

**FINAL
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

METRO GREEN LINE EASTERLY EXTENSION

Prepared for the
Los Angeles County Transportation Commission
and the
City of Norwalk

Prepared by
Myra L. Frank & Associates, Inc.

In association with
Gannett-Fleming West, Inc.
Meyer, Mohaddes Associates, Inc.
Harris Miller Miller and Hanson
The Tanzmann Associates

January 1993

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

METRO GREEN LINE EASTERLY EXTENSION

**SCH 92051033
SCAQMD # LAC920511-02**

**Prepared for the
Los Angeles County Transportation Commission
and the
City of Norwalk**

**Prepared by
Myra L. Frank & Associates, Inc.**

**In association with
Gannett-Fleming West, Inc.
Meyer, Mohaddes Associates, Inc.
Harris Miller Miller and Hanson
The Tanzman Associates**

January 1993

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY

S.1	INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND	S-1
S.2	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	S-1
S.2.1	Aerial Alignment	S-1
S.2.2	Subway Alignment	S-5
S.2.3	Operating Characteristics	S-5
S.2.4	Cost Estimates	S-5
S.3	ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT	S-7
S.4	AREAS OF CONTROVERSY	S-7
S.5	ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED	S-8
S.6	INTENDED USES OF THE EIR	S-8
S.7	IMPACTS AND PROPOSED MITIGATION	S-8
S.7.1	Aerial Alignment	S-8
S.7.2	Subway Alignment	S-10
S.7.3	Impacts Common to Both Alignments	S-11
S.8	CONCLUSION	S-11

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1.1	PROJECT HISTORY	1-1
1.2	PURPOSE OF THE PROJECT	1-1
1.3	ROUTE SELECTION PROCESS	1-3
1.3.1	Alternative Routes Initially Considered	1-3
1.3.2	Design Guidelines and Evaluation Criteria	1-3
1.3.3	Recommended Route Alternatives	1-5
1.4	FORMAT OF THE EIR	1-7

**CHAPTER 2
PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

2.1	INTRODUCTION	2-1
2.2	AERIAL ALIGNMENT	2-1
2.2.1	Physical Description	2-1
2.2.2	Operating Characteristics	2-13
2.2.3	Construction Sequence	2-13
2.3	SUBWAY ALIGNMENT	2-18
2.3.1	Physical Description	2-18
2.3.2	Operating Characteristics	2-27
2.3.3	Construction Sequence	2-27
2.4	COST ESTIMATES	2-31
2.5	RELATED PROJECTS	2-33
2.5.1	Metro Green Line	2-33
2.5.2	Other Rail Transit Projects	2-33
2.5.3	Metrolink	2-36
2.5.4	Orange County Urban Rail Project	2-37
2.5.5	High Occupancy Vehicle Projects	2-37
2.5.6	Norwalk Transportation Center	2-37

**CHAPTER 3
ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS & MITIGATION**

3.1	TOPOGRAPHY, GEOLOGY AND SOILS	3-1
3.1.1	Environmental Setting	3-1
3.1.2	Construction Impacts	3-9
3.1.3	Operational Impacts	3-10
3.1.4	Mitigation Measures	3-11
3.2	HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY	3-12
3.2.1	Environmental Setting	3-12
3.2.2	Construction Impacts	3-15
3.2.3	Operational Impacts	3-16
3.2.4	Mitigation Measures	3-16

3.3	VEGETATION AND WILDLIFE	3-17
3.3.1	Environmental Setting	3-17
3.3.2	Impacts	3-18
3.3.3	Mitigation Measures	3-18
3.4	LAND USE	3-18
3.4.1	Environmental Setting	3-18
3.4.2	Construction Impacts	3-28
3.4.3	Operational Impacts--Land Use Consistency	3-29
3.4.4	Operational Impacts--Property Acquisitions	3-29
3.4.5	Mitigation Measures	3-35
3.5	POPULATION AND HOUSING	3-36
3.5.1	Environmental Setting	3-36
3.5.2	Construction Impacts	3-40
3.5.3	Operational Impacts	3-40
3.5.4	Mitigation Measures	3-43
3.6	PUBLIC SERVICES	3-44
3.6.1	Environmental Setting	3-44
3.6.2	Construction Impacts	3-49
3.6.3	Operational Impacts	3-53
3.6.4	Mitigation Measures	3-54
3.7	UTILITIES	3-54
3.7.1	Environmental Setting	3-54
3.7.2	Impacts	3-56
3.7.3	Mitigation Measures	3-59
3.8	AESTHETICS	3-59
3.8.1	Environmental Setting	3-59
3.8.2	Construction Impacts	3-61
3.8.3	Operational Impacts	3-62
3.8.4	Mitigation Measures	3-71
3.9	CULTURAL RESOURCES	3-71
3.9.1	Applicable Legislation	3-71
3.9.2	Environmental Setting	3-76
3.9.3	Impacts on Archaeological Resources	3-79
3.9.4	Impacts on Historical/Architectural/Cultural Resources	3-79
3.9.5	Mitigation for Archaeological Resources	3-81
3.9.6	Mitigation for Historic and Architectural Resources	3-82

