

3-17 VISUAL IMPACTS

Changes Since the Draft EIS/EIR

Subsequent to the release of the Draft EIS/EIR in April 2004, the Gold Line Phase II project has undergone several updates:

Name Change: To avoid confusion expressed about the terminology used in the Draft EIS/EIR (e.g., Phase I; Phase II, Segments 1 and 2), the proposed project is referred to in the Final EIS/EIR as the Gold Line Foothill Extension.

Selection of a Locally Preferred Alternative and Updated Project Definition: Following the release of the Draft EIS/EIR, the public comment period, and input from the cities along the alignment, the Construction Authority Board approved a Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) in August 2004. This LPA included the Triple Track Alternative (2 LRT and 1 freight track) that was defined and evaluated in the Draft EIS/EIR, a station in each city, and the location of the Maintenance and Operations Facility. Segment 1 was changed to extend eastward to Azusa. A Project Definition Report (PDR) was prepared to define refined station and parking lot locations, grade crossings and two rail grade separations, and traction power substation locations. The Final EIS/EIR and engineering work that support the Final EIS/EIR are based on the project as identified in the Final PDR (March 2005), with the following modifications. Following the PDR, the Construction Authority Board approved a Revised LPA in June 2005. Between March and August 2005, station options in Arcadia and Claremont were added.

Changes in the Discussions: To make the Final EIS/EIR more reader-friendly, the following format and text changes have been made:

Discussion of a Transportation Systems Management (TSM) Alternative has been deleted since the LPA decision in August 2004 eliminated it as a potential preferred alternative.

Discussions of the LRT Alternatives have eliminated the breakout of the two track configurations used in the Draft EIS/EIR (Double Track and Triple Track). The Final EIS/EIR reports the impacts of a modified triple track configuration (2 LRT tracks and 1 freight track with two rail grade separations) but focuses on the phasing/geographic boundaries included in the LPA decisions.

Two LRT alternatives in the Final EIS/EIR are discussed under the general heading “Build Alternatives,” and are defined as:

1. Full Build (Pasadena to Montclair) Alternative: This alternative would extend LRT service from the existing Sierra Madre Villa Station in Pasadena through the cities of Arcadia, Monrovia, Duarte, Irwindale, Azusa, Glendora, San Dimas, La Verne, Pomona, and Claremont, terminating in Montclair. The cities from Pasadena to Azusa are also referred to in the Final EIS/EIR as Segment 1. The cities from Glendora to Montclair are also referred to in the Final EIS/EIR as Segment 2. Key changes from the Draft EIS/EIR are the inclusion of Azusa in Segment 1, the elimination of the Pacific Electric right-of-way option between Claremont and Montclair, the inclusion of a 24-acre Maintenance and Operations facility in Irwindale (the site is smaller than in the Draft EIS/EIR), and the addition of two rail grade separations. Note that the Maintenance and Operations Facility is located in Segment 1 but is part of the Full Build Alternative. In other words, it would not be constructed as an element of the Build LRT to Azusa Alternative (described below). The length of the alternative is approximately 24 miles. One station (and parking) would be located in each city, except for Azusa, which would have two. There are two options for the station locations in Arcadia and Claremont. Segment 1 would include 2 LRT tracks throughout and 1 freight track between the Miller Brewing Company in Irwindale and the eastern boundary of Azusa. The freight track that now exists

- west of Miller Brewing, which serves a single customer in Monrovia, would be removed from service following relocation of that customer by the City of Monrovia. Segment 2 would include two LRT tracks throughout and 1 freight track between the eastern boundary of Azusa and Claremont. In Claremont, the single freight track joins up with the double Metrolink tracks (which are also used for freight movement) and continues through to Montclair (and beyond). This alternative also includes two railroad grade separations (in Azusa and in Pomona) so that LRT tracks would pass above the at-grade freight track. These allow the LRT and freight services to operate independently (thus eliminating the time-constrained double track option discussed in the Draft EIS/EIR). Implementation of the alternative would include relocation of the existing freight track within the rail right-of-way, but there would be no changes in the service provided to customers. The alternative includes 8 new traction power substations in Segment 2, as well as the 8 in Segment 1.
2. Build LRT to Azusa Alternative: This alternative (also referred to as Segment 1) would extend LRT service from the existing Sierra Madre Villa Station in Pasadena through the cities of Arcadia, Monrovia, Duarte, Irwindale, and to the eastern boundary of Azusa. (The main change from the Draft EIS/EIR is the inclusion of the City of Azusa.) The length of the alternative is approximately 11 miles. One station (and parking facility) would be located in each city, except for Azusa, which would have two. There are two options for the station location in Arcadia. Segment 1 would include two LRT tracks throughout and 1 freight track between the Miller Brewing Company in Irwindale and the eastern boundary of Azusa. The freight track that now exists west of Miller Brewing, which serves a single customer in Monrovia, would be removed from service following relocation of that customer by the City of Monrovia. This alternative also includes the railroad grade separation in Azusa so that LRT tracks would pass above the at-grade freight track. This allows the LRT and freight services to operate independently (thus eliminating the time-constrained double track option discussed in the Draft EIS/EIR). Implementation of the alternative would include relocation of the existing freight track within the rail right-of-way, but there would be no changes in the service provided to customers. The alternative also includes 8 new traction power substations.

As in the Draft EIS/EIR, impact forecasts use 2025 conditions, except for traffic impacts, which reflects a 2030 forecast based on the recently adopted 2004 SCAG Regional Transportation Plan.

Summary of Impacts

The No Build alternative would not have substantive visual impacts in the study corridor cities that are not addressed in project-specific environmental documents (e.g., for Eastside Extension LRT).

For the Build Alternatives within the Segment 1 portion of the project visual impacts are anticipated in the cities of Monrovia and Duarte due to the potential removal of the oleander screening hedgerow. This hedgerow extends along Duarte Road east from Myrtle Avenue in Monrovia, through the city of Duarte. Within the Foothill Extension Segment 2 portion of the project ~~in the city of La Verne~~, it is likely that a few Deodar cedar tree landscape screening in the City of La Verne (roughly between Walnut and Park Avenues) would need to be removed, resulting in a visual impact. Also within Segment 2, if the Option A station is implemented in Claremont, a row of mature pepper trees on the south side of the right of way would need to be removed to allow for right of way expansion. ~~A draft mitigation measure is proposed to replace the hedgerow tree row with comparable landscaping consistent with that provided in Phase I.~~

Mitigation measures for the loss of landscape materials are provided.

3-17.1 Existing Conditions

The No Build Alternative includes only one element that would substantially affect the visual environment. The visual impacts of the Eastside LRT Extension are addressed in the environmental document for that project. The other projects in the No Build Alternative, increases in Gold Line Phase I service, and improvements in bus service, do not include elements that would substantially affect the visual environment. Bus service improvements in the No Build Alternative may involve new or modified bus shelters, but the potential impact of the facilities to the visual environment would be minimal. In addition, no specific locations of new or modified bus shelters have been identified. Accordingly, this section does not address the existing conditions related to bus service improvements.

The Gold Line ~~Phase II Foothill Extension~~ would utilize existing railroad rights-of-way along a 24-mile corridor within ~~13~~ 12 municipalities, including the cities of ~~South Pasadena~~, Pasadena, Arcadia, Monrovia, Duarte, Azusa, Glendora, La Verne, San Dimas, Pomona, Claremont, and Montclair for ~~commuter rail system or potentially~~ combination of commuter and freight rail service. Due to the fact that the project utilizes existing railroad right-of-way and is not changing the use of the property from its original railroad function, the potential for adverse effects to visual resources, overall, is minimal.

3-17.1.1 Pasadena

The proposed LRT project would occur within the existing center right-of-way of I-210 (Foothill Freeway). The existing Sierra Madre Villa station includes the train platform/station and catenary system in the median of I-210 to the west of the station. The proposed extension would be in the center of the freeway to the east of the existing station and will be seen chiefly by motorists on the freeway. Concrete block soundwalls and mature trees are present on both sides (north and south) and serve to block views across the top of the freeway from the adjoining neighborhoods as well as views from the freeway to the surrounding neighborhood and the distant San Gabriel Mountains (north).

