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SUMMARY
Summary

This documentation for the ‘Add One High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) Lane in Each Direction on the San Bernardino Freeway (Interstate 10) from Puente Avenue to State Routes 57/71 in Los Angeles County’ Project (henceforth referred to as the ‘I-10 HOV Lane Project’ or ‘proposed project’) has been prepared in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). For the proposed project, the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) is the project proponent and lead agency under CEQA.

S.1 Overview of the Project Area

The proposed I-10 HOV Lane Project corridor extends just over 9 miles from the Puente Avenue interchange in Baldwin Park east to the SR 57/SR 71 interchange in Pomona. The communities along this section of I-10 were largely developed along with the freeway in the 1950s. The project corridor can be characterized as urban, with the mostly unincorporated, hilly east end less densely developed than incorporated land to the west of Grand Avenue in the City of West Covina. Major land uses within the project corridor are commercial, residential, cemetery, and public (i.e., Cal Poly Pomona).

I-10 currently operates as a four-lane freeway in each direction from the Puente Avenue interchange east to the Citrus Avenue interchange, with auxiliary lanes typically between on- and off-ramps. Going eastbound from Citrus Avenue to the SR 57/SR 71 interchange, the facility operates as a four-lane freeway with one auxiliary lane. In the westbound direction, I-10 operates in a similar fashion to the eastbound direction, with the exception of an additional fifth mixed-flow lane from Via Verde Street to Kellogg Drive.

S.2 Purpose and Objectives

Purpose. The major purpose of the proposed project is threefold, as follows: (1) improve mobility for persons traveling within the corridor by increasing the person-carrying capacity of I-10; (2) increase continuity and decrease travel time by closing a gap in the HOV system; and (3) implement corridor improvements that are consistent with goals of both the Southern California Association of Governments’ 2008 Regional Transportation Plan and the South Coast Air Quality Management District’s 2007 Air Quality Management Plan. The proposed project would also provide incentive and opportunity for individual drivers to switch from single-occupancy vehicles to carpooling or transit.

Objectives. Operationally, I-10 has historically experienced, and will continue to experience, serious traffic congestion. Peak-period traffic demand on I-10 currently exceeds capacity and, as a result of existing and forecasted growth, is expected to continue to exceed capacity.

In addition, there is an existing lack of connectivity between HOV lanes in the proposed project area. Even with completion of the 2.2-mile-long project currently under construction to extend the HOV lanes east to Puente Avenue, a nine-mile gap will remain between HOV lane termini. This gap adversely affects person carrying capacity on I-10 as well as regional connectivity with the HOV system.
Most of the recorded accidents for this segment of I-10 have been sideswipes, rear-ends, and broadsides. These types of accidents are usually associated with end-of-queue or stop-and-go conditions, which are typical on this segment of I-10.

S.3 Description of Proposed Project

The proposed project is located along I-10 in Los Angeles County, California between Puente Avenue in the city of Baldwin Park and the State Route 57 (SR 57)/State Route 71 (SR 71) interchange in the city of Pomona. The subject freeway corridor also traverses the jurisdictions of West Covina, Covina, San Dimas, and Los Angeles County (unincorporated).

The proposed project location would entail the addition of one HOV lane in the center freeway median along 18 lane-miles (nine in each direction) of I-10 from PM 33.2 to PM 42.4. To accommodate HOV lanes, center median reconstruction, freeway widening, and striping and signage improvements would be necessary. Additional work for the complete project footprint includes modification of adjoining freeway ramps, realignment of frontage roads, and construction of soundwalls, and retaining walls where required.

The proposed project would consist of constructing one median HOV lane in each direction. Where auxiliary lanes exist, a typical 91-foot-wide cross section would be used for in each direction. Where there are no existing or proposed auxiliary lanes, the half-cross section freeway width would be 79 feet. East of Holt Avenue where there are five general purpose lanes, a 93-foot-wide typical half-cross section would be necessary. Work would include widening the existing freeway on the outside of the existing traffic lanes, with restriping to accommodate the HOV lanes in the median. This alternative would incorporate a nonstandard HOV lane that is 12 feet wide with an 8- to 10-foot-wide shoulder.

The proposed ‘Build Nonstandard HOV Lane Alternative’ has been identified as the ‘preferred alternative’ for subsequent design and construction. This alternative would fulfill the project’s purpose and objectives; other alternatives (No Project, Additional Mixed-Flow Lane; and Traffic System Management [TSM] Alternatives) as discussed below would not. This alternative would also result in substantially less significant impacts at considerably lower construction cost than either the Standard HOV Lane Alternative or the Elevated Facility Alternative.

S.4 Alternatives

Alternatives to the Proposed Project. Alternatives considered in both current and past environmental documents for the proposed project are the following: Standard HOV Lanes Alternative; Additional Mixed-Flow Lanes Alternative; Elevated Facility Alternative; and TSM Alternative.

Standard HOV Lane Alternative. This alternative would also provide construction of an HOV lane in each direction; however, it includes standard lane and median widths. Such a cross section would involve typical mainline widening of approximately 23 feet in each direction, resulting in the acquisition of many residential and business properties. When compared to
the Nonstandard HOV Lane Alternative, the Standard HOV Lane Alternative would provide only nominal operational benefits and safety improvements at substantially higher cost, and result in more significant right-of-way (ROW), utility, and construction impacts.

**Additional Mixed-Flow Lane Alternative.** This alternative would add one mixed-flow lane in each direction instead of an HOV lane. First, this alternative would not be consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and the ultimate configuration of I-10 as defined in the Project Reports as two HOV plus eight mixed-flow lanes. Second, it would not achieve the project purpose to increase the person-carrying capacity and promote ride sharing. Finally, any such alternative would not allow a logical extension to close the aforementioned HOV lane gap on I-10.

**Elevated Facility Alternative.** This alternative would utilize the existing median to construct a viaduct over the existing freeway. While this alternative would achieve the project purpose to increase the person-carrying capacity and promote ride sharing on I-10, while also providing a logical extension to close the existing HOV lane gap, this alternative would not be consistent with the RTP and the ultimate configuration of I-10 as defined in the Project Reports. This alternative would also involve substantially greater ROW and construction costs and impacts.

**TSM Alternative.** The proposed project would complement both existing and future TSM/Transportation Demand Management (TDM) improvements within the study area, and some TSM measures have been incorporated into the proposed project. However, a TSM Alternative alone would not be consistent with the RTP and the ultimate configuration of I-10 as defined in the Project Reports, would not achieve the project goals and objectives to increase the person-carrying capacity and promote ride sharing on I-10, and would not allow a logical extension to close an existing 9.2-mile-long HOV lane system gap.