3.10	TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION	3-82
3.10.1	Environmental Setting	3-82
3.10.2	Construction Impacts	3-96
3.10.3	Operational Impacts	3-99
3.10.4	Parking Impacts	3-107
3.10.5	Mitigation Measures	3-107
3.11	NOISE AND VIBRATION	3-110
3.11.1	Environmental Setting	3-110
3.11.2	Impact Criteria	3-115
3.11.3	Projection Models	3-116
3.11.4	Impacts	3-118
3.11.5	Mitigation Measures	3-120
3.12	AIR QUALITY	3-123
3.12.1	Regulatory Authority	3-123
3.12.2	Major Pollutants and Associated Health Effects	3-124
3.12.3	Environmental Setting	3-127
3.12.4	Construction Emissions	3-128
3.12.5	Operational Criteria Emissions	3-133
3.12.6	Carbon Monoxide Concentrations	3-136
3.12.7	Mitigation Measures	3-139
3.13	ENERGY	3-140
3.13.1	Environmental Setting	3-140
3.13.2	Construction Impacts	3-141
3.13.3	Operational Impacts	3-141
3.13.4	Mitigation Measures	3-141

**CHAPTER 4
OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS**

4.1	CUMULATIVE EFFECTS	4-1
4.1.1	Topography, Geology and Soils	4-1
4.1.2	Hydrology and Water Quality	4-1
4.1.3	Vegetation and Wildlife	4-1
4.1.4	Land Use	4-1
4.1.5	Population and Housing	4-2
4.1.6	Public Services	4-2
4.1.7	Utilities	4-2
4.1.8	Aesthetics	4-3
4.1.9	Cultural Resources	4-3
4.1.10	Transportation and Circulation	4-3

4.1.11	Noise and Vibration	4-3
4.1.12	Air Quality	4-4
4.1.13	Energy	4-4
4.2	UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE EFFECTS	4-4
4.2.1	Land Use Compatibility	4-4
4.2.2	Aesthetics	4-4
4.2.3	Cultural Resources	4-5
4.2.4	Property Acquisition	4-5
4.3	GROWTH INDUCEMENT	4-5
4.4	ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE	4-5

**CHAPTER 5
ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT**

5.1	NO BUILD ALTERNATIVE	5-1
5.2	BUS SHUTTLE CONNECTION ALTERNATIVE	5-2

**CHAPTER 6
COMMENTS AND RESPONSES**

6.1	OVERVIEW OF THE PUBLIC COMMENT PROCESS	6-1
6.2	WRITTEN COMMENTS AND RESPONSES	6-1
6.3	PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS AND RESPONSES	6-46

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A:	BIBLIOGRAPHY
APPENDIX B:	LIST OF PREPARERS
APPENDIX C:	LIST OF PERSONS AND ORGANIZATIONS CONSULTED
APPENDIX D:	NOTICE OF PREPARATION
APPENDIX E:	SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO THE NOTICE OF PREPARATION