3-17.1.2 Arcadia

The proposed project would leave the freeway right-of-way in Arcadia, briefly traversing the northern edge of an attractive Post-World War II residential subdivision and Newcastle Park (north of W. Colorado Boulevard), while gradually transitioning from the elevation at the freeway ~~(elevated alignment)~~ to an at-grade elevation at Santa Anita Avenue. To the west of Newcastle Park, the right-of-way exists to the rear of and in close proximity to houses. In this particular location, the trains would overlook backyards and passengers could potentially see inside a small number of houses that directly abut the railroad right-of-way. Along the north and east borders of Newcastle Park the grade of the railroad bed rises for the crossing of W. Colorado Boulevard atop an attractive Art Deco-style overpass (**Figure 3-17.1**). At Santa Anita and W. Colorado Boulevard the railroad right-of-way enters Arcadia's old commercial-industrial district, which is developed chiefly with one and two-story mid-twentieth and late-twentieth-century buildings of disparate design. The Santa Anita Avenue median is planted with mature pine trees, as majority of which are 50 to 75 feet tall, serving to buffer views of the city-proposed grade separation (should it be funded). Due to its lack of visual coherence, this neighborhood is not of architectural/visual interest. It contains neither documented historic buildings, nor designated/proposed scenic highways or scenic vistas. It is also a local redevelopment area where new mid- and long-term development governed by the City's current urban design guidelines will bring parcel consolidation and demolitions (**Figure 3-17.2**).



Figure 3-17.1: Arcadia, Railroad Crossing, at W. Colorado Blvd.

Source: Jones & Stokes, December 2003.



Figure 3-17.2: Arcadia, Proposed Station Setting, View W. Across First Street

Source: Jones & Stokes, December 2003.

The Gold Line Foothill Extension would introduce catenary (overhead wires that power the LRT vehicles approximately 42-16 feet above track level and new metal security fencing (along the railroad right-of-way) as new visual elements. In addition, to retrofitting existing railroad bridges, a rail grade separation over Santa Anita Avenue has been requested by the City of Arcadia, and an aerial station over N. First Street (at Santa Clara Street) is proposed as one of three possible station alternatives under consideration (Option B). This structure would reach 30 feet at its highest point. It should be noted that the City of Arcadia has voiced general concerns that catenary placement and other design features not adversely affect views and vistas. The catenary system must be developed in accordance with LACMTA standards. There are limited opportunities to modify the design of the catenary system; these are generally limited to

the design of the main support pole such as use of tubular steel poles rather than I-beams and painting poles rather than having a galvanized finish. Conformance with local design standards ~~is anticipated however,~~ would generally be limited to the design of stations and parking.

East of North First Street, the existing rail alignment transitions to a berm, which allows it to cross above Huntington Drive. The alignment remains on this berm until to reaches the city limits of Monrovia.

3-17.1.3 Monrovia

The Project alignment begins on an elevated berm at the west city limits, then traverses to nearly flat terrain. The alignment passes through a primarily residential neighborhood as it angles along a southeasterly alignment toward Duarte Road (**Figure 3-17.3**). It then enters an industrial/commercial district along Duarte Road. Residences and commercial buildings are somewhat more buffered from the railroad right-of-way than in Arcadia (i.e., north of Colorado Boulevard). The overwhelming majority of the development adjoining the railroad right-of-way is the product of the recent past. With the exception of the historic ATSF Railroad Depot, other development adjoining the railroad right-of-way is of recent date and/or is not ~~thought~~ significant in architectural/historical terms. The key visual resources ~~within the APE~~ along the alignment are the Spanish Colonial Revival Style Monrovia Santa Fe Train depot (which abuts the ATSF Railroad tracks on the north, near the northwest corner of Myrtle Avenue and Duarte Road)(**Figure 3-17.4**); and an oleander hedgerow along the north side of Duarte Road east of Myrtle Avenue. The hedgerow is an important visual resource because of its scale and its intended function to screens the railroad tracks and train traffic from view. This feature extends from Monrovia eastward into the City of Duarte. The most notable visual resource just outside the ~~APE~~ rail alignment, on the south side of Duarte Road, is the Live Oak Memorial Park cemetery (at California Avenue).

3-17.1.4 Duarte

The Project's railroad right-of-way borders a mixed commercial-industrial-residential district along the north side of Duarte Road dating chiefly from the 1960s and later. On the north side of the rail right of way, there are residences, between Mountain and Highland. These residences front on Three Ranch and other streets. Most of the residences are separated from the rail right-of-way by masonry or wooded property walls. Across Duarte Road to the south is a combination of commercial, single-family residential uses, and the large campus of the City of Hope. A tall oleander hedgerow approximately 9-10 feet tall extends east from Monrovia through much of Duarte, screening much of the railroad track area from view from the south along Duarte Road (including the City of Hope) (**Figure 3-17.5**). Although oleander is a very common plant material in Southern California, the hedgerow is a significant visual resource because of its scale and its intended role in screening the railroad corridor.

3-17.1.5 Irwindale

The alignment traverses a rolling sparsely developed area that is defined geographically by the San Gabriel River/Flood Control Basin, and its chaparral landscape dotted with river rock. It follows an alignment along the northern border of the Santa Fe Dam Flood Control Basin/Recreation Area and Miller Brewery property (**Figure 3-17.6**). The Santa Fe Recreation Area is a key visual landmark in Irwindale. To the west of the Miller Brewery property is the potential LRT maintenance facility/yard site. On the border of Santa Fe Recreation Area, to the west, is another visually dominant feature in this setting: a large freeway interchange that connects the 210 Freeway and 605 (San Gabriel River) Freeway (Figure 3-17.7). Santa Fe Dam is a key visual landmark in Irwindale. Adjoining the railroad right-of-way and the proposed station just ~~west~~ east of N. Irwindale Avenue is the I-210 (Foothill Freeway), which along with Irwindale Avenue ~~causeway~~ overcrossing of the railroad, dominates the proposed station setting visually. Irwindale Avenue serves as a key north-south thoroughfare. It is elevated (20 to 25 feet)

in its crossing over the railroad right-of-way and the I-210 (Foothill Freeway). It is bordered on the east by an extensive industrial park developed with large tilt-up concrete warehouses and manufacturing buildings that appear to date chiefly from the 1980s and 1990s. The streets are planted with Chinese elm and pine parkway trees. This setting as a whole does not possess high visual quality. ~~On the border of Santa Fe Dam, to the west, is another visually dominant feature in this setting: a large freeway interchange that connects the 210 Freeway and 605 (San Gabriel River) Freeway (Figure 3-17.7).~~ The San Gabriel River/Flood Control Basin is not designated or proposed for designation as a scenic corridor, but does afford medium-quality views of the San Gabriel Mountains (north).



Figure 3-17.3: Monrovia, Railroad Right-of-Way, SE from Fifth Ave.

Source: Jones & Stokes, November 2003.



Figure 3-17.4: Monrovia, ATSF RR Depot, View E. Toward Myrtle Ave.

Source: Jones & Stokes, November 2003.



Figure 3-17.5: Duarte, Typical Oleander Hedgerow, Duarte Road, View NE

Source: Jones & Stokes, November 2003.



Figure 3-17.6: Irwindale, Overview San Gabriel River Basin

Source: Jones & Stokes, August 2003.



Figure 3-17.7: Irwindale, Railroad Right-of-Way and Freeway, View W

Source: Jones & Stokes, August 2003.

The City of Irwindale has formulated design standards stipulating that all new commercial and industrial development convey a Spanish or Mission Revival design theme. This should inform the architectural program for the design of the station and maintenance facility, ~~and parking facility~~ proposed in Irwindale.