**No Project Alternative.** The No Project Alternative assumes no changes associated with the proposed project would be made to the existing facility. With this alternative, temporary (i.e., construction) and operational impacts associated with the build alternatives would be avoided. However, it would be inconsistent with local and regional plans of Metro and Caltrans because additional traffic demands would not be satisfied. Without improvements to I-10, safety, travel times, fuel consumption, and air quality would deteriorate throughout the project corridor.

### S.5 Environmental Analysis

A list of major potential impacts from both the No Project Alternative and the Proposed Project Alternative is summarized in Table S-1. All impacts are considered to be not significant with incorporation of mitigation measures into the project.

### S.6 Areas of Controversy

In 1973-74, State and Federal agencies adopted formal policy and criteria for construction of noise barriers. California leads the nation in both completed and planned soundwalls. A freeway widening project is one of three basic programs under which Caltrans may undertake
soundwall construction, the others being new freeway construction and Caltrans’ Community Noise Abatement Program.

In order for the area to qualify, it must meet all of the following criteria:

a. Residential property built prior to the freeway or prior to a major widening;
b. Has hourly noise levels that exceed the federal 67-decibel (Leg) threshold;
c. Must be able to achieve at least a 5-decibel reduction; and
d. Cost does not exceed $35,000 per residential unit (1987 dollars).

For the proposed project, Caltrans has considered noise abatement at all locations where traffic noise impacts are predicted, and soundwalls have been incorporated into the proposed project. However, some commercial property owners do not want a soundwall constructed along the freeway if it would partially or wholly obstruct the visibility of their business. Under Caltrans Noise Protocol, local hotel property owners can choose to not participate in the noise abatement program; some businesses have written letters to inform Caltrans about their concern that a soundwall could obstruct views of their businesses from passing motorists. Where the owners choose to opt out of the Community Noise Abatement Program, soundwalls will not be constructed.

In one case, blockage of a business not subject to protection under Caltrans Protocol would occur. Soundwall protection of residential properties on East Garvey Avenue South in West Covina could partially affect visibility of the adjacent Penske Audi dealership.

Approximately 200 feet of wall is required in front of the dealership. While Caltrans staff is working with the City and affected parties to resolve this issue, partial blockage of private property views from the freeway is not generally considered an impact under CEQA.

**S.7 Issues to be Resolved**

The proposed project as assessed in this EIR would result in various potentially significant impacts on the environment. Mitigation measures have been developed as part of the impact analyses to fully offset all impacts to a level of insignificance. There are no unresolved impacts that would require preparation and approval of a Statement of Overriding Considerations.
### TABLE S-1. SUMMARY OF MAJOR POTENTIAL IMPACTS FROM ALTERNATIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue Area</th>
<th>Potential Impact by Alternative</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures for Build Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>The project’s anticipated overall moderate visual change, combined with moderate viewer sensitivity level, would result in a moderate visual impact to the corridor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|            | Proposed Project | **VA-1:** During the project design stage, architectural detailing will be applied to the retaining walls, including textures, colors, and patterns.  
**VA-2:** During the project design and construction stages, existing vegetation in the corridor will be saved and protected to the extent that is feasible.  
**VA-3:** During the project design stage, and to the extent feasible, skyline trees will be included in the new plantings to replace those removed by construction.  
**VA-4:** The final design of the proposed project will include soundwalls and retaining walls designed to be easily cleaned of graffiti, as well as landscaping where feasible to soften the appearance of these walls.  
**VA-5:** Coordinate the design of soundwall aesthetics with local agencies.  
**VA-6:** During final design, conceptual landscape guidelines for planting in designated right-of-way areas to be revegetated, consistent with existing Caltrans policies and procedures, will be developed, in coordination with the adjacent local jurisdictions.  
**VA-7:** For Segment 3, final design will incorporate features to ensure that landscaping plantings are integrated with proposed earth berms and cut slopes to screen undesirable views. The grading guidelines will address issues such as where berms are recommended, the sizes of the berms and the recommended slope gradients to minimize soil erosion.  
**VA-8:** Landscape areas that will take the longest time to establish and achieve their desired visual effects will be installed as early as feasible in the construction process. Rehabilitation priorities will be established as a framework based on the size of the area to be landscaped, the visibility of the area and the feasibility of installing landscaping prior to or during construction, rather than after construction is complete.  
**VA-9:** Caltrans will require construction contractors to shield construction and storage areas from travelers on I-10 and from viewsheds along I-10 to the extent feasible and where the safety of construction and traffic operations is not compromised.  
**VA-10:** Construction will be phased such that areas to be relandscaped are landscaped as soon as possible after construction in the immediate vicinity is completed. |
### TABLE S-1. SUMMARY OF MAJOR POTENTIAL IMPACTS FROM ALTERNATIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue Area</th>
<th>No Project Alternative</th>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During construction, motorists traveling in the immediate vicinity of street, ramp, and lane closures would at times experience some inconvenience from temporary traffic congestion.

The proposed project would involve construction that could contribute to short-term impacts to fire protection and emergency services due to delayed response times.

Analysis results, shown in Table 3.2-4, indicate that the eastbound I-10 ramps at Vincent Avenue interchange would operate at an unsatisfactory LOS E in 2015 and LOS F in 2030. While the intersection of Vincent Avenue and Plaza / Lakes Drive, as a whole, would operate at a satisfactory LOS in 2030, the north, east and west approaches would operate at an unsatisfactory LOS E.

No mitigation is required; however, the following minimization measures would be implemented:

- A TMP will be prepared to offset the effects of traffic congestion and access during construction on the freeway, ramps, and local streets.
- Residents will be kept informed through public outreach of development and construction plans so that they are aware of construction timing, traffic/transit detour plans, and lane/road closures.
- At the northbound Vincent Avenue approach to eastbound I-10 on-ramp, modify the existing shared (through/right) lane to an exclusive through lane and add an exclusive full right turn lane. Additional slight improvement to the intersection can be achieved by adding a deceleration lane for right turn movements, with an approximate storage length of 250 feet.
- Increase the capacity of the eastbound I-10 on-ramp from northbound Vincent Avenue through the addition of a lane and the relocation of the proposed ramp meter approximately 370 feet downstream.
- Caltrans will periodically coordinate with the transit companies to discuss changes in the construction operations and potential impacts to the transit providers.
- Prior to the initiation of site preparation, grading or construction activities, Caltrans will require construction contractors to provide travel plans to the local jurisdictions along the project study area. The travel plans will indicate the expected travel routes of construction trucks carrying construction materials and construction debris.
- During final design, a Traffic Management Plan (TMP) will be prepared in consultation with emergency service providers, area transit operators, local agencies, and major traffic generators (such as large shopping centers and businesses including Forest Lawn Cemetery) which may include the following elements:
  - Identification of ramps near large retail centers (including Westfield West Covina, Eastland Shopping Center and Gateway Crescent Properties). These ramps shall remain open from mid-November to January 2.
  - A commitment has been made to Forest Lawn Cemetery that the eastbound and westbound off-ramps at Via Verde Drive will not be
TABLE S-1. SUMMARY OF MAJOR POTENTIAL IMPACTS FROM ALTERNATIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue Area</th>
<th>Potential Impact by Alternative</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures for Build Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Project Alternative</td>
<td>Closed simultaneously.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Media coverage outlining the work to be completed, the hours and duration of lane closures and potential alternative travel routes to avoid the construction area or the areas with temporary lane closures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Surveillance and control techniques and strategies using electronic surveillance devices such as loop detectors, ramp meters, closed circuit television, congestion management systems and the services of the existing Caltrans Traffic Management Center, among others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Surveillances control techniques and strategies using electronic surveillance devices such as loop detectors, ramp meters, closed circuit television, congestion management systems and the services of the existing Caltrans Traffic Management Center, among others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Surveillance and control techniques and strategies using electronic surveillance devices such as loop detectors, ramp meters, closed circuit television, congestion management systems and the services of the existing Caltrans Traffic Management Center, among others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Provision of freeway patrol services to assist disabled vehicles and to remove disabled vehicles, accidents, debris and other materials from travel lanes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Coordination with local area school districts, transit operators and emergency service providers to provide alternative travel routes and construction related information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Prior to the initiation of site preparation, grading or construction activities, Caltrans will require construction contractors to provide construction and traffic management plans (TMPs) to the affected police, fire and emergency medical services in the project area indicating possible detours, lane and ramp closures, and areas which may experience overall traffic delays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>Inconsistent with regional goals and policies for improving air quality within the Basin.</td>
<td>AQ-1: The construction contractor shall comply with Caltrans’ Standard Specifications in Section 14 (2010).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>During construction, short-term degradation of air quality may occur due to the release of particulate emissions (airborne dust) generated by excavation, grading, hauling, and other activities related to construction. Emissions from construction equipment also are anticipated and would include CO, NOX, VOCs, directly-emitted particulate matter (PM₁₀ and PM₂.₅),</td>
<td>• Section 14-9.01 specifically requires compliance by the contractor with all applicable laws and regulations related to air quality, including air pollution control district and air quality management district regulations and local ordinances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Section 14-9.02 is directed at controlling dust. If dust palliative materials other than water are to be used, material specifications are contained in Section 18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AQ-2: Apply water or dust palliative to the site and equipment as frequently as required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE S-1. SUMMARY OF MAJOR POTENTIAL IMPACTS FROM ALTERNATIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue Area</th>
<th>Potential Impact by Alternative</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures for Build Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Project Alternative</td>
<td>Proposed Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and toxic air contaminants such as diesel exhaust particulate matter. Ozone is a regional pollutant that is derived from NOx and VOCs in the presence of sunlight and heat.</td>
<td>AQ-3: Spread soil binder on any unpaved roads used for construction purposes, and all project construction parking areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ-4: Wash off trucks as they leave the right-of-way as necessary to control fugitive dust emissions.</td>
<td>AQ-5: Properly tune and maintain construction equipment and vehicles. Use low-sulfur fuel in all construction equipment as provided in California Code of Regulations Title 17, Section 93114.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ-6: Develop a dust control plan documenting sprinkling, temporary paving, speed limits, and expedited revegetation of disturbed slopes as needed to minimize construction impacts to existing communities.</td>
<td>AQ-7: Locate equipment and materials storage sites shall be kept at least 500 feet from the sensitive receptors. Keep construction areas clean and orderly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ-8: Establish Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESAs) or their equivalent near sensitive air receptors within which construction activities involving extended idling of diesel equipment would be prohibited, to the extent feasible.</td>
<td>AQ-9: Use track-out reduction measures such as gravel pads at project access points to minimize dust and mud deposits on roads affected by construction traffic.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ-10: Cover all transported loads of soils and wet materials prior to transport, or provide adequate freeboard (space from the top of the material to the top of the truck) to minimize emission of dust (particulate matter) during transportation.</td>
<td>AQ-11: Promptly and regularly remove dust and mud that are deposited on paved, public roads due to construction activity and traffic to decrease particulate matter.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ-12: Route and schedule construction traffic to avoid peak travel times as much as possible, to reduce congestion and related air quality impacts caused by idling vehicles along local roads.</td>
<td>AQ-13: Install mulch or plant vegetation as soon as practical after grading to reduce windblown particulate in the area. Be aware that certain methods of mulch placement, such as straw blowing, may themselves cause dust and visible emission issues, and may need to use controls such as dampened straw.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE S-1. SUMMARY OF MAJOR POTENTIAL IMPACTS FROM ALTERNATIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue Area</th>