List of Figures

Figure S-1:	Aerial and Subway Alternatives	S-2
Figure S-2:	Proposed Station at Norwalk Transportation Center	S-4
Figure S-3:	Proposed At-Grade Station at Norwalk Transportation Center	S-6
Figure 1-1:	Location Map	1-2
Figure 1-2:	Alternative Routes Considered	1-4
Figure 2-1:	Aerial Alignment	2-2
Figure 2-2:	Aerial Alignment - Perspective View - NTC	2-11
Figure 2-3:	Aerial Alignment - Conceptual Site Plan - NTC	2-12
Figure 2-4:	Aerial Alignment - Construction Sequence	2-14
Figure 2-5:	Subway Alignment	2-19
Figure 2-6:	Subway Alignment - conceptual Station - NTC	2-25
Figure 2-7:	Subway Alignment - Perspective View - NTC	2-26
Figure 2-8:	Concept Elevation - At-Grade Station	2-28
Figure 2-9:	Subway alignment - Construction Sequence	2-30
Figure 2-10:	East End Staging Area Construction Sequence	2-32
Figure 2-11:	Plan Transit Network	2-35
Figure 3-1:	Fault Map	3-4
Figure 3-2:	Hazardous Waste Sites in the Project Vicinity	3-8
Figure 3-3:	Groundwater Resources	3-14
Figure 3-4:	Land Use Study Area	3-19
Figure 3-5:	Existing Land Uses	3-21
Figure 3-6:	General Plan Land Use Designations	3-22
Figure 3-7:	Existing Zoning	3-23
Figure 3-8:	Specific Plan and Redevelopment Project Area Boundaries	3-26
Figure 3-9:	Project Area Census Tracts	3-37
Figure 3-10:	Areas of Full Acquisition	3-42
Figure 3-11:	Location of Public Services in Study Area	3-45
Figure 3-12:	Utility Sections	3-57
Figure 3-13:	Studebaker Road and Lyndora Street	3-63
Figure 3-14:	Imperial Highway and Southern Pacific RR	3-64
Figure 3-15:	Imperial Highway and Firestone Boulevard	3-66
Figure 3-16:	Imperial Highway and I-5	3-68
Figure 3-17:	Imperial Highway and Hutton Imperial Centre	3-69
Figure 3-18:	Imperial and Norwalk Transportation Center	3-70
Figure 3-19:	Paddison Ranch	3-77
Figure 3-20:	Regional Vicinity	3-84
Figure 3-21:	Existing ADT Volumes in Study Area	3-87
Figure 3-22:	Study Intersection	3-89
Figure 3-23:	Existing Lane Configurations at Study Intersections	3-90
Figure 3-24:	AM Peak Hour Turning Movements at Study Intersections	3-91
Figure 3-25:	PM Peak Hour Turning Movements at Study Intersections	3-92
Figure 3-26:	Construction Trucks Traffic Circulation	3-98
Figure 3-27:	Parking Demand Forecast	3-108
Figure 3-28:	Noise and Vibration Survey Sites	3-111
Figure 3-29:	Location of Sensitive Receptors	3-137

List of Tables

Table S-1:	Summary of Project Impacts for the Metro Green Line Easterly Extension	S-12
Table 2-1:	Cost Estimates	2-34
Table 3-1:	Geologic Time Scale	3-2
Table 3-2:	Major Named Active Faults	3-5
Table 3-3:	Hazardous Waste Sites in the Project Vicinity	3-9
Table 3-4:	Norwalk General Plan Distribution of Land Uses (1992)	3-20
Table 3-5:	Specific Planning Area (SPA) - Project Study Area	3-27
Table 3-6:	Compatibility of Transit Centers and Commuter Rail Stations with Land Use Types	3-30
Table 3-7:	Aerial Alignment Full Property Acquisitions	3-30
Table 3-8:	Aerial Alignment Partial Property Acquisitions	3-31
Table 3-9:	Subway Alignment Full Property Acquisitions	3-34
Table 3-10:	Subway Alignment Partial Property Acquisitions	3-35
Table 3-11:	Population and Housing Characteristics	3-39
Table 3-12:	Public Services Facilities in the Study Area	3-46
Table 3-13:	Existing Utilities Located Along Imperial Highway	3-55
Table 3-14:	FTA Airborne Noise Impact Criteria	3-74
Table 3-15:	Impact Criteria for Ground-Borne Vibration and Noise	3-75
Table 3-16:	Level of Service Interpretation	3-93
Table 3-17:	Existing Conditions Level of Service Analysis	3-94
Table 3-18:	Forecasted Commuter Rail Vehicular Trips	3-101
Table 3-19:	Forecasted Green Line Vehicular Trips	3-101
Table 3-20:	Future AM Peak Hour Intersection Levels of Service	3-105
Table 3-21:	Future PM Peak Hour Intersection Levels of Service	3-106
Table 3-22:	Noise Survey MEasurement Sites & Summary Results	3-112
Table 3-23:	Generalized Community Noise Levels	3-113
Table 3-24:	Ambien Vibration Test Sites and Summary Results	3-114
Table 3-25:	Federal Transit Administration NOise Impact Criteria	3-115
Table 3-26:	Impact Criteria for Ground-Borne Vibration and Noise	3-116
Table 3-27:	Vibration and Noise Criteria for Special Buildings	3-117
Table 3-28:	Typical Equipment List	3-118
Table 3-29:	Airborne Noise and Ground-Borne Vibration Impact	3-121
Table 3-30:	Summary of Noise and Vibration Mitigation Measures	3-122
Table 3-31:	Federal and State Air Quality Standards	3-125
Table 3-32:	Whittier Monitoring Station Exceedances	3-129
Table 3-33:	Pico Rivera Monitoring Station Exceedances	3-130
Table 3-34:	Construction Equipment	3-131
Table 3-35:	Construction Emissions - Aerial Alternative	3-132
Table 3-36:	Construction Emissions - Subway Alternative	3-133
Table 3-37:	Level of Service (LOS) at Major Intersections	3-134
Table 3-38:	Daily Mobile Source Emissions	3-135
Table 3-39:	Regional "Burden" Analysis	3-136
Table 3-40:	1-Hour Carbon Monoxide Concentration Levels at Sensitive Receptors	3-138