3-17.1.6 Azusa

The project alignment traverses an urbanized setting featuring commercial, industrial, and residential development—including a number of potential historic buildings in Downtown Azusa. In the western portion of the city (between the municipal boundary and Orange Avenue) the railroad right-of-way is elevated above the adjoining streets, sitting atop a berm that is on average 10 feet above the adjoining single-family residential buildings, eventually crossing Foothill Boulevard on a trestle approximately 18 feet above street level. Common commercial and industrial buildings from the recent past (1970s, 1980s) are located along the south side of Foothill Boulevard (N. Lemon Avenue to the west) and serve to block views of the railroad right-of-way from the north. The setting both south and north of the railroad does not possess high visual quality. East of San Gabriel Avenue, the railroad right-of-way is fairly wide. Unattractive industrial-commercial development occurs along the south. In Downtown Azusa the Civic Center and the old commercial district lie south of the right-of-way while large industrial facilities and a modest residential neighborhood occur north of the right-of-way. The Azusa Depot (1946) is a Streamlined Modern design, which ~~appears~~ has been determined eligible for the California Register of Historical Resources and, therefore, ~~should~~ would be considered a visual resource (Figure 3-17.8). The Foothill Extension LRT Station location would be north and just east of the Depot ~~approximately 180 feet east of N. Azusa Avenue. It would span the current location of Alameda Avenue, which would be closed.~~ As with most of the proposed Gold Line Foothill Extension, corridor views of the San Gabriel Mountains (north) are the primary visual resource in this locale, along with the presence of historic buildings ~~outside the APE~~ in scattered locations nearby (viz., Azusa Civic Center, Azusa Historical Museum building)(Figure 3-17.9). In the eastern portion of Azusa and western portion of Glendora is the former Monrovia Nursery site, which straddles ~~three~~ two governmental jurisdictions, ~~including unincorporated Los Angeles County land~~ (Figure 3-17.10). The Nursery is was a significant agricultural resource but is not a significant visual resource. Conversion of the property to mixed-use medium-density residential-commercial development is ~~proposed~~ planned. Adjoining it on the south is the Covina Canal, an artifact of the area's agricultural history. Local water district plans call for the near-term undergrounding of the canal, so no visual effect to it from the Gold Line project is anticipated.

Adjoining the proposed Azusa-Citrus Station site are nursery and residential and institutional uses. Short-to-medium-term conversion of the nursery property to residential-commercial development is anticipated. New grade separated street improvements/overpasses are proposed at Palm Drive and Citrus Avenue.



Figure 3-17.8: Azusa, ATSF Railroad Depot, View SW

Source: Jones & Stokes, December 2003.



Figure 3-17.9: Azusa, View SE from Railroad Right-of-Way at Alameda

Source: Jones & Stokes, December 2003.



Figure 3-17.10: Azusa, View E (Adj. Nursery) toward Azusa-Citrus Station Site

Source: Jones & Stokes, August 2003.

3-17.1.7 Glendora

Adjoining the proposed Azusa-Citrus Station site are nursery and residential and institutional uses. Short- to medium-term conversion of the nursery property to residential-commercial development is anticipated, however, and new grade-separated street improvements/overpasses are proposed at Palm Drive and Citrus Avenue. In western Glendora, the project traverses a neighborhood in which community-scaled commercial and residential uses predominate. In the urbanized setting adjacent to the proposed train station at Glendora Avenue, development includes community-scaled retail commercial to the south, and a post office to the north that dates from the recent past (c 1980) (Figure 3-17.11). A late nineteenth and early twentieth century residential neighborhood (containing potential historic districts) is located to the east and northeast across Glendora Avenue, and should be considered a visual resource even though located outside the APE (Figure 3-17.12). Medium-quality views of the San Gabriel Mountains (north) and historic buildings in scattered locations are the primary scenic resources in this locale. However, there are no other designated/proposed scenic vistas or other scenic resources in this setting.

3-17.1.8 San Dimas

In the western portion of the city (at Lone Hill Avenue above Gladstone Street) the proposed project right-of-way traverses an urbanized setting marked first by a regional-scaled retail/automobile showroom district and light industrial development, and next, by ordinary single-family residential development— dating overwhelmingly from the recent past. There are stretches of open space in the South Hills area in which native vegetation occurs, creating a sylvan atmosphere (from San Dimas Wash north).



Figure 3-17.11: Glendora, Setting of Proposed Station, View W from Glendora Ave.

Source: Jones & Stokes, December 2003.



Figure 3-17.12: Glendora, View E. across Glendora Avenue of Neighborhood Adjoining Proposed Station

Source: Jones & Stokes, December 2003.

The old San Dimas business and residential district, which includes early Twentieth century buildings, is located along Bonita Avenue, between Cataract and San Dimas Avenues. An “Out West/Frontier” design theme has been adopted (simple board-batten, wood-sided, and brick architectural treatments)(**Figure 3-17.13**). The adjoining neighborhood includes ~~an old citrus~~ the historic San Dimas Lemon Association Packing House (at the northwest corner of Cataract and Bonita Avenues) (**Figure 3-17.14**) and Late Victorian and early twentieth century dwellings (~~outside the APE~~). ~~Two potential station siting options are under consideration (Triple Track configuration). In Option One, the station would be sited between Cataract Avenue and Acacia Street adjacent to the historically significant packinghouse property and eater corner (across Bonita Avenue) from the historic San Dimas Railroad Depot and its cluster of camphor and native oak trees (visual resources)(Figure 3-17.14). In Option Two, the station would adjoin the Depot (side platform configuration)~~ Catenary and safety fencing ~~and the platforms themselves~~ would be new visual elements in this setting, which has a chiefly early twentieth century character and medium-high visual quality. However, these new visual elements would not strongly contrast with the setting or bring a dramatic departure, in design terms, from the railroad’s historic/on-going function.

3-17.1.9 La Verne

In this urbanized setting, single-family residential and educational institutions are the primary uses west of D Street, including Damien High School and La Verne University. At about D Street, the old La Verne business and residential district adjoins the railroad right-of-way (north). Numerous buildings in this setting ~~although outside the APE~~ are locally listed historic resources. The historic district, generally located one block north of the railroad right-of-way, consists chiefly of twentieth century buildings constructed at different time periods. The identifying features that define the historic district ~~are outside the APE and~~ would not be adversely affected by the proposed project, which is ~~potentially proposed~~ at E Street and Arrow Highway—a location that is not visually sensitive (**Figure 3-17.15**). Along the southern border of the railroad right-of-way along Arrow Highway is a non-continuous row of Deodar cedar (*Cedrus deodara*) trees planted to provide visual screening of the existing railroad right-of-way (**Figure 3-17.16**).



Figure 3-17.13: San Dimas, ATSF Depot and Old Business District, View SW

Source: Jones & Stokes, December 2003.

The proposed Station site is shown in **Figure 3-17.17** . The City of La Verne “Arrow Corridor Specific Plan” (per the June 2001 update) specifies the Deodar cedar tree and Crepe Myrtle as the Master Plan street trees along the north side of Arrow Highway. The tree row is a significant visual resource because ~~of its role in screening it~~ it serves to screen the railroad corridor.



Figure 3-17.14: San Dimas, View NW from ATSF Depot to LRT Station Site

Source: Jones & Stokes, December 2003.



Figure 3-17.15: La Verne, View SE from E Street N of Arrow Highway

Source: Jones & Stokes, December 2003.



Figure 3-17.16: La Verne, Row of Deodar Cedars, N Side of Arrow Hwy., View E

Source: Jones & Stokes, December 2003.



Figure 3-17.17: La Verne, View E along Railroad Right-of-Way from E Street

Source: Jones & Stokes, December 2003.