<th>Potential Impact by Alternative</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures for Build Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Project</td>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>In addition to the above-mentioned mitigation measures, the following two measures were identified in the MMRP (2003): AQ-14: Caltrans will require the construction contractors to prepare a dust control plan and to submit the plan to the South Coast Air Quality Management District (AQMD) prior to construction. The plan is expected to include, but not be limited to: stabilization of construction roads to 24 kilometers per hour (15 miles per hour); daily removal of dirt spilled onto paved roads; ceasing grading and excavation activities when wind speeds exceed 40.2 kilometers per hour (25 miles per hour) and during extreme air pollution episodes; phasing and scheduling of construction activities to avoid days with high ozone (O₃) levels; possibly interrupting construction activities on days with elevated smog levels (such as Stage 2 smog alerts); use of alternative fuel/clean fuel equipment when available; covering haul trucks; phasing of grading to minimize daily emissions; property maintenance of construction vehicles to maximize efficiency and minimize emissions; and prompt revegetation of exposed cut slopes, road medians and shoulders. AQ-15: Caltrans will require construction contractors to maintain and tune equipment engines consistent with the manufacturers’ requirements to maximize the efficiency of the equipment and to minimize air and noise emissions, including the use of noise mufflers and/or other noise abatement features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise and Vibration</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>No mitigation is required; however, the following minimization measures would be implemented: • Soundwalls will be implemented as a part of this project to reduce existing traffic noise levels in excess of the Noise Abatement Criteria. Final locations, heights and lengths of these soundwalls would be determined in final design. • Caltrans will require construction contractors to maintain and tune equipment engines consistent with the manufacturers’ requirements to maximize the efficiency of the equipment and to minimize air and noise emissions, including the use of noise mufflers and/or other noise abatement features. • Construction of soundwalls will be incorporated as early as possible in the phasing of the project, consistent with Caltrans’ construction procedures and as reasonable and feasible. • Caltrans will require construction contractors to comply with applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue Area</td>
<td>No Project Alternative</td>
<td>Proposed Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles County and local jurisdiction noise control regulations and ordinances.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Caltrans will require construction contractors to use construction techniques that reduce or minimize construction noise including, but not limited to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Grouping construction activities that will occur outside normal construction hours to avoid continuing periods of noise disturbances during the evening and night hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Scheduling work, as feasible, at times that would cause the least amount of impact to the surrounding land uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Scheduling, as feasible, the noisiest activities as close together as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Use of the quietest type of equipment available, which will perform identically to equipment types which generate more noise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Use of haul trucks that do not rely on air or jake brakes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Locating stockpiles and vehicle staging areas away from occupied residences and other sensitive receptors whenever possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Use of approved haul routes, which minimize the exposure of sensitive receptors to potential noise impacts associated with hauling operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>In addition to landscape trees, three to five walnut trees and two Chinese elms would be removed at the end of a small, unnamed stream course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- No mitigation is required; however, the following minimization measures would be implemented:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Removal of trees should occur between September 15 and January 15 to avoid the breeding season. If tree removal must occur during the breeding season, then procedures outlined in the Biology Report will be followed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Trees of both toyon and black walnut species will be planted from suitable nursery stock at a ratio of three replacements for each natural tree removed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Walnut and oak trees native to southern California that are removed or damaged during project construction will be replaced at a minimum ratio of 5:1. The actual planting ratios will depend on the tree species and their connectivity to native habitats, in compliance with regional and local walnut and oak tree regulations. Planting sites for walnut and oak trees will be within Caltrans’ right-of-way to the maximum extent feasible and in adjacent open areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE S-1. SUMMARY OF MAJOR POTENTIAL IMPACTS FROM ALTERNATIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue Area</th>
<th>Potential Impact by Alternative</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures for Build Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Project Alternative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>space areas if sites within Caltrans' right-of-way are not sufficient.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prior to the start of construction, the gnatcatcher habitat shall be delineated by the Caltrans Biologist. The delineated area shall be designated as an Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA). Temporary fencing shall be placed by the contractor at the direction of the Caltrans Biologist to surround the ESA during construction to prevent any debris, equipment or people from entering the ESA. Construction crews shall be educated and instructed to avoid entering into, or in any way disturbing, the ESA. Intrusion into the ESA shall not be allowed for any purposes (except for those identified by emergency services personnel). The ESA fencing will be maintained during construction by the contractor, from outside the ESA. The ESA will be designated as a sensitive noise receptor, and as such, all measures outlined in the Noise Section of this Final Environmental Document will apply to the ESA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Future maintenance activities, such as mowing and chemical weed control, have the potential to impact the already degraded RSS habitat. After project construction is complete, efforts will be instituted to study (in conjunction with appropriate parties) the establishment of another, permanent ESA. This post-construction ESA will serve to establish any areas of degraded habitat in the project area for further disruption, as allowed by law and Caltrans policy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Just prior to the start of construction in a particular area, including any clearing of vegetation, vector control shall be performed to prevent the invasion of homes and businesses by displaced pests.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Phase site preparation, grading and construction so that these activities adjacent to the degraded California walnut woodland area are conducted outside the March 1 to September 1 bird nesting season.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conduct a survey prior to any site disturbance in the degraded California walnut woodland area if site preparation, grading and/or construction activities must occur in the bird nesting season adjacent to this area. If any nests are within 305 meters (1,000 feet) of the construction limits, temporary measures, such as the use of specialized mufflers on construction equipment, will be used to reduce noise. A biological monitor will be employed to provide suggestions in the field to reduce intrusions into sensitive areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE S-1. SUMMARY OF MAJOR POTENTIAL IMPACTS FROM ALTERNATIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue Area</th>
<th>No Project Impact</th>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural and Paleontological Resources</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>Archaeological Resources - No Impact; Historical Resources – No Impact; Paleontological - The Kellogg Hill area has a ‘high’ potential for exposing significant fossils.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology, Soils, and Seismicity</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>Given the historic landslide activity in the Kellogg Hill area, there is the potential that the proposed project could be adversely affected by landslides.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mitigation Measures for Build Alternative**

