3 Growth-Inducing Impacts

This section discusses the ways in which the proposed project could foster economic or population growth, either directly or indirectly, including, but not limited to, the removal of obstacles to population growth or the construction of additional housing. Generally, growth-inducing projects are located in isolated, undeveloped, or underdeveloped areas, necessitating the extension of major infrastructure (e.g., sewer and water facilities, roadways, etc.) or are those that could encourage "premature" or unplanned growth (i.e., "leap-frog" development). Although development of the project supports urban growth, it is important to note that the proposed transit alternatives will not remove an obstacle to population growth since the corridors travel areas that are entirely urbanized. Rather, the project will accommodate and serve residents and visitors to the City and will provide an increased level of public transit service that is consistent with local and regional growth projections. Although supporting new and existing residents, the project will not foster new growth beyond that projected for the area and will not exceed the capacities of existing and proposed infrastructure and governmental services.

Development of any "build" alternative would generate relatively short-term, construction-related employment opportunities. However, the construction phases of any project would require a limited labor force due to the relatively short-term nature of construction employment. Given the ample supply of construction workers in the regional work force, which is the area from which construction workers would be drawn, the proposed project would not be considered growth-inducing from a short-term employment perspective.

The long-term employment opportunities created by the proposed project would also be limited, since both corridors are currently served by public transportation and an increased level of service will only provide a slight increase in employment. Furthermore, opportunities are generally low-paying, and not considered growth-inducing from an employment perspective. Rather, a majority of the positions generated would be filled by the local labor force. Management positions, if any, may involve recruitment procedures with a target area that is larger than the local region. This could induce a limited number of newcomers to the area. However, this number is expected to be low, and not result in any adverse growth inducing impacts.

### 4.2.4 Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitment of Resources

Section 15126.2(c) of the State CEQA Guidelines requires a discussion of any significant irreversible environmental changes which would be caused by the proposed project should it be implemented. Specifically, the State CEQA Guidelines state that:

> Use of nonrenewable resources during the initial and continued phases of the project may be irreversible since a large commitment of such resources makes removal or nonuse thereafter unlikely. Primary impacts, and particularly, secondary impacts generally commit future generations to similar uses. Also, irreversible damage can result from environmental accidents associated with project construction and operation.

The construction and implementation of the proposed project would entail the irreversible and irretrievable commitment of energy and human resources; however, this commitment of energy, personnel, and building materials would be commensurate with that of other projects of similar magnitude. Labor would also be committed for the planning, design, construction, and operation phases of the project.

Construction of the proposed project would require the commitment of a variety of non-renewable or slowly renewable natural resources. Energy (in the form of fossil fuels) and construction materials (such as lumber, sand and gravel, metals, and water) would be irretrievably committed for construction of the proposed project. However, there could be some offset of the loss of energy resources. Demolition debris could be recycled for other uses; for example inert construction debris (e.g., concrete and asphalt) may be crushed and used for road base or for reinforcing levees.

On-going maintenance of the project will entail a further commitment of energy resources in the form of petroleum products (diesel fuel and gasoline), natural gas, and electricity. This commitment of energy resources would be a long-term obligation because, practically speaking, it is impossible to return the land to its original condition once it has been developed. However, as established in Section 3.13, the impacts of increased energy usage are not considered significant adverse environmental impacts.

In summary, implementation of the proposed project would involve the following irreversible environmental changes to existing natural resources:

- Commitment of natural resources during project construction, including the consumption of fossil fuels and the use of materials in construction (such as steel, concrete, asphalt, and plastics).
- Commitment of energy and water resources as a result of the operation and maintenance of the proposed transit corridors.

## 4.3 IMPACTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT

The impacts associated with the proposed project that are less than significant or can be reduced to a level of insignificance through mitigation are discussed in detail in the appropriate issue area sections of Chapter 3.0 (Environmental Analysis) of this EIR/EIS, and are summarized in the Executive Summary.

## 4.4 EXECUTIVE ORDER PERTAINING TO FLOODPLAINS

Executive Order 11988 (Floodplain Management) links the need to protect lives and property with the need to restore and preserve natural and beneficial floodplain values. Specifically, Federal agencies are directed to avoid conducting, allowing, or supporting actions on the base floodplain unless the agency finds that the base floodplain is the only practicable alternative location. Similarly, Department of Transportation (DOT) Order 5650.2, which implements Executive Order 11988 (Floodplain Management) and was issued pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, and the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973, prescribes policies and procedures for ensuring that proper consideration is give to the avoidance and mitigation of adverse floodplain impacts in agency actions, planning programs, and budget requests.

### *Impacts*

Each of the project alternatives traverse limited portions of flood hazard areas, which are defined as the 100-year or 500-year floodplain. However, none of the alternatives travel though naturally-occurring floodplains, such as rivers, streams, or alluvial floodplains; instead, the alternatives would be implemented within the limits of existing roadway rights-of-way (e.g., Wilshire Boulevard, Exposition Boulevard, Jefferson Boulevard, Venice Boulevard, Sepulveda Boulevard, and Olympic Boulevard) or existing railroad rights-of-way (i.e., the Exposition right-of-way, which is currently owned by the MTA). Flooding within the study area as the result of a 100-year or 500-year flood is currently caused by an overflow of existing undersized storm drain systems. This flooding exists within the study area, and would continue to exist whether, or not, any of the alternatives were implemented; furthermore, none of the alternatives would worsen existing flooding conditions or expose people or property to increased flood hazards.

Because flooding (as the result of a 100-year or 500-year flood event) occurs throughout the study area, along each of the primary east-west travel corridors that connect downtown Los Angeles to Santa Monica, there is no practicable alternative that would both achieve the project objectives (i.e., to provide improved transit services to the Westside of Los Angeles) while avoiding any impacts to the base floodplain. Therefore, there is no practicable alternative to any of the project alternatives, and compliance with Executive Order 11988 and DOT Order 5650.2 can be achieved.