~~(NEPA)/significant impact (CEQA) If the larger cedars are not retained when possible to do so and suitable replacement landscape screening is not proposed an adverse effect (NEPA)/significant effect (CEQA) could result.~~

3-17.1.10 Pomona

The proposed alignment for the project traverses an urbanized setting in which single-family residential neighborhood and community-scale commercial uses predominate (east). In the western portion of the city, at Garey Avenue and continuing west, the right of way traverses an industrial park comprised of concrete tilt-up-constructed light manufacturing and commercial buildings of recent date (c 1990)(**Figure 3-17.18**). To the north and northeast of the railroad right-of-way are earlier mid-twentieth century industrial facilities on large lots. ~~In most options,~~ The station is proposed approximately 1000 feet west of Garey (adjoining Santa Fe Street) north of the existing Metrolink Train Station (**Figure 3-17.19**). Concrete industrial buildings of recent date and the double-wide expanse of train tracks dominate this setting visually. The north side of the alignment between Garey and Towne Avenues is primarily developed with large industrial facilities dating from the 1960s and later. By contrast, the south side of the alignment in this same segment is developed with a combination of single-family residential, large industrial facilities (1970s and later), and Palomares Park. Palomares Park contains the historic Palomares Adobe, however the adobe is located at the southern edge of the park (fronting Arrow Highway) and is thus approximately 600 feet from the alignment and blocked from view by intervening park development (Figure 3-17.20). Typical views north to the San Gabriel Mountains can be glimpsed at this location, however, there are no designated/proposed scenic vistas or other scenic resources in this setting, except the nearby ATSF train depot (1941)(located east, at Garey Avenue). This is the only noteworthy historical/visual resource in this locale, as the other nearby buildings are typical, quite ordinary suburban industrial/commercial development from the recent past. ~~In one of the options(Option D/F) (rather than Garey Avenue) a A rail grade separation is planned to cross Towne Avenue.~~ Both to the north and south of the railroad right-of-way, industrial and commercial uses predominate adjoining the Towne Avenue station site, with some single-family residential uses occurring to the south (approximately 575 feet west of Towne Avenue). With the exception of medium-value views of the mountains, no scenic resources were identified in this setting. ~~No effects to visual resources, therefore, are expected to result from the Towne Avenue station siting option~~

3-17.1.11 Claremont

Land use along the portion of the proposed project right-of-way west of Indian Hill Avenue includes residential and twentieth century industrial structures (under conversion to institutional and commercial uses). East of Indian Hill Avenue there is a mix of commercial, residential, and institutional buildings—the institutional buildings being chiefly associated with Pomona College. The proposed LRT station options occur in a densely developed setting that includes Claremont Villas, a three-story senior housing facility (south) and a three-story office building (north). Both buildings are products of the recent past however (**Figure 3-17.21**).

Several historic buildings are located in the Claremont Village district in vicinity of the station ~~outside the APE~~ (chiefly across First Street to the north). Across Indian Hill Avenue to the west is a large vacant parcel ~~(site of the proposed three-level parking structure)~~ adjoined to the west by the large two-story College Heights Lemon Packinghouse (532 W. First St.). One of a small number of surviving early twentieth century citrus packing plants along the ATSF/BNSF Railroad corridor, it has been determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. Noteworthy among the historic buildings adjoining (east) the station is the National Register-listed old Claremont ATSF Railroad Depot (110 W. First St.)(**Figure 3-17.22**). Although Claremont Village, in general, is an area of high aesthetic quality (viz., architectural quality, abundant mature street trees) there are no designated or proposed scenic highways,

view corridors, or scenic vistas in this neighborhood. Because of the trees and dense placement of buildings in Claremont Village there are only fleeting views of the San Gabriel Mountains (north)—an esthetic resource. ~~The project poses effects to visual resources due to changes to the existing Metrolink improvements at Claremont Station.~~ Conformance with local design standards in the architectural/landscape design treatment would be accorded the proposed parking structure, and LRT station. ~~Nor would LRT-related improvements (viz., catenary, safety fencing) potentially proposed along the railroad alignment would not strongly contrast with the setting or bring a dramatic departure, in design terms, from the railroad's historic/on-going function.~~ pose an adverse/significant effect to visual resources. ~~Mature trees on the south side of the rail right of way at the Claremont Depot would be removed if Station Option A were implemented, since the right of way would need to be expanded by about 30 feet to the south.~~



Figure 3-17.18: Pomona, Railroad Right-of-Way, View W to Metrolink Station

Source: Jones & Stokes, December 2003.



Figure 3-17.19: Pomona, ATSF Railroad Depot (at Garey Avenue)

Source: Jones & Stokes, August 2003.



Figure 3-17.20: Pomona, Railroad Right-of-Way, Rear of Park, View SW

Source: Jones & Stokes, August 2003.



Figure 3-17.21: Claremont, Office Development Adjoining Railroad Station, View E

Source: Jones & Stokes, November 2003.



Figure 3-17.22: Claremont, ATSF Railroad Depot

Source: Jones & Stokes, November 2003.

3-17.1.12 Montclair

The proposed alignment for the project traverses an urban setting developed with a diverse range of uses in which neighborhood- and community-scale retail shopping centers, industrial, rock quarrying/water catchment, and the Montclair TransCenter (multi-modal transit center)(circa 1990) are the chief land uses (**Figure 3-17.23**). The Montclair TransCenter property extends from Monte Vista Avenue (west) to Central Avenue (east, between the ATSF/BNSF Railroad right-of-way and Richton Street, north). It is developed with bus lanes, bus passenger shelters, a large surface parking lot, and a Metrolink train station. To the north is a large expanse of vacant chaparral dotted with river rock. In general, this neighborhood in Montclair is not aesthetically significant. There are no designated/proposed scenic corridors/vistas and no identified historic resources in the vicinity of ~~either the North Station or South Station~~the station site. Almost all the development adjacent to the proposed project rights-of-way dates from the recent past and is unimportant in architectural and landscape terms (**Figure 3-17.24**). Medium-value views of the San Gabriel Mountains (north)—the only aesthetic resource in this setting—would remain unimpaired by the proposed project.



Figure 3-17.23: Montclair TransCenter, View E Along Railroad Right-of-Way

Source: Jones & Stokes, November 2003.

3-17.1.13 Upland

~~The potential “North Station” alignment (along the Southern Pacific Railroad right-of-way) for the project traverses a setting characterized almost exclusively industrial, rock quarrying/water catchment uses, as well as the Montclair Transcenter (multi-modal transit center)(circa 1990). This setting is of low visual quality. There are no designated/proposed scenic corridors/vistas, no identified historic resources in the vicinity of the North Station site, and views of the mountains of only medium value. Almost all the development adjacent to the proposed project rights-of-way dates from the recent past and is unimportant in architectural and landscape terms (Figure 3-17.23).~~



Figure 3-17.24: Montclair TransCenter, View N

Source: Jones & Stokes, November 2003.

3-17.2 Environmental Impacts

3-17.2.1 Evaluation Methodology

The visual impact assessment follows the FHWA/CALTRANS guidelines for assessing visual impacts associated with transportation projects as outlined in *Environmental Impact Statement Visual Impact Discussion* (undated) and *Visual Impact Assessment for Highway Projects* (March 1981). The analysis is intended to satisfy the provisions of NEPA and CEQA with reference to visual impacts associated with transportation projects. NEPA states that it is the “continuous responsibility” of federal government “to use all practicable means to assure for all Americans safe, healthful, productive, and aesthetically and culturally pleasing surroundings.” After the adoption of NEPA in 1969, the Council on Environmental Quality published NEPA implementation regulations. These regulations direct that the EIS include discussion of urban quality, historic, and cultural resources, and the design of the built environment.

Visual Quality is one of the precepts used to analyze the aesthetic characteristics of a project on the surrounding environment. The FHWA *Visual Impact Assessment for Highway Projects Guidelines* utilize the criteria of vividness, intactness, and unity in assessing visual quality. Vividness is the visual power or memorability of landscape components as they combine in striking and distinctive patterns. Intactness is the visual integrity of the landscape and its freedom from encroaching elements. Unity is the visual coherence and compositional harmony of the landscape considered as a whole. Views of high visual quality have several of the following six characteristics:

- topographic relief
- a variety of vegetation

- rich colors
- impressive scenery
- unique natural features
- unique built features.

Viewer Sensitivity ratings were one of the key analytical tools employed in performing a visual assessment for this project. Residential viewers are generally thought to have a high level of sensitivity because of their desire to preserve an attractive environment near their homes, and due to the on-going long-term nature of their views. With the exception of persons driving for pleasure (sightseeing), motorists are thought to have a low level of sensitivity, generally speaking, due to the fact that their attention is directed chiefly on driving. Commercial/industrial occupants are thought to have a low-to-medium level of viewer sensitivity due to the focus on daily business activities and the often intermittent nature of views. Due to the fact that the project will utilize already extant railroad rights-of-way utilized at present and historically for railroad transportation functions, and because the improvements are minor in nature, viewer sensitivity ratings were expected to be low in a majority of the locations along the project alignments. In a small number of instances, when landscape screening is potentially proposed for removal (viz., Monrovia east of Myrtle Avenue, Duarte, La Verne) and due to the close proximity of historic buildings (viz., ~~Monrovia~~ La Verne, San Dimas, Claremont), viewer sensitivity was ~~rated high~~ thought to be heightened.