- CUL-1: In the unlikely event cultural materials are discovered during construction, all earth-moving activity within and around the immediate discovery area will be diverted until a qualified archaeologist can assess the nature and significance of the find.
- CUL-2: A qualified principal paleontologist (MS or Ph.D. in paleontology or geology familiar with paleontological procedures and techniques) will be retained.
- CUL-3: Paleontological monitor, under the direction of the qualified principal paleontologist, will be onsite to inspect cuts for fossils during original grading involving sensitive geologic formations.
- CUL-4: When fossils are discovered, the paleontologist, or paleontological monitor, will recover them. Construction work in these areas will be halted or redirected to allow recovery of fossil remains in a timely manner.
- CUL-5: Fossil remains collected during the monitoring and salvage portion of the mitigation program will be cleaned, repaired, sorted, and cataloged.
- CUL-6: Prepared fossils, along with copies of all pertinent field notes, photos, and maps, will then be deposited in a scientific institution.
- CUL-7: A final report will be completed to document results of the mitigation program.
- CUL-8: In the unlikely event human remains are discovered, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that further disturbances and activities shall cease in any area or nearby area suspected to overlie remains, and the County Coroner contacted. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, if the remains are thought to be Native American, the coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) who will then notify the Most Likely Descendant (MLD). At this time, the person who discovered the remains will contact Gary Iverson, Environmental Chief, so that they may work with the MLD on the respectful treatment and disposition of the remains. Further provisions of PRC 5097.98 are to be followed as applicable.
### TABLE S-1. SUMMARY OF MAJOR POTENTIAL IMPACTS FROM ALTERNATIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue Area</th>
<th>Potential Impact by Alternative</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures for Build Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Project Alternative</td>
<td>Proposed Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue Area</td>
<td>Potential Impact by Alternative</td>
<td>Mitigation Measures for Build Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Hazardous Waste/ Materials | No Impact | HAZ-1: If groundwater needs to be disturbed and/or extracted during construction, coordination with appropriate regulatory agency shall be done to prevent possible cross contamination. If contamination is found, a work plan shall be prepared by a registered geotechnical engineer to protect the health of construction workers.  
HAZ-2: ADL soil management will be evaluated for the applicability of the lead variance issued to Caltrans by the Department of Toxic Substances Control.  
HAZ-3: Bridges and structures shall be surveyed to screen for ACMs and lead-based paint (LBP) prior to construction activities. If ACMs are found, then the contractor will comply with the SCAQMD Rule 1403 notification and removal processes. In addition, disposal of ACMs will be handled in compliance with local, state, and federal requirements. If LBP and/or heavy metals are found, then the contractor shall comply with local, state, and federal rules and regulations for notification, removal process, and disposal activities.  
HAZ-4: Any hazardous materials or wastes encountered before or during the demolition stage of the proposed project shall be disposed according to current regulatory guidelines.  
HAZ-5: A worker Health and Safety Plan (HSP) that meets the provisions of California Code of Regulations (Title 22, Section 5192) shall be developed by the proposed project contractor. HSP procedures will address the identification, excavation, handling, and disposal of hazardous wastes and materials that may be found in construction areas.  
HAZ-6: Removed thermoplastic and yellow paint will be disposed at an appropriate landfill in accordance with local, state, and federal laws.  
HAZ-7: If unknown wastes or underground storage tanks are discovered during construction which the construction contractor believes may involve hazardous materials, he/she will (1) immediately stop work in the vicinity of the suspected contamination, remove workers and the public from the area; (2) notify Caltrans’ Resident Engineer; and (3) secure the area as directed by Caltrans’ Resident Engineer. Caltrans’ Plans and Procedures for Hazardous Wastes and Materials, the Construction Hazardous Materials Response Plan and the Construction Underground Tank Contingency Plan, as appropriate, will be implemented by Caltrans and the construction contractors.  
HAZ-8: Prior to the start of construction, Caltrans will conduct a Site Investigation |
### TABLE S-1. SUMMARY OF MAJOR POTENTIAL IMPACTS FROM ALTERNATIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue Area</th>
<th>Potential Impact by Alternative</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures for Build Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Project Alternative</td>
<td>(SI) for all sites in the proposed right-of-way identified as having the potential for hazardous waste. The SI will consist of drilling and testing. Based on the findings of the drilling and testing, specific remediation measures will be identified in the SI to address documented hazardous wastes contamination at the affected sites in accordance with applicable federal and state laws. For sites documented through the SI process to contain hazardous waste, Caltrans will include the mitigation defined in the SI in the construction contract and specifications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrology and Water Quality</td>
<td>It would be determined during detailed design stage whether temporary encroachment at Walnut Creek or the aforementioned unnamed drainage would be required during construction. A floodplain cannot be altered in any way until it has been shown that such alteration would pass the base flood without significant damage to either the floodplain or surrounding property.</td>
<td>HAZ-9: Hazardous substances are strictly regulated by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the California and Federal Occupational Health and Safety Administration (OSHA), the United States Department of Transportation (DOT) and a number of other federal, state and local agencies. DOT specifies procedures for safely transporting hazardous material and procedures to follow in case of accidental spills during transport. EPA specifies the requirements for proper labeling and placarding of hazardous substances. The American National Standards Institute (ANSI) recommends safety procedures for handling and storing hazardous materials. OSHA specifies the procedures required for using and storing hazardous materials. Other local, state and federal regulations address the identification, removal, handling and disposal of hazardous wastes. Project contractors will be required to follow these procedures and to maintain the required documentation during all site preparation, grading and construction of the proposed project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>No mitigation measures are required; however, the following minimization measures would be implemented:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• During final project design, Caltrans will conduct a detailed hydrologic analysis to determine if any flood control devices will require modification to protect the project site and facility from design flood levels. The final design of these flood control devices will be coordinated with all affected cities and the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Caltrans will coordinate with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) prior to completion of the final project design to confirm any necessary revisions to the FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Maps or FEMA Special Flood Hazard Areas maps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• A small concrete lined drainage parallel to eastbound I-10 west of Kellogg Drive will be realigned. Permits will be required from the Army Corps of Engineers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE S-1. SUMMARY OF MAJOR POTENTIAL IMPACTS FROM ALTERNATIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue Area</th>
<th>Potential Impact by Alternative</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures for Build Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Project Alternative</td>
<td>(Clean Water Act Section 404 permit), Regional Water Quality Control Board, (Clean Water Act Section 401 permit) and California Department of Fish and Game (Section 1601 Streambed Alteration Agreement). This drainage will be replaced in kind using Best Management Practices for water quality and in conjunction with the desires of the applicable permitting agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Project</td>
<td>• During final design, detailed hydrologic analysis will be conducted to determine if any flood control devices would require modification to protect the site and facility from design flood levels. The final design of the flood control devices will be coordinated with the Cities of Baldwin Park, West Covina, Covina, San Dimas and Pomona and the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (LACDPW).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The final design of the proposed project will be coordinated with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) to confirm any needed revisions to the FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Maps or FEMA Special Flood Hazard Areas Maps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The proposed project would be subject to the requirements of Caltrans' existing National Pollutant Discharge Elimination Systems (NPDES) permit regarding water pollution control. Caltrans would coordinate construction and operation of the proposed project under the existing NPDES permit with the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), consistent with the requirements of the existing permit, for any discharges of wastes to surface waters. Issues related to water quality would be mitigated to a level less than significant based on implementation of existing Caltrans plans and programs which address water pollution control and stormwater management. These are the Department Storm Water Management Plan (SWMP) and the Storm Water Quality Handbooks (three manuals: Project Planning Design Guidelines, Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and Water Pollution Control Program (WPCP) Preparation Manual). In addition, District Directive DD20 also applies to storm water management. These plans and programs would apply to the proposed project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Appropriate erosion control measures will be incorporated in a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) approved by Caltrans Resident Engineer. The SWPPP will be implemented during site preparation, grading and construction. The SWPPP will include, but not be limited to, measures to protect exposed slope...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue Area</td>
<td>Potential Impact by Alternative</td>
<td>Mitigation Measures for Build Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Project Alternative</td>
<td>Proposed Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>Three business displacements, all located within West Covina near the Vincent Avenue on-/off-ramp, are currently proposed to be required. Temporary impacts would include temporary construction easements (TCEs) on nonresidential and residential properties along the nine-mile-long project ROW.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services and Utilities</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>The proposed project would involve construction that could contribute to short-term impacts to fire protection and emergency services due to delayed response times. Construction of the proposed project would require the relocation of several public and private utilities within the project area. Utilities could be damaged during construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE S-1. SUMMARY OF MAJOR POTENTIAL IMPACTS FROM ALTERNATIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue Area</th>
<th>Potential Impact by Alternative</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures for Build Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Project Alternative</td>
<td>Proposed Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Parsons, 2012.