## 4.5 EXECUTIVE ORDER PERTAINING TO WETLANDS

This order issued in 1977 directs all Federal agencies to avoid, if possible, adverse impacts to wetlands and to preserve and enhance the natural and beneficial values of wetlands. Each agency shall avoid undertaking or assisting in wetland construction projects unless the head of the agency determines that there is no practicable alternative to such construction and that the proposed action includes measures to minimize harm.

### *Impacts*

The proposed project alternatives in the Mid-City/Westside Corridor would not cross, intersect with, or remove areas designated as wetlands. The only crossing of a surface water body is the Exposition right-of-way crossing of Ballona Creek in Culver City. The creek is a concrete lined flood control channel at this crossing and there are no associated wetlands or riparian areas. Thus the proposed project transit alternatives would not invoke the provisions of Executive Order 11990.

## 4.6 EXECUTIVE ORDER PERTAINING TO ENDANGERED SPECIES

Adopted in 1973, this act requires Federal agencies, in consultation with and with the assistance of the Secretary of the Interior or of Commerce, as appropriate, to insure that actions they authorize, fund or carry out are not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of threatened or endangered species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat for these species.

### *Impacts*

As discussed in Section 3 of this report, there are no threatened or endangered species known to exist in the Mid-City/Westside Transit Corridor that would be affected by the proposed bus or light rail transit alternatives under consideration. Similarly, there are no natural habitat areas that would be affected by the transit alternatives under consideration. Thus, the proposed project alternatives would not invoke the requirements of the Endangered Species Act.

## 4.7 EXECUTIVE ORDER PERTAINING TO ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

On February 11, 1994, President Clinton issued an "Executive Order on Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations." This Order is designed to focus Federal attention on environmental and human health conditions in minority communities and low-income communities. The Order is further intended to promote non-discrimination in Federal Programs substantially affecting human health and the environment and to provide for information access and public participation relating to such matters.

The approach in this EIS/EIR is to achieve compliance with the letter and spirit of the President's Executive Order by addressing the question of whether, and how, the impacts of the project and its alternatives may disproportionately affect minority and low-income populations.

This section analyzes the distributional patterns of minority populations and low-income populations on a regional basis and characterizes the distribution of such populations adjacent to the project alternatives. The analysis then focuses on the existing environmental conditions and impacts relative to these populations and analyzes how project impacts affect these populations, focusing on possible disproportionate effects and potential exacerbation of existing conditions.

The unit of analysis in this EIS/EIR for impacts on minority populations and low income populations is the Census Block Group. Baseline data provided in this section is from the 1990 United States (US) Census. For each of the Census Block Groups the following information is included:

- Total population;
- Black/African American population;
- Asian/Pacific Islander Population;
- American Indian Population;
- Hispanic Population; and
- Households at Poverty Level.

Low Income households defined as "Poverty Level" are households whose incomes met the 1990 Los Angeles County threshold for poverty at less than $8,104 dollars.

### *Wilshire Corridor*

Tables 4-1 and 4-2 show the ethnic breakdown and number of poverty level households for a 0.5 mile distance on either side of the corridor and a 0.5 mile radius of the Wilshire BRT station locations.

**TABLE 4-1**
**ETHNIC BREAKDOWN WITHIN 0.5 MILE OF THE WILSHIRE CORRIDOR**

| Category | Numbers of Individuals | Percentage (in %) |
|---|---|---|
| *Persons* | *178,866* | *100* |
| Black | 11,589 | 6 |
| Asian | 23,792 | 13 |
| Hispanic | 18,382 | 10 |
| American Indian | 566 | 0.3 |
| *Households* | *86,367* | *100* |
| Poverty | 21,581 | 12 |

Source: 1990 US Census

**TABLE 4-2**
**ETHNIC BREAKDOWN WITHIN 0.5 MILE OF THE WILSHIRE BOULEVARD STATIONS**

| Station | Persons | Black | Asian | Hispanic | American Indian | Households | Poverty |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Western | 2,550 | 293 | 922 | 696 | 30 | 1,218 | 419 |
| Crenshaw | 566 | 19 | 175 | 138 | 1 | 204 | 72 |
| La Brea | 826 | 16 | 195 | 52 | 0 | 281 | 96 |
| Fairfax | 1,288 | 128 | 142 | 98 | 2 | 890 | 228 |
| La Cienega | 1,027 | 11 | 24 | 39 | 2 | 619 | 85 |
| Robertson | 2,106 | 44 | 75 | 105 | 6 | 1,159 | 123 |
| Beverly | 557 | 5 | 34 | 26 | 0 | 284 | 0 |

| TABLE 4-2<br>ETHNIC BREAKDOWN WITHIN 0.5 MILE OF THE WILSHIRE BOULEVARD STATIONS | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Station** | **Persons** | **Black** | **Asian** | **Hispanic** | **American Indian** | **Households** | **Poverty** |
| Santa Monica | 1,066 | 7 | 58 | 63 | 4 | 571 | 48 |
| Westwood Village | 2,651 | 58 | 548 | 154 | 5 | 1,450 | 690 |
| Barrington | 1,169 | 382 | 12 | 99 | 11 | 928 | 62 |
| Bundy | 1,815 | 54 | 172 | 175 | 12 | 977 | 145 |
| 14th | 1,155 | 39 | 60 | 85 | 3 | 448 | 125 |
| 4th | 712 | 30 | 18 | 58 | 4 | 543 | 173 |
| Ocean | 821 | 19 | 7 | 42 | 0 | 636 | 221 |
| Source: 1990 US Census | | | | | | | |

## *Exposition Corridor*

Tables 4-3, 4-4, and 4-5 show the ethnic breakdown and number of poverty level households for a 0.5 mile distance on either side of the Exposition corridor and a 0.5 mile radius of the Exposition BRT and LRT Alternatives station locations.