3-17.2.2 Impact Criteria

a. NEPA Impact Criteria

NEPA, and the Commission on Environmental Quality and FHWA Guidelines that were created to implement it, provide only general guidance on how to determine effects to visual resources. An action that would result in the demolition, or other substantial adverse change to aesthetically noteworthy and/or culturally significant resources would be considered an adverse effect under NEPA. After the visual character and quality of the project setting have been assessed the key question under NEPA would be:

- Does the proposed project introduce new visual elements that would strongly contrast or otherwise be incompatible with the character of the area if the area is of high quality or has a sensitivity rating of medium to high?

Another secondary measure of impact associated with NEPA is the potential level of controversy posed by the proposed change to the visual resource. If the proposed change is likely to be controversial then the project is likely to have an adverse effect.

b. CEQA Impact Criteria

CEQA requires that a determination be made whether an impact is significant or not. The CEQA Checklist provides specific impact criteria under CEQA. In general, an effect to the environment is considered significant if any of the following conditions would result, either singly or in combination with each other from the proposed project:

- Substantially degrades existing visual character within the project setting, or;
- Damages significant visual resources (including trees/landscape features, rock outcroppings, historic buildings, etc.), or;
- Adversely affects a scenic vista or scenic view, or;

- Introduces substantial new shadow effects on sensitive users, or;
- Introduces substantial glare that would affect sensitive users, or;
- Creates substantial artificial light that would adversely affect nighttime views in the area.

3-17.2.3 Construction Period Impacts

During the construction period, the existing rail right of way would be reconstructed to accommodate two LRT tracks and, in the area between Irwindale and Pomona, a single freight track. Construction impacts that would result from construction of the Build Alternatives may include limited demolitions of existing structures, taking up of and shifting rail tracks, removal and replacement of ballast, the installation of temporary barricades and scaffolding adjoining bridges/overpasses that are proposed for retrofit or replacement, installation of overhead contact electrification systems and communications/signaling systems, and some excavation adjoining railroad crossings for the installation of roadway improvements (e.g., signal gates). Construction-related activities would cause temporary visual disruptions related chiefly to the placement of barricades, construction security fencing, stock-piled building materials, scaffolding associated with overpass construction, excavation fencing, the laying of track and replacement ballast, and some demolition activities. Construction vehicles would also be present on a short-term basis (viz., pile driving and trenching equipment, bulldozers, rollers, cranes, concrete trucks, pumping equipment, flatbed trucks, dump trucks, and rail-mounted equipment). Accompanying the construction process would be temporary traffic detours, as well as the limited, temporary use of construction land easements to stage construction in places where railroad property staging capacity and/or access is the most constrained.

During the construction period, the only visual resources that would be adversely affected are the oleander hedgerow along Duarte Road in Monrovia and Duarte, a neighborhood in Azusa where a new railroad grade separation would be built, and if station Option A is implemented in Claremont, the mature trees on the south side of the alignment opposite the historic Claremont Depot. These sites are discussed under long term impacts, below. Mitigation measures for these impacts are listed in Section 3-17.3.1.

3-17.2.4 Long Term Impacts

a. Phase I Cities Affected and the Effects

Phase I is that portion of the project within the cities of Los Angeles, South Pasadena and Pasadena that is already in place. Visual impacts under the No Build Alternative would arise in Los Angeles from the Eastside Extension project. Visual impacts are addressed in the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/ Draft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (FTA and LACMTA, 2001) for that project. Another project that will occur in Phase I is the addition of TPSSs to enable more frequent headways following construction of the Eastside Extension. The addition of TPSSs is a project of LACMTA that is unrelated to the proposed Foothill Extension. No impacts to visual resources within the Phase I portion of the project would result from the Foothill Extension project because no new construction is proposed within the Phase I cities portion of the project as part of the Foothill Extension.. For this reason, no mitigation is required.

b. Foothill Extension, Segment 1

The cities in Foothill Extension Segment 1 include Pasadena, Arcadia, Monrovia, Duarte, Irwindale, and Azusa. LRT stations in ~~Phase II~~ the Foothill Extension, Segment 1 would include the existing station at Sierra Madre Villa in Pasadena, and new stations in Arcadia, Monrovia, Duarte, Irwindale, and Azusa. Overall, the project has a low potential to adversely affect visual resources because it will occur within

the existing railroad right-of-way. The proposed project continues past and current railroad use, and brings only minor changes to the design setting. No scenic vistas would be adversely (significantly) affected, since none are designated. Nor are there would be no adverse effects under NEPA (significant impacts under CEQA) related to shade and shadow effects anticipated given that there are no light-sensitive resources adjoining the proposed multi-story garages. The LRT catenary system is not of sufficient mass to create shade and or shadow impacts. Station and parking development would introduce new sources of light. Since these sources can be shielded so that nighttime lighting is focused on the transit properties, there should be no adverse effects under NEPA/significant impacts under CEQA. In accordance with Construction Authority policy, each city will be provided opportunities for design review of stations and parking facilities to help assure that the transit facilities are assimilated into each community with minimal impacts.

Pasadena

No adverse effects (NEPA)/significant impacts (CEQA) are anticipated as a result of the project, which will occur within the median of the I-210 (Foothill Freeway) right-of-way, flanked by the east and west vehicle traffic lanes. Because the freeway is framed by continuous tall masonry soundwalls on both the north and south, the project will be seen only by motorists on the freeway and will not be seen by sensitive receptors from typical vantage points within the adjoining neighborhoods.

Arcadia

No adverse effects (NEPA)/significant impacts (CEQA) are anticipated as a result of the project. The key visual resource is a 1930's-era Art Deco style railroad bridge over Colorado Boulevard that ~~could potentially qualify~~ has been determined to be an historic resource. However, the planned retrofit and rehabilitation would not pose an adverse (NEPA)/significant effect (CEQA) ~~if~~ because it will be carried out in conformance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. New visual elements in the city include catenary, safety fencing, station platforms, and a traction power substation. ~~In Option B, an aerial station would be constructed including an overpass over N. First Street. However, none of the three station siting alternatives under consideration would adversely affect/pose a significant impact to scenic resources.~~ The design setting consists ~~overwhelmingly~~ of a mix of residential and commercial/light industrial land uses, lacks visual cohesiveness, and is of low-to-moderate visual quality due to disparate design treatments. Also, no significant architectural resources exist in this setting. Nor would scenic views/vistas be affected because there are no noteworthy, designated and/or proposed scenic vistas at this location (e.g., such as views north of the San Gabriel Mountains). No adverse shade and shadow effects are anticipated as a result of the city-proposed grade separation of Santa Anita Avenue because there are no sensitive viewers in this setting. Although no mitigation is required, in accordance with Construction Authority policy, project conformance with City design guidelines (viz., station architectural treatments, color selection, traction power substation architectural treatments) ~~is anticipated.~~ would occur. ~~Accordingly, no mitigation is required.~~

Monrovia

There is no ~~potentially~~ adverse effect (NEPA)/significant impact (CEQA) ~~is anticipated as a~~ that would result from the proposed project. Residential land uses predominate along the western portion of the LRT corridor (between Fifth and Mayflower Avenues), backing up to the existing railroad without having significant views of it. As a result, the railroad is not a strong visual element. Moreover, there are no identified significant view/vistas, and few visual resources along the corridor. A majority of the development adjoining the railroad right-of-way is the product of the recent past and is neither architecturally or historically significant. No designated and/or proposed scenic vistas exist in this setting. One visual resource adjoins the proposed station at Monrovia: the National Register-eligible Spanish Colonial Revival style ATSF Railroad Depot (1925)(at Myrtle Avenue). This resource ~~could~~

~~potentially would not be~~ adversely affected by the project-related improvements—~~including construction of a multiple level 500 vehicle vehicle parking garage (south, across the railroad right of way from the existing depot, adjoining the car wash).~~ Parking that is part of the Foothill Extension project would be limited to surface parking that would be provided by the City of Monrovia on its current transit center site. Future additional parking that would serve the Foothill Extension would be provided as part of the City's Station Square development. Plans for the Station Square development are only at a preliminary stage at this time and its potential visual impact cannot be assessed. The City of Monrovia will be preparing a specific plan and EIR for the Station Square development in the 2005/2006 time period; potential visual impacts under CEQA will be addressed in that document.