Table 3-41: Estimated Fossil Fuel Consumption 3-141
Table 3-42: Construction Equipment Fuel Consumption 3-142
Table 3-43: Estimated Overall Operating Energy Consumption 3-143
Table 6-1: Construction Equipment Used During Station Construction 6-12
Table 6-2: Emissions During Station Construction 6-13

SUMMARY

SUMMARY

S.1 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

In May 1991, the LACTC authorized the preparation of a Route Refinement Study and Environmental Impact Report for the easterly extension of the Metro Green Line. This extension would begin at the present Green Line eastern terminus at I-605 and Studebaker Road in the City of Norwalk and proceed eastward approximately 2.8 miles to the proposed Norwalk Transportation Center, located south of Imperial Highway and east of Bloomfield Avenue, also in the City of Norwalk. The Metro Green Line Easterly Extension is one of eight fundable candidate corridors included in the 30-Year Integrated Transportation Plan that was adopted by the LACTC in April 1992.

The Norwalk-to-El Segundo Metro Green Line project, currently under construction, will provide direct rail access from Norwalk to Los Angeles International Airport and the El Segundo employment area, and through its connection with the Metro Blue Line, the Green Line will provide regional light rail accessibility to downtown Los Angeles. The City of Norwalk is desirous of developing a Transportation Center that would integrate its local bus service with regional rail service, including the proposed commuter rail service from Orange and Riverside counties. The Metro Green Line Easterly Extension is a regional rail gap closure that would complete the linkages required for fully integrated regional rail service. The Orange County Transportation Authority is currently exploring the connection between its urban rail system and the Los Angeles County urban rail network at the Norwalk Transportation Center.

Three alternative routes were evaluated for the easterly extension, each of which would connect the easterly terminus of the Green Line at I-605 with the proposed Norwalk Transportation Center. After preliminary engineering evaluation of the three routes, which included extensive discussions on community, environmental and land use impacts, and inputs received at a public meeting, the preferred route was identified. This route would begin at the Green Line station east of I-605, proceed northward to Imperial Highway and east along Imperial Highway to the Norwalk Transportation Center.

Based on the results of the preliminary evaluation, the LACTC directed staff to analyze the impacts of both an aerial alignment and a subway alignment along the Imperial Highway route and document the analysis in the Environmental Impact Report. These two alignments have been defined and are documented in the EIR.

S.2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

S.2.1 Aerial Alignment

The aerial alignment (shown in Figure S-1) would begin in a cut approximately 20 feet below grade at the Metro Green Line station located west of Studebaker Road and south of Imperial Highway. It would proceed eastward a short distance and before reaching Studebaker Road, it would turn to the north. Before reaching Studebaker Road, the guideway would pass over