| TABLE 4-3<br>ETHNIC BREAKDOWN WITHIN 0.5 MILE OF THE EXPOSITION CORRIDOR | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Category** | **Numbers of Individuals** | **Percentage (in %)** |
| *Persons* | *148,399* | *100* |
| Black | 47,211 | 32 |
| Asian | 13,725 | 9 |
| Hispanic | 47,769 | 32 |
| American Indian | 666 | 0.4 |
| *Households* | *55,192* | *100* |
| Poverty | 28,316 | 19 |
| Source: 1990 US Census | | |

| TABLE 4-4<br>ETHNIC BREAKDOWN WITHIN 0.5 MILE OF THE EXPOSITION BRT STATIONS | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Station** | **Persons** | **Black** | **Asian** | **Hispanic** | **American Indian** | **Households** | **Poverty** |
| 7th/Flower | 667 | 102 | 5 | 357 | 5 | 205 | 137 |
| Figueroa/Pico | 454 | 46 | 1 | 390 | 8 | 96 | 84 |
| Figueroa/Adams | 686 | 41 | 32 | 541 | 4 | 168 | 136 |
| Figueroa/Jefferson | 984 | 96 | 61 | 767 | 7 | 241 | 197 |
| USC Park/ Exposition | 1,491 | 158 | 40 | 1,251 | 2 | 407 | 374 |
| Vermont | 2,104 | 760 | 52 | 1,147 | 24 | 1,133 | 557 |
| Western | 1,363 | 948 | 33 | 209 | 14 | 470 | 350 |
| Crenshaw | 718 | 424 | 146 | 25 | 4 | 318 | 20 |
| La Brea | 785 | 591 | 57 | 109 | 0 | 329 | 217 |

**TABLE 4-4**
**ETHNIC BREAKDOWN WITHIN 0.5 MILE OF THE EXPOSITION BRT STATIONS**

| Station | Persons | Black | Asian | Hispanic | American Indian | Households | Poverty |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| La Cienega | 826 | 532 | 88 | 188 | 4 | 307 | 70 |
| National/Hayden | 748 | 147 | 143 | 98 | 3 | 437 | 42 |
| Venice/Main | 3,883 | 536 | 506 | 733 | 37 | 2,144 | 348 |
| Venice/Overland | 3,333 | 419 | 507 | 657 | 23 | 1,752 | 526 |
| Venice/Sepulveda | 872 | 47 | 159 | 195 | 7 | 362 | 66 |
| Sepulveda/National | 890 | 52 | 182 | 188 | 2 | 435 | 131 |
| Pico/Sawtelle | 597 | 15 | 86 | 220 | 7 | 274 | 93 |
| Bundy | 720 | 31 | 154 | 244 | 9 | 304 | 119 |
| Cloverfield | 1,888 | 248 | 185 | 842 | 14 | 800 | 432 |
| Colorado/14th | 1,056 | 143 | 28 | 411 | 6 | 481 | 216 |
| Ocean | 327 | 42 | 18 | 48 | 6 | 174 | 17 |

Source: 1990 US Census

**TABLE 4-5**
**ETHNIC BREAKDOWN WITHIN 0.5 MILE OF THE EXPOSITION LRT STATIONS**

| Station | Persons | Black | Asian | Hispanic | American Indian | Households | Poverty |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 7th/Flower | 667 | 102 | 5 | 357 | 5 | 205 | 137 |
| Pico/Flower | 454 | 46 | 1 | 390 | 8 | 96 | 84 |
| Washington/Grand | 3,061 | 267 | 37 | 2,459 | 16 | 1,189 | 621 |
| I-110/USC/ Exposition | 1,491 | 158 | 40 | 1,251 | 2 | 407 | 374 |
| Vermont | 2,104 | 760 | 52 | 1,147 | 24 | 1,133 | 557 |
| Western | 1,363 | 948 | 33 | 209 | 14 | 470 | 350 |
| Crenshaw | 718 | 424 | 146 | 25 | 4 | 318 | 20 |
| La Brea | 785 | 591 | 57 | 109 | 0 | 329 | 217 |
| La Cienega | 826 | 532 | 88 | 188 | 4 | 307 | 70 |
| Venice/Washington | 1,326 | 111 | 221 | 661 | 2 | 370 | 191 |
| Venice/Overland | 3,333 | 419 | 507 | 657 | 23 | 1,752 | 526 |
| Venice/Sepulveda | 872 | 47 | 159 | 195 | 7 | 362 | 66 |
| Sepulveda/National | 890 | 52 | 182 | 188 | 2 | 435 | 131 |
| Pico/Sawtelle | 597 | 15 | 86 | 220 | 7 | 274 | 93 |
| Bundy | 720 | 31 | 154 | 244 | 9 | 304 | 119 |
| Cloverfield | 1,888 | 248 | 185 | 842 | 14 | 800 | 432 |
| Ocean/Colorado | 327 | 42 | 18 | 48 | 6 | 174 | 17 |

Source: 1990 US Census

## *Impacts*

The impact analysis is based on the consideration of the locations of minority populations and low-income populations throughout the Study Area and specifically within one-mile of the alternative route corridors, as defined by the Census Block Group classification and distribution. Key elements of the analysis throughout the following section include consideration of:

- Disproportionate project impacts on high minority populations and low income populations along the routes;

- Disproportionate project impacts when considering existing conditions or locational patterns for existing impact sources and burdens; and
- Factors that influence or increase the disproportionalities noted.

For purposes of this analysis, an area that contains one-third or more (of the total population) of high minority or low-income population is considered a "high concentration." While the Census data used is from the 1990 US Census, it is assumed that similar demographic trends have occurred within the Census Block Groups that were examined in this analysis.