It should be noted that the overall design setting around the proposed LRT station lacks visual cohesiveness and is of low visual quality due to disparate design treatments. ~~Due to the spatial separation of the parking structure and the Depot the project is would not expected to pose an adverse effect to a historic/visual resource.~~ However, Although no mitigation is required, in accordance with Construction Authority policy, project conformance with City design guidelines (viz., station architectural treatments, color selection, traction power substation architectural treatments) would occur.

Given the scale of the oleander hedgerow along Duarte Road, ~~removal of the oleander screening hedge along the north side of Duarte Road (east from Myrtle Avenue), as may is likely to occur be proposed in the Triple Track Alternative, its removal would be an adverse effect (under NEPA)/significant impact (under CEQA) to visual resources. if an appropriate replacement landscaping treatment is not developed. Mitigation: Planting a n ew landscape buffer comparable with the current landscape buffer improvements would mitigate the effect of the removal to a level less than significant. Mitigation is described in Section 3-17.3.1.~~

Duarte

~~The open space found at the City of Hope and the oleander screening hedge along Duarte Road (north side) are the primary visual resources in Duarte in proximity to the project. Removal of the oleander screening hedge, as may occur in the Triple Track Alternative, would pose a potentially adverse effect (under NEPA)/significant impact (under CEQA) to a visual resource if an appropriate replacement landscape treatment is not developed. Mitigation: Planting a new landscape buffer comparable in design with the Gold Line Phase I current landscape buffer improvements would mitigate to a level of insignificance the effect of the removal ing the existing landscaping to a level less than significant. Subsequent to the Draft EIS/EIR, the earlier proposal for a parking structure on the City of Hope campus was eliminated. The elimination of parking would result in there being no impact to the visual open space provided by the City of Hope.~~

Given the scale of the oleander hedgerow along Durate Road, its removal would be an adverse effect (under NEPA)/significant impact (under CEQA) to visual resources. Mitigation is described in Section 3-17.3.1. Although no other design mitigation for other project elements is required, in accordance with Construction Authority policy, project conformance with City design guidelines (viz., station architectural treatments, color selection, traction power substation architectural treatments) would occur.

Irwindale

No adverse effect (under NEPA)/significant impact (under CEQA) to visual resources would result from the project within the city of Irwindale. There are no important visual resources in this setting and no scenic vistas (designated and/or proposed). Accordingly, no mitigation is required.

~~Though not required for mitigation purposes, conformance with City design guidelines is anticipated. Although no mitigation is required, in accordance with Construction Authority policy, project~~

conformance with City design guidelines (viz., station architectural treatments, color selection, traction power substation architectural treatments) would occur.

Azusa

Primarily minor design changes are proposed within the existing rail right-of-way (viz., safety fencing, catenaries, traction power substations) that are appropriate to/compatible with the railroad's historic function. The most significant change will be an approximately 30-foot increase in the elevation of the railroad bed in the Virginia Avenue neighborhood to accommodate a grade-separated crossing over Virginia Avenue. Properties on the north side of the rail alignment are commercial and industrial, as are those on the south side of the alignment on the west side of Virginia. On the south side of the alignment, on the east side of Virginia, there are residential streets. Although the general setting possesses neither medium or high visual quality, the grade separation structure will make it a far more prominent visual feature than it is currently (at roughly 10 to 12 feet above median street grade). The proposed grade separation structure will block a portion of current views of the San Gabriel Mountains that can occur only within the westerly portions of the first blocks south of the railroad (above 6th Street). Such views are the only visual resource in this residential neighborhood.

Since the change in view would occur from only a few locations, and the mountains could still be seen with a slight change in the viewers' line of sight, the introduction of the rail grade separation would not be an adverse effect under NEPA/significant impact under CEQA.

c. Foothill Extension, Segment 2

Foothill Extension Segment 2 cities include Azusa, Glendora, San Dimas, La Verne, Pomona, Claremont, and Montclair, and Upland. With the exception of Montclair, new LRT stations would be constructed in each city. Overall, the project has a low potential to adversely affect visual resources because it will occur within existing railroad right-of-way, continues past and current railroad uses, and brings only minor changes to the design setting. Project impacts would not be adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) in the cities of Glendora, Pomona, San Dimas, or Montclair. No scenic vistas would be adversely (significantly) affected, since none are designated. There would be no adverse effects under NEPA (significant impacts under CEQA) related to shade and shadow effects given that there are no light-sensitive resources adjoining the proposed multi-story garages. The LRT catenary system is not of sufficient mass to create shade and or shadow impacts. Station and parking development would introduce new sources of light. Since these sources can be shielded so that nighttime lighting is focused on the transit properties, there should be no adverse effects under NEPA/significant impacts under CEQA. In accordance with Construction Authority policy, each city will be provided opportunities for design review of stations and parking facilities to help assure that the transit facilities are assimilated into each community with minimal impacts.

~~Minor minor design changes are proposed within the existing rights of way (viz., safety fencing, catenaries, traction power substations) that are appropriate to/compatible with the railroad's historic function. Substantial changes to the visual character or visual quality of the remainder of the project setting east of Orange Avenue will not occur as a result of the project. Therefore the project's effect/impacts to visual resources would not be adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA).~~

Glendora

Minor design changes are proposed within the existing rights-of-way (viz., safety fencing, catenaries, traction power substations, development of a new surface parking lot). Substantial changes to the visual character or visual quality of the project setting will not occur as a result of the project. Therefore project effects/impacts to visual resources would not be adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA).

Although no design mitigation for project elements is required, in accordance with Construction Authority policy, project conformance with City design guidelines (viz., station architectural treatments, color selection, traction power substation architectural treatments) would occur.

San Dimas

Minor design changes are proposed within the existing rights-of-way (viz., safety fencing, catenary, traction power substations, possible development of new surface parking facilities). However, these new visual elements would not strongly contrast with the historic buildings found in the station setting, or bring about a dramatic departure, in design terms, from the railroad's on-going function. The proposed station and parking facility is not located in a visually sensitive area. Therefore Significant changes to the visual character or visual quality of the project setting would not occur as a result of the project, and consequently, project effects/impacts to visual resources would not be adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA).

Although no design mitigation for project elements is required, in accordance with Construction Authority policy, project conformance with City design guidelines (viz., station architectural treatments, color selection, traction power substation architectural treatments) would occur.

La Verne

With the ~~possible~~ exception of cedar tree removal along the north curb line of Arrow Highway, no other substantial changes to the visual character or visual quality of the project setting are proposed. The trees proposed for removal are not mature ones are considered a significant visual resource by the community because of the scale of the plantings and their role in screening the railroad tracks/operations. However ~~However, and if they were replaced with comparable new landscaping, consistent with that provided in Phase I of the Gold Line, the potential adverse effect to visual resources would be mitigated.~~

Current design indicates that the majority of trees would not be affected, while others would need to be trimmed to ensure that the safety envelope needed for rail operations is protected. Given that only a few trees would need to be trimmed, the proposed project would not create an adverse effect under NEPA/significant impact under CEQA. Although no design mitigation for other project elements is required, in accordance with Construction Authority policy, project conformance with City design guidelines (viz., station architectural treatments, color selection, traction power substation architectural treatments) would occur.

Pomona

Minor design changes are proposed within the existing rights-of-way (viz., safety fencing, catenaries, traction power substations). Substantial changes to the visual character or visual quality of the project setting will not occur as a result of the project. Therefore project impacts to visual resources would not be adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA). Accordingly, no mitigation is required.

A grade separation is planned in Pomona at Towne Avenue. The structure would rise about 30 feet above the existing railroad grade. Views of the San Gabriel Mountain would potentially be blocked for residents living to the south. This neighborhood is composed of one-story homes, separated from the rail right of way by a masonry property wall. This wall constrains the view for those residents living closest to the rail right of way. For some residents living further south, the 30 foot high structure would partially block their views of the mountains.