- No Project Alternative
- Proposed Project
- At Jalapa Park in Covina, indirect temporary air quality and noise impacts are likely to occur during construction.
- No mitigation is required; minimization measures to reduce potential air quality and noise impacts during construction are provided in Sections 3.3 and 3.4, respectively.
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CHAPTER 1

PROJECT DESCRIPTION
1.0 Project Description

1.1 Project Background

The San Bernardino Freeway, Interstate Route 10 (I-10), is a major east-west freeway used for intraregional, interregional, and interstate travel and shipping in southern California. I-10, part of the Federal National Highway System, is a major commuter route linking Los Angeles, San Bernardino, and Riverside counties and is a major travel route to and from states east of California. It is a major truck route of key economic importance in southern California. I-10 begins at 4th Street in the city of Santa Monica and extends east through Los Angeles County to San Bernardino and Riverside counties, continuing out of California and terminating on the east coast of the United States.

Figure 1-1 is a project vicinity map, and a project location map is provided as Figure 1-2. The proposed ‘Add One High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) Lane in Each Direction on the San Bernardino Freeway (I-10) from Puente Avenue to State Routes 57/71 in Los Angeles County’ Project (henceforth referred to as the ‘I-10 HOV Lane Project’ or ‘proposed project’) is located along I-10 in Los Angeles County, between Puente Avenue in the city of Baldwin Park and the State Route 57 (SR 57)/State Route 71 (SR 71) interchange in the city of Pomona. It would extend easterly a distance of 9.2 miles.

During both morning and evening peak periods, heavy congestion currently occurs eastbound and westbound in the project study corridor. To ameliorate the traffic congestion, the project proposes adding one HOV lane adjacent to the center median in each direction.

This Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) follows previous environmental documentation that was prepared for a longer HOV lane improvement project encompassing the same portion of I-10. In the early 2000s, the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), in cooperation with the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro), completed an Initial Study/Environmental Assessment (IS/EA) to assess impacts associated with an approximately 11.2-mile-long section of I-10 from Interstate Route 605 (I-605) easterly to the SR 57/SR 71 interchange. The IS/EA evaluated a range of alternatives to meet existing (at the time) and future traffic demands. This process resulted in selection of the Build Nonstandard HOV Lanes as the preferred alternative for subsequent design and construction. In January 2003, a final Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) was approved by Caltrans and Metro, and a Finding of No Significant Effect (FONSI) was approved by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA).
Figure 1-1 Project Vicinity Map
Figure 1-2 Project Location Map
Since January 2003, several changes to the project have occurred, as well as changes to circumstances surrounding the project. Refined engineering development of the proposed project has resulted in changes to several arterial ramp interchanges, soundwall modifications, right-of-way (ROW) acquisitions, and retaining wall locations. Eight years of time passage has also resulted in changes to the surrounding land uses and businesses.

Currently, Caltrans is constructing HOV lanes and other improvements along the westernmost 2-mile-long section of the former project study area, which extends easterly on I-10 from I-605 to just west of Puente Avenue in the city of Baldwin Park. This portion of I-10, referred to as ‘Segment 1’ in the IS/EA, is not part of the analysis in this FEIR.

1.2 Purpose and Need

1.2.1 Purpose
The purpose of the proposed project is to:

- Improve mobility for persons traveling within the corridor by increasing the person-carrying capacity of I-10.
- Decrease travel time for HOVs and public transit vehicles along the corridor.
- Increase continuity of the HOV system by closing the gap between existing and planned HOV facilities on both the west and east ends of the corridor.
- Provide incentive and opportunity for individual drivers to switch from single-occupancy vehicles to carpooling or transit.
- Implement corridor improvements that are consistent with the key goals of the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) 2008 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).
- Provide regional air quality benefits consistent with the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) 2007 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP).

1.2.2 Need
Eastern Los Angeles County and western San Bernardino County are continuing to grow at a rapid rate, including development of residential and employment land uses. The SCAG region is projected to add 5.9 million people to reach 24 million people by 2035. SCAG projects 2.5 million new jobs generated to support this forecasted population growth. This level of population and job growth is expected to yield 2 million additional households in the region at an average of three persons per household (SCAG, 2008).

Traffic Demand. I-10 has historically experienced, and will continue to experience, serious traffic congestion, particularly during peak periods. The I-10 corridor currently encompasses several major traffic generators between downtown Los Angeles and the County line, including County USC Medical Center; Cal State University, Los Angeles; Eastland and Plaza Shopping Centers; Cal Poly Pomona; Mount San Antonio College; Pomona Fairplex;
and Claremont Colleges. In addition, downtown Los Angeles is a major trip attractor for those traveling I-10, due to its position as a major employment center for the region.

Peak-period traffic demand on I-10 currently exceeds capacity and, as a result of existing and forecasted growth, is expected to continue to exceed capacity. In the westbound direction, delays occur due to recurrent congestion in the morning peak period of 6:00 AM to 9:00 AM. Eastbound delays occur in the afternoon peak period between 3:00 PM and 7:00 PM. (Parsons, 2009)

Long-range forecasts indicate continued increases in traffic volumes on I-10, related to continuing development of employment opportunities in the greater Los Angeles area and continuing residential development in Los Angeles, Riverside, and San Bernardino counties. The proposed I-10 HOV Lane Project would assist in addressing commuter needs while focusing limited transportation capital on improvements that support HOV modes.

**Connectivity.** The I-10 corridor from downtown Los Angeles to San Bernardino, including the study area, crosses several other freeways (i.e., I-605, I-710, I-210, I-15, and I-215) and major north-south arterials. The corridor lacks nearby major parallel arterials that span extensive distances from west to east. The proposed project would close a 9-mile-long gap to provide a continuous west-east HOV lane facility that crosses all of these freeways and arterials.

**Carrying Capacity.** HOV lanes are currently operational from downtown Los Angeles to I-605 and from SR 57 to I-15 in San Bernardino County. In addition, a 2.2-mile-long project is currently under construction to extend the HOV lanes east to Puente Avenue. The proposed project would close a gap between Puente Avenue and SR 57 that will still exist on I-10 after construction of the I-605 to Puente Avenue extension. Given current peak-period occupancy requirements on segments of I-10 with HOV lanes, it has been shown that HOV lanes can carry more than four times the number of people carried on a mixed-flow lane (Metro, 2007). Closing this gap would provide continuous HOV lane service on this high-performing HOV lanes corridor.

**Accident Conditions.** Caltrans estimated traffic accident rates for I-10 using the Traffic Accident Surveillance and Analysis System (TASAS). Between 2005 and 2007, the average accident rate for the subject I-10 corridor was evaluated at 0.81 accidents per million vehicle miles (MVM) traveled on eastbound I-10 and 1.63 accidents per MVM on westbound I-10. The expected accident rate for a similar statewide facility is 1.05 accidents per MVM. (Parsons, 2009) Most of the recorded accidents for this segment of I-10 have been sideswipes, rear-ends, and broadsides. These types of accidents are usually associated with end-of-queue or stop-and-go conditions, which are typical on this segment of I-10.

It is anticipated that the existing accident rates would decrease after implementation of the proposed I-10 HOV Lane Project. The addition of median HOV lanes would result in reduced congestion, which is anticipated to lead to a reduction in the types of accidents currently occurring on this section of I-10 (Parsons, 2009).
1.3 Existing Facilities

1.3.1 Level of Service Definition
Road capacity is generally measured as the number of vehicles that can reasonably pass over a given section of road in a given period of time. The *Highway Capacity Manual* (HCM) (National Transportation Research Board, 2000) identifies travel speed, freedom to maneuver, and proximity to other vehicles as important factors in determining the level of service (LOS) on a road. Daily traffic volumes are used to estimate the extent to which peak-hour traffic volumes equal or exceed the maximum desirable capacity of a road.