*Wilshire Corridor*. The Wilshire Corridor as a whole contains 30.3% minority population and 24.9% low income population. The breakdown of minority and low income population at each individual BRT station is as follows:

**TABLE 4-6**
**PERCENTAGE OF MINORITY AND LOW-INCOME POPULATIONS WILSHIRE CORRIDOR**

| Station | Minorit y | Low Income |
|---|---|---|
| Western | 65% | 34% |
| Crenshaw | 59% | 35% |
| La Brea | 31% | 34% |
| Fairfax | 28% | 25% |
| La Cienega | 7% | 13% |
| Robertson | 11% | 1% |
| Beverly | 11% | 0% |
| Santa Monica | 12% | 8% |
| Westwood | 28% | 47% |
| Barrington | 43% | 6% |
| Bundy | 22% | 14% |
| 14th | 16% | 27% |
| 4th | 15% | 32% |
| Ocean | 8% | 34% |
| **Straightline Average** | **25%** | **22 %** |

Source: 1990 US Census.

As shown in Table 4-6, several station locations contain a mixture of high minority and low-income households. The Western Avenue, Crenshaw Boulevard, and La Brea Avenue station areas contain the highest concentrations of minority and low-income households. The high percentage of low-income households near the Westwood Village station area can be attributed to the large numbers of UCLA students housed in the area. While several station locations contain high concentrations of minority and low-income populations, the Corridor as a whole contains less than 33% minority and low-income households. Because the percentage of minority and low-income populations is below the threshold of 33% (with a minority population of 30% and a low-income population of 25%), infrastructure and environmental impacts associated from the proposed Wilshire BRT Alternative would not disproportionately affect low-income or minority populations in close proximity to the project area. Therefore, the impacts are not considered significant to low-income and minority households.

*Exposition Corridor*. The Exposition Corridor as a whole contains 73.7% minority population and 83.5% low income population (refer to Table 4-7). The breakdown of minority and low income population at each individual BRT and LRT Alternative station is as follows:

**TABLE 4-7**
**PERCENTAGE OF MINORITY AND LOW-INCOME POPULATIONS**
**EXPOSITION CORRIDOR**

| Exposition BRT Alternative | | | Exposition LRT Alternative | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Station** | **Minority** | **Low Income** | **Station** | **Minority** | **Low Income** |
| 7th/Flower | 70% | 66% | 7th/Flower | 70% | 66% |
| Figueroa/Pico | 98% | 87% | Pico/Flower | 98% | 87% |
| Figueroa/Adams | N/A | N/A | -- | -- | -- |
| Figueroa/Jefferson | 90% | 52% | Washington/Grand | 90% | 52% |
| Exposition/USC | 97% | 91% | USC/Exposition | 97% | 91% |
| Vermont | 94% | 49% | Vermont | 94% | 49% |
| Western | 88% | 74% | Western | 88% | 74% |
| Crenshaw | 83% | 6% | Crenshaw | 83% | 6% |
| La Brea | 96% | 65% | La Brea | 96% | 65% |
| La Cienega | 98% | 22% | La Cienega | 98% | 22% |
| National/Hayden | 52% | 10% | Venice/Washington | 75% | 51% |
| Venice/Main | 46% | 16% | Venice/Overland | 48% | 30% |
| Venice/Overland | 48% | 30% | Venice/Sepulveda | 46% | 18% |
| Venice/Sepulveda | 46% | 18% | Sepulveda/National | 47% | 30% |
| Sepulveda/National | 47% | 30% | Pico/Sawtelle | 54% | 33% |
| Pico/Sawtelle | 54% | 33% | Bundy | 60% | 39% |
| Bundy | 60% | 39% | Cloverfield | 68% | 54% |
| Cloverfield | 68% | 54% | Ocean/Colorado | 54% | 10% |
| Colorado/14th | 55% | 45% | -- | -- | -- |
| Ocean | 54% | 10% | -- | -- | -- |

Source: 1990 US Census

The study area displays distinct patterns of correlation and possible disproportionality with regard to minority populations and low-income populations and their socioeconomic conditions. The majority of the Census Block Groups identified as high minority and low income overlap within the Exposition Corridor. As a whole, the Exposition Corridor contains a large low-income and minority population, specifically concentrated near the stations located between 7th/Flower Street and La Cienega Boulevard.

Because the Exposition Corridor contains a disproportionately high concentration of both low-income and minority households, the physical and environmental impacts associated with the proposed alternatives using the Exposition Corridor would disproportionately effect those households. Evaluation of the possible MTA transit routes was based largely on lands owned by the MTA. The right-of-way (ROW) proposed for use with the Exposition alternatives is currently owned and operated by the MTA and allows the alternatives to be fiscally feasible. Public transportation projects are beneficial to low-income households because of the reliance those individuals have on public transit for mobility. While the environmental impacts associated with this alternative would be disproportionately distributed to both low-income and minority households, the result of an improved transit system for those individuals is considered beneficial. The environmental consequences of the proposed project primarily consist of an increase to the air quality, noise, and traffic levels currently existing in the area. These impacts do not outway the benefits of installing an improved public transportation system to an area of target users. Therefore, the impacts are not considered significant to either low-income or minority households.

## 4.8 NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended through 1992 (16 U.S.C. Section 470), and 36 CFR Part 800: Protection of Historic Properties, are two of several federal regulations protecting historic resources. Section 106 requires that federal agencies take into account the effect of carrying out federally funded, assisted, or licensed projects on resources identified as included in, or determined eligible for, the National Register. This law is set up so that, in the planning stages, the widest range of feasible alternatives can be investigated. 36 CFR Part 800 specifies the "Criteria of Effect," which is the method applied to determine whether or not a project would adversely affect those characteristics qualifying a resource for inclusion on the National Register. Federal agencies follow these steps in the Section 106 review process:

- Determine that the Section 106 provisions apply to the undertaking or proposed action;
- Define the APE ;
- Identify historic, archaeological and cultural resources, and evaluate their significance to determine eligibility for listing in the National Register;
- Apply the criteria of effect and adverse effect to determine impacts on identified resources;
- Consult with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and other interested persons, agencies, and tribes to agree on appropriate mitigation measures;
- Execute a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with the SHPO that specifies
- the mitigation and identifies those responsible for carrying out the specific measures;
- Obtain the comments and concurrence of the Advisory Council for Historic Preservation.