Since the change in view would occur from only a few locations, and the mountains could still be seen with a slight change in the viewers' line of sight, the introduction of the rail grade separation would not be an adverse effect under NEPA/significant impact under CEQA.

Although no design mitigation for other project elements is required, in accordance with Construction Authority policy, project conformance with City design guidelines (viz., station architectural treatments, color selection, traction power substation architectural treatments) would occur.

Claremont

The Claremont Village portion of this setting east of Indian Hill Avenue possesses high visual quality. ~~However, only Minor~~ design changes that are proposed within the existing rights-of-way (viz., station architectural treatment, safety fencing, catenary, traction power substations) adjoining the existing Metrolink train station. If station option A were constructed, the rail right of way would need to be expanded to the south by about 30 feet. This expansion would result in the loss of mature trees that were planted along the south railroad right of way. Although these trees are not protected under the City of Claremont Tree Ordinance, the scale and age of the plantings, their loss would result in an adverse effect under NEPA/significant impact under CEQA. Mitigation is proposed under Section 3-17.3.1

Station option B would place LRT platforms to the east of College Avenue and require no changes to the existing Metrolink platforms to the west of College Avenue. Station option B would be adjacent to College Park. Although new design elements (primarily the station canopies) would be introduced into views looking north from the park, they would not affect the recreational functions of the park. Given that College Park is located in an a developed suburban setting, which also includes view of large water tanks, the proposed transit facilities would not create and adverse effect under NEPA/significant impact under CEQA..

~~The three-level parking structure proposed on the site of current Metrolink parking would be the most intensive design change proposed in Claremont. The structure would be erected west of Indian Hill Avenue (bordering, but outside, Claremont Village) adjoining the Corona College Heights Lemon Packinghouse a two story warehouse of utilitarian design eligible for the National Register. Conformance of the parking garage architectural treatment with City design guidelines is proposed. Overall, when the proposed parking structure and design changes proposed for the station within the rights of way are considered together, substantial changes to the visual character or visual quality of the project setting will not occur as a result of the project. Therefore, project impacts to visual resources would not be adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA), and mitigation would not be required.~~

The 3-story height of the proposed garage is consistent with the height of the commercial building directly across College Avenue. Since the proposed facility is consistent, it would not create an adverse effect under NEPA/significant impact under CEQA. In accordance with Construction Authority policy, project conformance with City design guidelines (viz., station architectural treatments, color selection, traction power substation architectural treatments) would occur.

Montclair

Minor design changes are proposed within the existing rights-of-way (viz., safety fencing catenary, traction power substations). Substantial changes to the visual character or visual quality of the project setting will not occur as a result of the project, and are proposed within the boundaries of the extant multi-modal transit center (TransCenter). Therefore project impacts to visual resources would not be adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA). Accordingly, no mitigation is required.

Although no design mitigation for project elements is required, in accordance with Construction Authority policy, project conformance with City design guidelines (viz., station architectural treatments, color selection, traction power substation architectural treatments) would occur.



Figure 3-17.25: Duarte, Railroad Landscape Screening, E. at Buena Vista Av.

Source: Jones & Stokes, November 2003.

Summary of Impacts for Full Build (Pasadena to Montclair) Alternative

The Full Build (Pasadena to Montclair) Alternative would have adverse effects/significant impacts to visual resources in the cities of Monrovia and Duarte due to the removal of the oleander hedgerow that screens the railroad right of way (between Myrtle Avenue and Highland Avenue, refer to **Figure 3-17.25**) and in Claremont in station option A is implemented due to the removal of mature trees near the Claremont Depot.

Summary of Impacts for Build LRT to Azusa Alternative

The Build LRT to Azusa Alternative would have adverse affects/significant impacts to visual resources within the cities of Monrovia and Duarte due to the removal of the oleander hedgerow that screens the railroad right-of-way (between Myrtle Avenue and Highland Avenue).

3-17.2.5 Cumulative Impacts

The Southern California Association of Governments' (SCAG) 2004 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Final Program EIR is the most applicable certified planning document that provides a regional cumulative

impact assessment for transportation improvements (including the proposed project) through the year 2030. The 2004 RTP EIR concludes that implementation of the RTP could result in obstructed views of scenic resources, which would constitute a significant cumulative impact. New design elements associated with the proposed project, such as safety fencing, catenaries, traction power substations, and passenger platforms, will be constructed at one time taking into account the local design setting, as well as municipal design standards. The project's impacts to visual resources result almost entirely from the removal of screening landscaping. The project's visual changes to the environment would be mitigated and would not fall outside the scope of the regional cumulative impact identified by SCAG in the 2004 RTP EIR.

~~Gold Line Phases I and Phase II Foothill Extension will not introduce dramatic design changes to the project alignment. Nor does implementation of the project call for smaller incremental design changes over time, which although individually minor, would constitute an adverse effect (NEPA)/significant impact to visual resources (CEQA) when considered together. The project utilizes existing railroad rights of way used both historically and at present for railroad related transportation purposes. New design elements associated with the LRT Alternatives, such as safety fencing, catenary, traction power substations, and passenger platforms, will be constructed at one time taking into account the local design setting, as well as municipal design standards. Once constructed, significant new design modifications that could adversely affect (NEPA)/significantly impact (CEQA) visual resources, such as demolitions of historic buildings (e.g., railroad depots) are not envisioned. The project's impacts to visual resources result almost entirely from the removal of screening landscaping, or. However, mitigation is expected to fully address this effect/impact, and no additional spillover effects to visual resources are anticipated.~~

~~Long term effects to visual resources, in the cumulative sense, would not flow from the project. Instead, this threshold would be reached only as a result of a series of major changes to current local government development policy and design/historic preservation policy over time (e.g., policy changes calling for the demolitions of historic buildings, removal of mature landscaping adjoining the project rights of way, and densification of development adjoining project alignments in ways that are inconsistent with current policies that protect and enhance scenic views and vistas). The likelihood of such wholesale changes to local development policy occurring is remote.~~

3-17.2.6 Impacts Addressed by Regulatory Compliance

The framework of mitigation of effects through regulatory compliance is not germane to the visual resources aspect of this particular project. Neither the lead nor co-operating governmental agencies, through specific governing statutes, have on-going mandated regulatory compliance jurisdiction concerning visual resources in this matter. The protection of visual resources in the Gold Line project is promulgated through voluntary conformance with FHWA guidelines for assessing visual impacts associated with transportation projects. These provide a methodology for determining whether visual resources exist and whether impacts to those resources are likely to occur as a result of the proposed project. With mitigation, the proposed project as currently conceived is not expected to result in adverse effects (under NEPA)/significant impacts (under CEQA) to visual resources.

The Construction Authority has implemented a policy to consult with each city regarding design of transit facilities. Where feasible, local design standards will be followed.

3-17.3 Mitigation

3-17.3.1 Construction Period Mitigation Measures

a. No Build Alternative

The No Build Alternative does not require construction-period mitigation measures because compliance with local, state, and/or federal regulatory requirements and/or permits identified in section 3-17.2.9 are expected to mitigate effects to visual resources. There are no elements of the Foothill Extension project that would create construction period impacts.

b. Build Alternatives Construction Period Mitigation

Phase I - The Cities Affected and Proposed Measures

Phase I is that portion of the project within the cities of Los Angeles, South Pasadena and Pasadena that is already in place. No construction period effects in Phase I cities to visual resources are anticipated. would arise from the Foothill Extension, so no mitigation is required.

Foothill Extension, Segment 1 - The Cities Affected and Proposed Measures

Adverse effects to visual resources during the construction period are limited to ~~potential screening~~ removal of landscaping in the cities of Monrovia and Duarte. The ~~draft~~ mitigation measure is to provide landscaping of available right-of-way in a manner consistent with the landscape treatments used in Phase I of the Gold Line. These treatments will consist of hardscape and/or landscape treatments that can be physically accommodated within available right of way, plant materials that are indigenous or adaptable to the Southern California environment, plant materials that can survive with limited maintenance and without introducing safety concerns. All hardscape and landscape treatments must avoid current or future encroachment into the safety enveloped required for operation of an LRT system. Implementation of these measures would ensure that both construction period and long- term adverse visual effects/significant impacts will be mitigated at the conclusion of the construction period. All other construction related effects to visual resources will be fully mitigated through compliance with the local, state, and/or federal regulatory requirements and/or permits identified in Section 3-17.2.9.