**TABLE S-1
SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS FOR THE METRO GREEN LINE EASTERLY EXTENSION**

IMPACTS	ALIGNMENT	POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS	SIGNIFICANCE	MITIGATION	RESIDUAL IMPACT
POPULATION AND HOUSING					
Property acquisition	Aerial	The aerial alignment would require acquisition of one residential parcel, displacing an estimated 3 persons. The aerial alignment would result in partial acquisitions, affecting 9 parcels, for placement of guideway columns or street widening.	Significant Not significant	Payment of fair market value and provision of relocation assistance. Placement of columns to reduce intrusion as much as possible.	Not significant Not significant
	Subway	The subway alignment would require acquisition of 17 residential parcels, displacing an estimated 54 persons, for a construction staging area at the west end of the corridor.	Significant	Payment of fair market value and provision of relocation assistance. Use of the east end of the corridor for construction staging would eliminate the takings.	Not significant
Growth	Aerial and subway	The proposed project is not anticipated to produce a demand for additional housing or induce population growth.	Not applicable	None required.	Not applicable
PUBLIC SERVICES					
Construction	Aerial and subway	Construction of the proposed project would produce traffic, noise and accessibility impacts that would affect parks, schools, churches, libraries and health care facilities. Fire and police services could also experience some impairments. These effects would be temporary.	Not significant	Construction signage, adequate advanced notice, auto and pedestrian detours	Not significant
Operation	Aerial and subway	The proposed project should result in a slight reduction of traffic along Imperial Highway and would thus have a slight beneficial effect on accessibility to most public services. Emergency response should not be adversely affected. No adverse effects on schools are expected. Adverse effects are not expected for libraries, parks, and medical facilities.	No effect or slightly beneficial	None required.	No effect or slightly beneficial.
		One church would be displaced by the project.	Potentially significant	Relocation assistance	Not significant

**TABLE S-1
SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS FOR THE METRO GREEN LINE EASTERLY EXTENSION**

IMPACTS	ALIGNMENT	POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS	SIGNIFICANCE	MITIGATION	RESIDUAL IMPACT
UTILITIES					
Facilities disruption	Aerial	Underground utilities would be subject to temporary disruption during the construction period, including gas, oil, and water lines ranging in diameter from 2 inches to 10 inches. A 79 inch diameter Metropolitan Water District main line runs beneath Imperial Highway for a distance of 3,000 feet and would require a substantial effort to relocate. Overhead electrical power poles in the vicinity of the Southern Pacific tracks would be potentially subject to relocation.	Potentially significant	All lines would be relocated using appropriate procedures and service interruptions would be kept to a minimum.	Not significant
	Subway	No problems associated with minor utilities are anticipated. The MWD water main can be avoided.	Not significant	Definition of final profile to take into account the location of the MWD water main.	Not significant
AESTHETICS					
Construction	Aerial	Construction activities and equipment would be generally prominent and would affect the entire corridor over the course of the construction period.	Significant	Construction would be conducted as expeditiously as possible. Screening would be used where visual aspects would have safety implications.	Not significant
	Subway	Construction activities would be confined to the portal/staging area.	Significant	Screening of construction area from nearby residences could be considered. Use of east end for staging area.	Not significant
Operation	Aerial and subway	The presence of the light rail station and associated parking at the Norwalk Transportation Center would constitute a different but not incompatible change from the existing visual environment.	Not significant	Appropriate design principles and architectural treatments would be used.	Not significant

**TABLE S-1
SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS FOR THE METRO GREEN LINE EASTERLY EXTENSION**

IMPACTS	ALIGNMENT	POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS	SIGNIFICANCE	MITIGATION	RESIDUAL IMPACT
Aesthetics - Operation (Cont.)	Aerial	The overhead guideway would be of substantial size and it would become a significant visual element in the post-project environment. The guideway support columns would constitute a significant change from the existing visual setting. The number, size and proximity of bent structures would obstruct views along some portions of the corridor. The project would be out of scale with its environment in some locations.	Significant	Design elements and architectural treatments would be carefully selected to reduce adverse visual effects.	Significant
	Subway	With the exception of descending portions of the project at the west end of the corridor, this alternative would not be visible until it reaches the east end station.	Not significant	None required.	Not significant
CULTURAL RESOURCES					
Archaeological resources	Aerial and subway	There is a small potential for encountering resources during construction of the project.	Not significant	A phase I archaeological survey should be conducted and consultation with an archaeologist should be done if artifacts are encountered.	Not significant
Historical and architectural resources	Aerial	The Paddison Ranch (11951 Imperial Highway) is a National Register property that would be adversely affected by: (a) the taking of an 8-foot wide strip of land along its frontage, and (b) the presence of columns, bents and guideway structures that are out of scale with this resource.	Significant	Appropriate landscaping should be provided to reduce the visual prominence of the project structures.	Significant
	Subway	No adverse effects regarding the Paddison Ranch property would occur.	Not applicable	None required.	Not applicable