This document summarizes the results of the completion of the first four steps. The final three steps will be completed prior to the conclusion of the environmental process and the issuance of the Record of Decision. Formal consultation with the SHPO and others to define impacts on historic properties and determine how to resolve them should be undertaken after the DEIS is completed. The views of the public on any draft document should be addressed in the consultation.

The cultural resource investigation was a phased effort. 36 CFR 800.4 (b) (2) provides the following: "Where alternatives under consideration consist of corridors or large land areas, or where access to properties is restricted, the Agency Official may use a phased process to conduct identification and evaluation efforts." As specific aspects or locations of an alternative are refined or access is gained, the Agency Official shall proceed with the identification and evaluation of historic properties in accordance with 800.4(b)(1) and (c). In this particular study, the use of light rail and buses is under consideration. The choice of one or the other will have a differential effect on cultural resources, e.g., vibration from light rail usage as opposed to considerably less for buses. Until this alternative is refined, it is considered prudent to limit the cultural resource investigation to a limited identification.

## 4.9 Section 4(F)

Public recreational lands and facilities (including local parks), significant cultural resources, natural wildlife refuges, and schools (to the extent that school facilities are open and available to the general public for recreational purposes) are afforded special protection by Section 4(f) of the U.S. Department of Transportation Act of 1966. The following land use types include potential Section 4(f) lands:

- Beach Parks;
- Local Park and Recreation Lands (Undeveloped);
- Local Park and Recreation Lands (Developed);
- Regional Park and Recreation Lands (Undeveloped);
- Regional Park and Recreation Lands (Developed);
- Colleges and Universities;
- Elementary Schools;
- Junior or Intermediate High Schools;
- Pre-Schools Day Care Centers;
- Senior High Schools; and
- Trade Schools; and
- Lands of historic significance

The courts have found that any National Register property, and any property determined eligible for the National Register, is an "historic site" for purposes of Section 4(f).

Section 4(f) lands within or adjacent to the Wilshire and Exposition Corridors are presented in Table 4-8:

**TABLE 4-8**
**PARKLAND AND RECREATIONAL SITES**

| | |
|---|---|
| **WILSHIRE CORRIDOR** | |
| Macarthur Park | Wilshire Boulevard /Alvarado Boulevard |
| LaFayette Park | Wilshire Boulevard /Hoover Street |
| LaBrea Tar Pits | Wilshire Boulevard /Curson Avenue |
| Carthay Circle Park | Wilshire Boulevard /Crescent Heights Boulevard |
| Douglas Park | Wilshire Boulevard /Chelsea Avenue |
| Lincoln Park | Wilshire Boulevard /7th Street |
| Junior High School | Wilshire Boulevard/Highland Avenue |
| **EXPOSITION CORRIDOR** | |
| Rancho Cienega Sports Center Park | Exposition Boulevard /LaBrea Avenue |
| Baldwin Hills Recreation Center | Exposition Boulevard/Dunsmuir Avenue |
| Syd Kronenthal Park | National Boulevard /McManus Avenue |
| Palms Park | National Boulevard /Clarkson Road |
| Stewart Street Park | Exposition ROW/Cloverfield |
| Memorial Park | Olympic Boulevard /14th Street |

| TABLE 4-8<br>PARKLAND AND RECREATIONAL SITES | |
|---|---|
| University of Southern California | Exposition Boulevard /Vermont Avenue |
| Middle School | Exposition Boulevard/Western Avenue |
| Continental High School | Exposition Boulevard/16th Street |
| Dorsey High School | Exposition Boulevard /Farmdale Avenue |
| Source: Thomas Brother's Guide/EIP Associates, 2000 | |

Direct use (i.e. encroachment) of Section 4(f) lands by Federally-funded transportation projects is prohibited unless it can be demonstrated that there are no prudent alternatives. If no prudent alternatives exist, design and mitigation measures must be implemented to reduce potentially-significant or significant effects. Indirect effects to Section 4(f) lands may involve impeding or altering access, introducing significant noise or vibration, casting shadows, or other substantive changes to the visual setting.

## *Impacts to Parklands*

Since the various project alternatives would operate within public ROWs, the potential for direct use of parklands is unlikely. There may be indirect effects, however, to significant cultural resources, which are also covered by Section 4(f), as described previously under "Cultural Resources."

*Indirect or Direct impacts on Section 4(f) Lands.* The proposed transit alternatives would involve construction and operation within public road ROWs or ROWs owned by the MTA, and would not result in any direct or indirect physical disruption of public lands, including Section 4(f) lands.

## *Impacts to Cultural Resources*

As described above, Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966 states that federal funds cannot be used for any "program or project which requires the use of any publicly owned land from a public park, recreation area, or wildlife and waterfowl refuge of national, State, or local significance as determined by the Federal, State, or local officials having jurisdiction thereof, or any land from an historic site of national, State, or local significance as determined by such officials unless (1) there is no feasible and prudent alternative to the use of such lands, and (2) such program includes all possible planning to minimize harm to such park, recreational area, wildlife and waterfowl refuge, or historic site resulting from such use." The word "use" refers to either a direct or a constructive use of the property. A direct use occurs when land is permanently incorporated into a transportation facility of a partial or full acquisition or easement of the property is required. Constructive use occurs when the project's proximity impacts are so severe that the activities, features, or attributes that qualify a resource for protection under 4(f) are substantially impaired. Typically, a constructive use of a resource would involve permanent and severe noise, vibration, visual, or access impacts. As outlined in Subsection 23 CFR 771.135 (p)(4), a constructive use of a protected resource occurs under any of the following situations:

- Predicted noise level increase, attributable to the proposed project, substantially interferes with the use and enjoyment of a noise-sensitive facility of a resource.
- Proximity of the proposed project substantially impairs the aesthetic features or attributes of a resource, where such features or attributes are considered important contributing elements to the value of the resource.