Foothill Extension, Segment 2 - The Cities Affected and Proposed Measures

Adverse effects to visual resources during the construction period are limited to ~~potential screening~~ landscaping removal in the city of La Verne and the removal of mature trees in Claremont.

The mitigation measure for loss of mature trees due to right of way expansion is to provide landscaping of available right-of-way in a manner consistent with the landscape treatments used in Phase I of the Gold Line. These treatments will consist of hardscape and/or landscape treatments that can be physically accommodated within available right of way, plant materials that are indigenous or adaptable to the Southern California environment, plant materials that can survive with limited maintenance and without introducing safety concerns. All hardscape and landscape treatments must avoid current or future encroachment into the safety enveloped required for operation of an LRT system. Implementation of these measures would ensure that both construction period and long-term adverse visual effects/significant impacts will be mitigated at the conclusion of the construction period.

In addition, due to the scale of trees that would be removed, the Construction Authority will provide replacement on a one to one basis for each tree removed. Replacement trees will be container grown specimens of native species, at least 36" boxed in size, to be planted at locations to be selected by the City of Claremont. Once planted, the trees will be maintained by the Authority for a period of one-year. At the end of one year, a certified arborist will warrant that the trees are in good health, and if so determined, will be transferred to the City for their ongoing maintenance. Implementation of these measures would ensure that both construction period and long-term adverse effects/significant impacts will be mitigated at the conclusion of the construction period.

Implementation of these measures would ensure that both construction-period and long-term ~~The adverse effects/significant impacts will be mitigated at the conclusion of the construction period.~~ All other construction-related effects to visual resources will be fully mitigated through compliance with the local, state, and/or federal regulatory requirements and/or permits identified in Section 3-17.2.9.

3-17.3.2 Long Term Mitigation

a. No Build Alternative

Since there are no elements of the Foothill Extension project that would be implemented under the No Build Alternative, no long-term mitigation is required.

b. Build Alternatives

Phase I - The Cities Affected and Proposed Measures

Because no construction is proposed within Phase I jurisdictions west of the Sierra Madre Villa LRT Station no effects are anticipated and no mitigation is required.

Foothill Extension, Segment 1 - The Cities Affected and Proposed Measures

No long-term impacts to visual resources are anticipated from operation of Build Alternative project component, so no long term mitigation is required. . Long term impacts would be eliminated or reduced to less than adverse/less than significant levels by complying with the local, state, and/or federal regulatory requirements and/or permits previously identified in Section 3-17.2.9. As a result, project impacts would be not adverse under NEPA and not significant under CEQA. The long-term loss of the oleander hedgerow along Duarte Road would be mitigated by the replacement landscape that would be implemented during construction.

Foothill Extension, Segment 2 - The Cities Affected and Proposed Measures

No long-term impacts to visual resources in Claremont are anticipated from operation of Build Alternative project component, so no long term mitigation is required. The long-term loss of trees if station Option A is implemented would be mitigated by the replacement landscape that would be implemented during construction.

~~Long term impacts would be eliminated or reduced to less than adverse/less than significant levels by complying with the local, state, and/or federal regulatory requirements and/or permits previously identified in Section 3-17.2.9. As a result, project impacts would be not adverse under NEPA and not significant under CEQA, and no long-term mitigation would therefore be required.~~

3-17.4 Impact Results with Mitigation

Impacts resulting from landscape screening removal will be fully mitigated by installing comparable replacement landscaping commensurate with anticipated Phase I landscape improvements.

3-17.4.1 Construction Period

a. No Build Alternative

Construction impacts for the No Build Alternative would not change from the level of impact initially identified since no mitigation measures would be required or implemented.

b. Build Alternatives

Phase I – The Cities Affected and the Results of Construction Period Mitigation Measures

~~No “spill back” impacts in Phase I cities are anticipated when the proposed Triple Track construction period mitigation measures are factored in.~~ No need for mitigation measures for Phase I cities from construction of the Foothill Extension was identified. There would be no “spill back” impacts to Phase I cities from construction of the Foothill Extension since there are no elements of the proposed Extension that affect these cities. Increases in the frequency of service in Phase I cities is a result of implementing LACMTA’s operating plan following construction of the Eastside Extension.

Foothill Extension , Segment 1 – The Cities Affected and the Results of Construction Period Mitigation Measures

~~Construction period impacts to visual resources would be eliminated or reduced to less than adverse/less than significant levels by installing comparable replacement landscaping commensurate with anticipated Phase I landscape improvements, and by complying with the local, state, and/or federal regulatory requirements and/or permits identified in Section 3-17.2.9.~~ by implementation of the construction period mitigation measures identified in Section 3-17.3.1 above. As a result, construction period impacts after mitigation would be not adverse under NEPA and not significant under CEQA.

Foothill Extension, Segment 2 – The Cities Affected and the Results of Construction Period Mitigation Measures

~~Construction period impacts to visual resources would be eliminated or reduced to less than adverse/less than significant levels by installing comparable replacement landscaping commensurate with anticipated Phase I landscape improvements, and complying with the local, state, and/or federal regulatory requirements and/or permits identified in Section 3-17.2.9.~~ by implementation of the construction period mitigation measures identified in section 3-17.3.1 above. As a result, construction period impacts after mitigation would be not adverse under NEPA and not significant under CEQA. Construction period impacts to visual resources would be eliminated or reduced to less than adverse/less than significant levels by complying with the local, state, and/or federal regulatory requirements and/or permits identified in Section 3-17.2.9. As a result, construction period impacts would be not adverse under NEPA and not significant under CEQA.

3-17.4.2 Long Term

a. No Build Alternative

~~Under this alternative, no LRT extension of the Gold Line Foothill Extension would occur, and improvements would be limited to the Eastside Extension, bus service improvements, and street and freeway enhancements already under consideration. Mitigation measures for the Eastside Extension are described in the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/ Draft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (FTA and LACMTA, 2001) for that project. Because only modest changes to existing infrastructure are contemplated under this alternative adverse for bus service improvements and street and freeway enhancements, effects are not likely to occur. Effects would result if historic resources or significant landscape features were proposed for demolition. Visual resource analysis is expected to accompany each grouping of project components under this alternative to minimize the demolition of visual resources~~

b. Build Alternatives

Phase I – The Cities Affected and the Results of Long Term Mitigation Measures

~~No effects to Phase I cities will result from long term mitigation efforts. Section 3-17.3.2 reported that no mitigation measures for Foothill Extension project were needed in Phase I cities. Accordingly, there would be no remainder impacts to be addressed.~~

Foothill Extension , Segment 1 – The Cities Affected and the Results of Long Term Mitigation Measures

~~Long-term impacts to visual resources in Monrovia and Duarte from the loss of the hedgerow along Duarte would be addressed by implementation of the construction-period mitigation measures outlined in Section 3-17.3.1. There would be no remainder impacts.~~

~~Irwindale, and Azusa would be eliminated or reduced to less than adverse/less than significant levels by complying with the local design requirements as identified in Section 3 17.2, and by installing comparable replacement screening landscaping in Monrovia and Duarte commensurate with anticipated Phase I landscaping improvements. No additional measures to mitigate impacts are needed. As a result, long term impacts would not be adverse (under NEPA)/not significant (under CEQA).~~

Foothill Extension, Segment 2 – The Cities Affected and the Results of Long-Term Mitigation Measures

~~Long-term impacts to visual resources in the cities of Azusa, Glendora, San Dimas, La Verne, Pomona City of Claremont, Montclair, and Upland if station option A were implemented, would be eliminated or reduced to less than adverse/less than significant levels by complying with the local design requirements as identified in Section 3 17.2, and by installing comparable replacement screening landscaping in La Verne commensurate with anticipated Phase I landscaping improvements. As a result, no additional long-term measures to mitigate impacts are required. by implementation of the construction-period mitigation measures outlined in Section 3-17.3.1. There would be no remainder impacts.~~