**TABLE S-1
SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS FOR THE METRO GREEN LINE EASTERLY EXTENSION**

IMPACTS	ALIGNMENT	POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS	SIGNIFICANCE	MITIGATION	RESIDUAL IMPACT
TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION					
Construction	Aerial	One lane of Imperial Highway (in each direction) would be closed during the construction period. This would result in diversion of some traffic to parallel local streets. Some north-south streets may also be affected. Closure of traffic lanes near I-5 and possible temporary closure of I-5 may be necessary.	Significant	A traffic management plan would be developed prior to construction.	Potentially significant
	Subway	Traffic disruption would be confined to the staging area and surrounding streets where trucks hauling away excavated material would be added to existing traffic. The intersection of Studebaker Road and Imperial Highway could be adversely affected, if the west end staging area is used.	Not significant	A traffic management plan would be developed prior to construction.	Not significant
Operation	Aerial	Roadway geometry must be altered along Imperial Highway to accommodate columns placed in the median. Sight distances would be reduced from present conditions.	Significant	Right-of-way should be purchased for required roadway widening.	Potentially significant
	Subway	This alternative should have a minimal effect on traffic	Not significant	None required.	Not significant
	Aerial and subway	Effects on study area intersection levels of service would be the same for both alternatives. In the morning peak, 7 intersections would experience improved level of service, 4 intersections would remain unchanged, and 5 intersections would have an inferior level of service. In the afternoon peak, 9 intersections would experience improved level of service, 3 intersections would remain unchanged, and 4 intersections would have an inferior level of service.	Not significant at any intersection in A.M. peak. Significant at intersection of Norwalk Blvd and I-5 southbound ramp in P.M. peak.	A left-turn pocket should be added to the I-5 southbound ramp at Norwalk Boulevard.	Not significant
Parking	Aerial and subway	An estimated 750 total parking spaces would be recommended for commuter rail and green line patrons. A total of 400 spaces are to be provided. The shortfall could result in overflow parking onto local streets.	Potentially significant	None proposed.	Potentially significant

**TABLE S-1
SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS FOR THE METRO GREEN LINE EASTERLY EXTENSION**

IMPACTS	ALIGNMENT	POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS	SIGNIFICANCE	MITIGATION	RESIDUAL IMPACT
NOISE AND VIBRATION					
Noise	Aerial	Adverse impacts affecting 141 single-family units, 20 multi-family buildings, 3 motels and 1 library.	Significant	Sound barrier placed atop guideway.	Not significant
	Subway	No effects.	Not applicable	None required.	Not applicable
Vibration	Aerial	No effects.	Not applicable	None required.	Not applicable
	subway	Adverse impacts affecting 33 single-family units, 9 multi-family buildings and 3 motels.	Significant.	Floating slabs, ballast mats, special track work, track fasteners.	No effect. (All impacts eliminated.)
AIR QUALITY					
Construction	Aerial	Construction emissions are expected to exceed the SCAQMD threshold of significance for nitrogen oxides. Localized emissions would occur along the length of the corridor.	Significant	Standard construction practices. Adherence to SCAQMD rules.	Not significant
	Subway	Construction emissions are expected to exceed the SCAQMD threshold of significance for nitrogen oxides and reactive organic gases. Localized emissions would be confined to the area surrounding the west end staging area.	Significant	Same as above	Not significant
Operation	Aerial and subway	Both project alternatives would result in reductions in criteria emissions, as compared with the No Project condition. Both project alternatives would result in reductions of carbon monoxide levels at all 7 study area receptors, as compared with existing conditions.	Beneficial	Project is mitigation	Beneficial

**TABLE S-1
SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS FOR THE METRO GREEN LINE EASTERLY EXTENSION**

IMPACTS	ALIGNMENT	POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS	SIGNIFICANCE	MITIGATION	RESIDUAL IMPACT
ENERGY					
Construction	Aerial and subway	Both project alternatives would consume minor amounts of electricity and fossil fuels.	Not significant	Standard conservation practices	Not significant
Operation	Aerial and subway	Both project alternatives would consume minor amounts of electricity for daily operation.	Not significant	Standard conservation practices	Not significant
		Both project alternatives would result in decreases in auto-related fuel consumption	Beneficial	Project is mitigation	Beneficial