- Restricted access, which substantially diminishes the utility of a publicly owned park, recreation area, or historic site.

- Vibration associated with the proposed project impairs the use of a resource.

- Ecological intrusion of the proposed project diminishes the value of wildlife habitat in a wildlife or waterfowl refuge adjacent to the project.

- Substantial interference with the access to a wildlife or waterfowl refuge when such access is necessary or established wildlife migration or critical life cycle processes.

The following sections evaluate park, archaeological and historic as they relate to Section 4(f). After reviewing the 4(f) evaluation, FTA may determine that: 1) there is no prudent or feasible alternative to using 4(f) properties in this section; and 2) the project includes all possible planning to minimize harm to parks, recreation areas, wildlife and waterfowl refuges and historic site resulting from the use. With this determination, Section 4(f) permits the Secretary of Transportation to approve a project for federal funding participation or other federal undertaking that requires the use of publicly owned land from a park; recreation area; wildlife and waterfowl refuge of national, State, or local significance; or any land from a historic site of national, State, or local significance. The U.S. Department of the Interior and the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) will be consulted regarding Section 4(f) properties after circulation of the Draft EIS/EIR.

**Section 4(f) Properties**

This section describes the Section 4(f) properties that would be affected by the project alternatives. No such properties would be affected by the No Action or TSM Alternatives. Historic, archaeological, and paleontological resources that would be affected by the Wilshire BRT and Exposition BRT and LRT Alternatives are identified below. For these properties, a description and the significance of the affected property and the application of Section 4(f) criteria for use are presented. Alternatives that would avoid use, measures to minimize harm, and coordination with the appropriate agencies are also described.

*Electoroliers and Other Fixtures, Such as Streetlights, Along Wilshire Boulevard*

Description and Significance of Affected Property

The electroliers and other fixtures along much of Wilshire Boulevard were installed prior to 1950, and contribute to the historical setting of the Boulevard itself. Additionally, a trend towards the nomination of "National Register Utilities Districts" has emerged, and is practiced by agencies such as Caltrans. Although they have not yet been studied in detail, the fixtures along Wilshire Boulevard may be potentially eligible for the National Register in just such a context, as a potential historic district.

Application of Section 4(f) Criteria for Use

If, upon further study, the fixtures on Wilshire Boulevard are determined to be eligible or potentially eligible to the National Register either individually or as a district, the Wilshire BRT Alternatives would alter the physical properties of a potential historic resource and would materially alter its historical integrity. This would constitute an adverse effect under Section 106 of the NHPA, as described in Section 3.17.3 (Cultural Resources: Impact Assessment and Mitigation Measures).

Alternatives that Would Avoid Use

The No Action and TSM Alternatives, which have been analyzed in this Draft EIS/EIR, would not involve substantial physical change to Wilshire Boulevard, and would therefore result in no effect upon the electric fixtures along Wilshire Boulevard. While a BRT system could be implemented on other east-west streets, Wilshire is a designated transit corridor, and no substantial transit improvement would then be provided within an area of established need.

Measures to Minimize Harm

Mitigation Measures 3.17-1 and 3.17-2, as described in Section 3.17.3 (Cultural Resources: Impact Assessment and Mitigation Measures), would require evaluation and HAER recordation, if appropriate, of the electric fixtures along Wilshire Boulevard, and the development of an MOA between MTA, SHPO, and other interested parties.

Coordination with Other Agencies

As required by Mitigation Measure 3.17-2, MTA would work with FTA and SHPO to determine agreed-upon mitigation measures that will minimize the impacts on the electric fixtures on Wilshire Boulevard. The measures will be developed after consideration of all public input that is received during the circulation period of the Draft SEIS/SEIR.

*Southern Pacific Railroad/Pacific Electric Railway Lines and Right-of-Way*

Description and Significance of Affected Property

A description of the Southern Pacific Railroad/Pacific Electric Railway (SPRR/PE) Lines and Right-of-Way (ROW) and their historical significance are described in detail in Sections 2.1 and 3.2.3 of the Cultural Resources Technical Report of this Draft EIS/EIR, and are summarized in Section 3.17.2 (Cultural Resources: Affected Environment).

Application of Section 4(f) Criteria for Use

The SPRR/PE Lines and ROW have been determined by SHPO to be eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). It is also, therefore, a resource that is protected under Section 4(f). Construction of the proposed Exposition BRT or LRT Alternatives would involve the destruction of remaining rail lines and alteration of the ROW. Removal of the lines and alteration of the ROW would alter the physical properties of the resource and would materially alter its historical integrity. This would constitute an adverse effect under Section 106 of the NHPA, as described in Section 3.17.3 (Cultural Resources: Impact Assessment and Mitigation Measures).

Alternatives that Would Avoid Use

The No Action and TSM Alternatives, which have been analyzed in this Draft EIS/EIR, would not involve any physical change to the Exposition ROW, and would therefore result in no effect upon the SPRR/PE Lines and ROW. Additionally, Alternative 1 (Wilshire BRT), which has also been analyzed in this Draft EIS/EIR, would avoid the SPRR/PE Lines and ROW by confining all construction to Wilshire Boulevard, and would result in no effect upon this historical resource.

Measures to Minimize Harm

Mitigation Measures 3.17-3 and 3.17-4, as described in Section 3.17.3 (Cultural Resources: Impact Assessment and Mitigation Measures), would require HAER recordation of the PE Lines and ROW, and the development of an MOA between MTA, SHPO, and other interested parties.