Traffic flow is classified by LOS, ranging from LOS A, defined as free-flow traffic with no delays, to LOS F, defined as forced flow with substantial delays, as shown in Table 1-1. At LOS E or higher, the theoretical capacity of a road is considered to be exceeded. Figure 1-3 visually depicts traffic flow conditions for LOS A to LOS F.

The LOS for a road is calculated by dividing the total traffic volume on that segment by the theoretical capacity of the segment. The volume to capacity (V/C) ratio provides an expression of traffic flow and congestion on a road. As shown in Table 1-1, LOS F is subdivided to better correlate the degree to which a road has exceeded its theoretical capacity as a function of the amount of time a road is congested. The V/C ratios for LOS F to LOS F3 range from 1.0 to 1.46 and greater, reflecting greater delays and congestion as the V/C ratio increases.

### Table 1-1. General Descriptions of Levels of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Service (LOS)</th>
<th>Description/Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOS A</td>
<td>Excellent – Free flow, unimpeded ability to maneuver within the traffic stream; effects of incidents or point breakdowns are easily absorbed at this level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS B</td>
<td>Very good – Reasonably free flow, ability to maneuver within the traffic stream is only slightly restricted, and effects of minor incidents are still easily absorbed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS C</td>
<td>Good – Freedom to maneuver is noticeably restricted, lane changes require more care and vigilance, and queues form behind any blockage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS D</td>
<td>Fair – Density begins to increase somewhat more quickly; minor incidents can be expected to create queuing because there is little space to absorb disruptions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS E</td>
<td>Capacity – Virtually no usable gaps in the traffic stream; maneuverability within the traffic stream is extremely limited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS F</td>
<td>Forced flow – Breakdown in vehicular flow, queues form behind traffic incidents or weaving areas. Caltrans rates LOS F by the length of time that congestion will be experienced at a certain point, as follows: F-0: 15 minutes to 1-hour of congestion F-1: 1 to 2 hours of congestion F-2: 2 to 3 hours of congestion F-3: 3 or more hours of congestion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Caltrans, 2010.*
### Levels of Service for Freeways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Service</th>
<th>Flow Conditions</th>
<th>Operating Speed (mph)</th>
<th>Technical Descriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>![Image A]</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Highest quality of service. Traffic flows freely with little or no restrictions on speed or maneuverability. <strong>No delays</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>![Image B]</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Traffic is stable and flows freely. The ability to maneuver in traffic is only slightly restricted. <strong>No delays</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>![Image C]</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Few restrictions on speed. Freedom to maneuver is restricted. Drivers must be more careful making lane changes. <strong>Minimal delays</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>![Image D]</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Speeds decline slightly and density increases. Freedom to maneuver is noticeably limited. <strong>Minimal delays</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>![Image E]</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Vehicles are closely spaced, with little room to maneuver. Driver comfort is poor. <strong>Significant delays</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>![Image F]</td>
<td>&lt;53</td>
<td>Very congested traffic with traffic jams, especially in areas where vehicles have to merge. <strong>Considerable delays</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1-3**
Level of Service Definitions
1.3.2 Existing Traffic Demand
I-10 operates as an eight-lane facility throughout most of the project length from Puente Avenue to the SR 57/SR 71 interchange. There are four general purpose lanes and one auxiliary lane in each direction between Puente Avenue and Citrus Street. Between the Citrus Street and Via Verde Street ramps, the four-lane freeway operates with one auxiliary lane in the eastbound direction. On the westbound side of I-10 between Kellogg Drive and Via Verde Street, there is a fifth mixed-flow lane to compensate for congestion caused by traffic slowing due to a steep (i.e., 5.5 percent) uphill grade. To manage traffic, ramp meters are provided on nearly all ramps in the project study area. Recurrent congestion occurs westbound in the morning peak hours and eastbound in the evening peak hours. Most of the project study area currently operates at capacity in the morning and evening peak hours.

Other freeways in the area include I-605, a north-south freeway crossing I-10 approximately 2.2 miles west of the Puente Avenue terminus; SR 57, a north-south freeway crossing I-10 at the east project terminus; SR 71, a north-south freeway also intersecting I-10 at the east project terminus; State Route 60 (SR 60), an east-west freeway located 3 miles south of and parallel to I-10; and I-210, an east-west freeway located approximately 3 miles north of and parallel to I-10. These other area freeways are shown in Figure 1-2. I-210 and SR 60 operate at congested levels during peak periods and do not offer reasonable alternatives to I-10.

The projected year 2035 peak-period traffic volumes and LOS on I-10 were calculated as part of an I-10 Proposed HOV Traffic Study (Parsons, 2009). Without the proposed project, it is projected that AM peak period, westbound traffic volumes between Puente Avenue and Citrus Street would average approximately 24,392 vehicles. The projected AM peak period, westbound traffic volumes between Citrus Street and the SR 57/SR 71 interchange would average approximately 23,806 vehicles. The PM peak period projections indicate volumes of 39,950 between Puente Avenue and Citrus Street and 38,603 between Citrus Street and the SR 57/SR 71 interchange. Average speeds are projected to range between 23 and 31 miles per hour (mph) in the AM peak period and 14 to 22 mph during the PM peak period.

1.4 Overview of Proposed Project
The Proposed Project Alternative is described in this section of the FEIR. Alternatives to the proposed project, including the No Project Alternative, are described in Chapter 5 (Alternatives). Chapter 5 also includes a list of alternatives that have been withdrawn from consideration in this environmental document.

Although several build alternatives were evaluated, the Build Nonstandard HOV Lanes Alternative was selected as the proposed project based on the following considerations: (1) potential environmental effects, (2) engineering and design constraints, (3) cost, and (4) consistency with regional planning for a comprehensive network of freeway HOV facilities.

The proposed project would entail the addition of one HOV lane in the center freeway median along 18 lane-miles (nine in each direction). To accommodate HOV lanes, center
median reconstruction, freeway widening, and striping and signage improvements would be necessary. Additional work for the complete project footprint includes modification of adjoining freeway ramps, realignment of frontage roads, safety barriers, and construction of soundwalls, and retaining walls where required. HOV passing (i.e., climbing) lanes would be provided in the uphill direction where existing grades exceed 3 percent.

For construction purposes, the proposed project would be divided into two phases. In this way, separate construction packages can be issued for both the section of I-10 between Puente Avenue and Citrus Street and between Citrus Street and the SR 57/SR 71 interchange. The segment between Puente Avenue and Citrus Street (Segment 2) would be constructed as the first phase, followed by a second phase (Segment 3) to be constructed when funding becomes available. Phase 2 includes rehabilitation (overlay or lane replacement) for the entire length of five miles, resulting in a 2- to 6-inch profile change. A Public Awareness Campaign will be provided during project construction that alerts the public to road closures, detours, etc.

The HOV lanes would operate 24 hours per day, 7 days per week, and they would require vehicle occupancy of two or more persons.