Coordination with Other Agencies

As required by Mitigation Measure 3.17-4, MTA would work with FTA and SHPO to determine agreed-upon mitigation measures that will minimize the impacts on the SPRR/PE Lines and ROW. The measures will be developed after consideration of all public input that is received during the circulation period of the Draft SEIS/SEIR.

*Visual Setting of the USC/Exposition Park Historic Resources*

Description and Significance of Affected Property

The historic resources of USC and Exposition Park include the Hancock Memorial Museum, USC Widney Hall, USC Faculty Center, USC Town and Gown Center, Ormerod Harris Hall, the State Armory Building, that Natural History Museum, the Los Angeles Memorial Coliseum, and the Exposition Park Rose Garden. These are structures that comprise a potential National Register Historic District. Although other structures in the vicinity are individually historical, the shared context of these other structures has not remained intact, and therefore, have no shared significance as a district, as described in Section 3.17.3 (Cultural Resources: Impact Assessment and Mitigation Measures). A description of the historic resources and their historical significance are described in detail in Sections 2.1 and 3.2.3 of the Cultural Resources Technical Report, and are summarized in Section 3.17.2 (Cultural Resources: Affected Environment).

Application of Section 4(f) Criteria for Use

The USC/Exposition Park historic resources listed above have been determined by SHPO to be potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP as elements of an historic district. They are also, therefore, a collective resource that is protected under Section 4(f). Construction of the proposed Exposition LRT Alternatives (3 or 3A) would necessitate construction of an overhead catenary system (OCS) to provide electrical power to the LRT system. Installation of an OCS would alter the aesthetic properties of the potential district and would, as an intrusive modern element, indirectly alter the historic setting of potential district. This would constitute an adverse effect under Section 106 of the NHPA, as described in Section 3.17.3 (Cultural Resources: Impact Assessment and Mitigation Measures).

Alternatives that Would Avoid Use

The No Action and TSM Alternatives, which have been analyzed in this Draft EIS/EIR, would not involve any physical change to the Exposition ROW, and would therefore result in no effect upon the SPRR/PE Lines and ROW. Alternative 1 (Wilshire BRT), which has also been analyzed in this Draft EIS/EIR, would avoid the SPRR/PE Lines and ROW by confining all construction to

Wilshire Boulevard, and would result in no effect upon this historical resource. Additionally, Alternatives 2 and 2A, which would both involve a BRT system in the Exposition ROW, would not result in a significant indirect impact to the historical setting of the USC/Exposition historical resources.

Measures to Minimize Harm

Mitigation Measure 3.17-7, as described in Section 3.17.3 (Cultural Resources: Impact Assessment and Mitigation Measures), would require an alternative design of the OCS that would mimic the historic OCS system of the PE Railway system. This would be developed in consultation SHPO, and would reduce the impact to the historical setting of the USC/Exposition Park historical resources to a less-than-significant level.

Coordination with Other Agencies

MTA would work with FTA and SHPO to determine an OCS design that will minimize the impacts on the USC/Exposition Park historical resources. The measures will be developed after consideration of all public input that is received during the circulation period of the Draft SEIS/SEIR.

*Archaeological Resources*

In accordance with Section 4(f), Sections 106 and 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act, Executive Order 11593 and the guidelines promulgated by the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), MTA has undertaken an extensive search for archaeological resources that could be affected by the Exposition LRT Alternatives (3 and 3A) and potential maintenance yards. MTA has determined that three known archaeological sites exist within ¼ mile of the Wilshire BRT APE; however, these sites do lie within the APE and would not be adversely affected by construction activities. MTA has also determined that three additional archaeological sites that are potentially eligible to the NRHP (CA-LAN-69, -70 and –74), as well as potential areas of archaeological sensitivity, exist within or near the APE of the Exposition LRT and the potential maintenance yard sites (see Section 3.17.2, Cultural Resources: Affected Environment/Archaeological Resources). All of the identified sites and areas of high archaeological sensitivity may have "Use" under Section 4(f) guidelines.

Description and Significance of Affected Properties

CA-LAN-74, the site known within the APE, lies in the vicinity of the intersection of La Cienega Boulevard and Boden Avenue. The two other archaeological sites, CA-LAN-69 and -70, lie near the Exposition ROW at Cochran and at Sentous. CA-LAN-69 and –70 have not been relocated since they were recorded: they are presumed either buried or destroyed, but their precise status has not yet been determined, as subsurface investigations have not been conducted for this study. However, they lie within approximately 200 feet from the Exposition ROW, and it is possible that subsurface remains of these sites, as well as elements of CA-LAN-74, can lie within the Exposition ROW, and could be affected by grading, excavation, or other construction activities required to implement any of the Exposition LRT Alternatives (3 and 3A), and the potential subway design option for the Exposition LRT and BRT Alternatives (2 and 2A).

Application of Section 4(f) Use Criteria

All three known archaeological sites within or near the Exposition ROW have been determined potentially eligible for listing on the NRHP. LRT and BRT subway design option construction activities, such as earthmoving and excavation, as well as maintenance facility construction, such as excavation for underground tanks or foundations, could also encounter unrecorded archaeological remains.

Alternatives that Would Avoid Use

Alternative LRT alignments that would shift construction activities from the streets where archaeological sites have been recorded or where buried remains may be found would traverse private property. However, the archaeological sensitivity of portions of the alignment is high, particularly in the vicinity of Downtown Los Angeles and within or near USC/Exposition Park, as discussed in Section 3.17.3 (Cultural Resources: Impact Assessment and Mitigation Measures). Therefore, archaeological features could also likely be found on any of the other streets. Additionally, if the rail alignment were to be placed outside of the street rights-of-way to avoid the historic rail routes, this would require acquisition of many private properties. Demolishing many historic properties to accommodate the any of the Exposition LRT Alternatives and Exposition BRT Alternative subway design option, as well as the neighborhood disruption it would cause, would be an adverse impact. In addition, avoiding the Exposition ROW would obviate a primary project goal in providing service to the Exposition corridor.

Finally, other alternatives have been analyzed in this Draft EIS/EIR that would not involve construction within the Exposition ROW: the No Action and TSM Alternatives, as well as the Wilshire BRT Alternative (Alternative 1).

Measures that Would Minimize Harm

In the event that archaeological and buried historic sites are encountered, evaluation of the site is often accomplished through test level excavation designed to determine the horizontal and vertical extent of the site, and to characterize the content of the site. In recognition of this possibility for the Exposition BRT and LRT Alternatives, Mitigation Measure 3.17-6 requires monitoring and scientific recovery of archaeological resources. Additionally, the measure requires an MOA with SHPO and other interested parties. MTA could follow terms similar to those stipulated in the previously adopted *Identification Study and Treatment Plan* for the suspended Metro Red Line East Side Extension FEIS/FEIR (1994) and in the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) authorized by the Department of the Interior (September 12, 1994) in consultation with the ACHP and SHPO.

A MOA is the preferred mechanism for implementing Section 106 where alternatives under consideration consist of corridors, or where access to properties is restricted. A phased approach may be used to conduct identification and evaluation of historic properties if it is specifically provided for in a MOA. The MOA may use standard treatments established by the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation under 36 CFR 800.14(d). The process would establish the likely presence of historic properties within the area of potential effects for each alternative though background research, consultation, and an appropriate level of field investigation, taking into account the number of alternatives under consideration, the magnitude of the undertaking and its likely effects, and the views of SHPO. As specific aspects or location of an alternative are refined or access is gained, the identification and evaluation of historic properties proceeds in accordance with Sections 36 CFR 800.13(a)). The MOA shall include a provision for monitoring and a mechanism for reporting its implementation (36 CFR 800.6(c)(4)).

Other elements of the MOA shall provide that:

- Areas subject to physical disturbance by the undertaking are subjected to intensive archaeological study in accordance with a study plan developed in consultation with the SHPO, and submitted in draft to the SHPO for at least 30 days of review and comment; and
- If the study indicates the existence of archaeological resources, MTA will review the potential impact on such resources with SHPO. MTA has a wide variety of choices for mitigation measures and will determine them in consultation with the SHPO.

Prior to the initiation of each construction contract, a pre-construction meeting would be held with all resident engineers, inspectors, contractors' representatives and foremen to review the procedures to be followed regarding the presence of archaeological and/or paleontological monitors, collecting of artifacts, reporting discoveries, and communications. When archaeological evidence is observed, work will be halted in the immediate vicinity and the procedures set forth in the MOA and Treatment Plan will be followed.

<u>Coordination with Other Agencies</u>

MTA will work with FTA and SHPO to determine agreed-upon mitigation measures that will be identified in a Memorandum of Agreement to minimize the impacts on archaeological sites. The measures will be developed after consideration of all public input that is received during the circulation period of the Draft SEIS/SEIR.

*Paleontological Resources*

As described in Section 3.17.2 (Cultural Resources: Existing Environment), implementation of the Exposition LRT Alternative or the Exposition BRT or LRT subway design options could result in impacts to paleontological resources in the Quaternary Alluvium soil units that underlie the Downtown Los Angeles and USC/Exposition Park area.

<u>Description and Significance of Affected Properties</u>

As described in Section 3.17.2 (Cultural Resources: Existing Setting/Paleontological Resources), the USC campus and surrounding area are underlain by Holocene Alluvium (unit Qa), which is composed of clay, sand, and gravel. Fossil occurrences of the younger alluvium, such as those near USC, have high scientific importance because they have allowed the determinations of ages of their respective fossil-bearing rock units, reconstructions of depositional paleoenvironments represented by the component sediments, and documentation of paleoclimates of the region during these depositional events. Some of these occurrences are also important because they represent time and/or geographic range extensions (including first reported occurrences) for their respective plant and animal species. Fossil occurrences in nearby units, such as Downtown Los Angeles, indicate a moderate to high potential for similar fossil remains within the Exposition ROW APE.

Application of Section 4(f) Use Criteria

Paleontological resources are considered a form of historical resource under Section 106 of the NHPA, and would therefore have "Use" under Section 4(f). The proposed Exposition LRT Alternative will likely not require excavation of sufficient depth to encounter paleontological resources, though impacts are possible. The proposed subway design options for the Exposition BRT and LRT Alternatives, however, would excavate to depths that are likely to contain paleontological resources.

Alternatives that Would Avoid Use

Alternative LRT alignments that would shift construction activities from the streets where paleontological resources are known or suspected may not be possible because, as described above, the geological units that contain such resources are so widespread in the vicinity of the APE. In addition, avoiding the Exposition ROW would obviate a primary project goal in providing service to the Exposition corridor.

Finally, other alternatives have been analyzed in this Draft EIS/EIR that would not involve construction within the Exposition ROW: the No Action and TSM Alternatives, as well as the Wilshire BRT Alternative (Alternative 1) would either require no construction, or would limit construction to the Wilshire ROW. Also, non-subway design option of the Exposition BRT Alternatives (2 and 2A) would avoid these impacts, and non-subway design options for the Exposition LRT Alternatives (3 and 3A) would substantially reduce the likelihood of encountering paleontological resources.

Measures that Would Minimize Harm

MTA could provide mitigation that would reduce impacts to paleontological resources to less-than-significant levels. Mitigation Measure 3.17.5 requires monitoring and scientific recovery of paleontological resources in the event that they are encountered, as well as development of a mitigation plan in consultation with the Los Angeles County Museum of Natural History Vertebrate Paleontology Section.

Coordination with Other Agencies

MTA will coordinate with the Los Angeles County Museum of Natural History Vertebrate Paleontology Section to develop an agreed-upon mitigation plan that will minimize the impacts on potential paleontological resources. The measures will be developed after consideration of all public input that is received during the circulation period of the Draft SEIS/SEIR.