1.4.1 Build Nonstandard HOV Lane Alternative

The proposed project would consist of constructing one median HOV lane in each direction using a typical 91-foot-wide cross section where auxiliary lanes exist. Where there are no existing or proposed auxiliary lanes, the half-cross section freeway width would be 79 feet. East of Holt Avenue where there are five general purpose lanes, a 93-foot-wide typical cross section would be necessary. Work would include widening the existing freeway on the outside of the existing traffic lanes, with restriping to accommodate the HOV lanes in the median. This alternative would incorporate a nonstandard eight-foot-wide inside shoulder west of Holt Avenue and solid double line striping in lieu of an HOV buffer for the entire corridor. Typical cross sections for two operational scenarios associated with the proposed project are shown in Figure 1-4.

1.4.2 Nonstandard Design Features

The proposed project chiefly utilizes standard design features; however, the use of some nonstandard design features would be applied to decrease the need for substantial ROW property acquisition, reduce project costs, and help minimize environmental impacts. For a complete list of the nonstandard design features, refer to the Project Report (Caltrans, 1994; Caltrans, 2002e) for each construction segment.
Figure 1-4
Typical Cross Sections for the Nonstandard HOV Lanes

Source: Parsons 2011
1.4.3  **Ramp Modifications**

As part of the proposed project, the existing ramp facilities at the following locations would be modified slightly to accommodate the widened mainline freeway cross section:

**Construction Phase 1**  
- Puente Avenue  
- West Covina Parkway  
- Azusa Avenue

**Construction Phase 2**  
- Citrus Street  
- Grand Avenue  
- Via Verde Street  
- Barranca Avenue  
- Holt Avenue  
- Kellogg Drive

The existing ramps at most of the above locations are currently nonstandard and would remain nonstandard after the addition of the HOV lanes. All these ramps would be modified only to the extent required to accommodate the mainline widening.

The following three ramps are proposed for HOV bypass lanes, which would allow entering HOVs to bypass queues of single-occupant vehicles at ramp meters: Citrus Street, Barranca Street, Holt Avenue, and Via Verde Street (Parsons, 2009).

Additional ramp modifications would include California Highway Patrol (CHP) enforcement areas where economical and where existing ROW is adequate to accommodate this purpose. One CHP enforcement area is proposed to be located east of Sunset Avenue to east of Vincent Avenue. Another enforcement area is proposed to be located west of Citrus Street to west of Barranca Street (Parsons, 2009). As part of this work, ramp meters would be moved or modified where required.

1.4.4  **Modifications to Existing Bridges and Other Facilities**

As shown in Table 1-2, construction work is proposed at several existing local street freeway bridge interchange crossings to accommodate the widened freeway cross section. Street lowering between a minimum of 4 inches (Puente Avenue) and 2 feet (Via Verde Street) is required at the undercrossings shown on the table. Changes to local street profiles would also entail related modifications to stormwater pump stations and inlets where necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Street Affected</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Street Lowering Required?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Puente Avenue Undercrossing</td>
<td>Widen bridge</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameron Avenue Undercrossing</td>
<td>Widen and partially replace bridge</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Covina Parkway Undercrossing</td>
<td>Widen bridge</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunset Avenue</td>
<td>Add barrier</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent Avenue Undercrossing</td>
<td>Widen and partially replace bridge</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lark Ellen Avenue Undercrossing</td>
<td>Widen bridge</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 1-2. PROPOSED BRIDGE IMPROVEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Street Affected</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Street Lowering Required?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Azusa Avenue Undercrossing</td>
<td>Widen bridge</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollenbeck Street Undercrossing</td>
<td>Widen bridge</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citrus Street Undercrossing</td>
<td>Widen bridge</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barranca Avenue Overcrossing</td>
<td>Construct retaining walls</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut Creek Overcrossing</td>
<td>Widen bridge</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Avenue Undercrossing</td>
<td>Widen bridge</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holt Avenue Undercrossing</td>
<td>Widen bridge</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via Verde Undercrossing</td>
<td>Widen bridge</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kellogg Drive Undercrossing</td>
<td>Widen bridge</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Caltrans, 1994; Caltrans 2002e.

Extensive improvements are proposed for the Vincent Avenue interchange, as follows:

- Remove eastbound I-10 collector / distributor road and loop ramp in the southeast quadrant
- Widen eastbound I-10 off-ramp terminal to Vincent Avenue from 2 to 3 lanes; one left and two right turn lanes
- Realign eastbound on-ramp from northbound Vincent Avenue and increase storage through the relocation of ramp metering, approximately 370 feet downstream
- Remove right turn bypass lanes at on-ramps
- Relocate the eastbound busway westerly, between the eastbound I-10 off-ramp and the eastbound I-10 loop on-ramp from southbound Vincent Avenue
- Install crosswalk on the south leg of the intersection of eastbound I-10 ramps and Vincent Avenue
- Modify lane designation on northbound and southbound Vincent Avenue approaches to the westbound I-10 ramps as follows: 2.5 through lanes; 1.5 right turn lanes (from 3 through lanes)
- Modify lane designation at the westbound I-10 off-ramp as follows: one left turn lane, one shared (left/right), and one right turn lane
- Modify lane designation for southbound Vincent Avenue approach at eastbound I-10 ramps as follows: 2.5 through lanes; 1.5 right turn lanes (from 3 through lanes).

(Caltrans, 2011)
Bus shelters would be refurbished/renovated at several locations. Shelters and associated public sidewalk access at both Vincent Avenue and Via Verde Street would be relocated. The proposed project would also include new sidewalk along South Garvey Avenue at the West Covina Civic Center between Pacific/West Covina Parkway and Sunset Avenue.

1.4.5 Ingress/Egress Facilities

Ingress/egress merge facilities would be provided at the following approximate locations to facilitate entry and exit to and from the HOV lanes and the mixed-flow lanes:

**Construction Phase 1**  
Between Vincent Avenue and Azusa Avenue

**Construction Phase 2**  
Between Holt Avenue and Via Verde Street (eastbound and westbound)  
Between Via Verde Street and Kellogg Drive (eastbound)

No direct ingress/egress ramps would be provided between the HOV lanes and arterial roads crossing I-10.

1.4.6 Retaining Walls and Soundwalls

Modeling results indicate that predicted traffic noise levels ($L_{eq[h]}$) for the design-year proposed project conditions would approach or exceed the federal Noise Abatement Criteria (NAC) of 67 A-weighted decibels (dBA) for Activity Category B land uses at many frequent outdoor use areas near I-10. Caltrans has considered noise abatement at all locations where traffic noise impacts are predicted, and soundwalls have been incorporated into the proposed project, as shown in Appendix E, Recommended Noise Barrier Locations. Under Caltrans Noise Protocol, local hotel property owners can choose to not participate in the noise abatement program; some businesses have written letters to inform Caltrans about their concern that a soundwall could obstruct views of their businesses from passing motorists. Retaining walls would also be incorporated into the project where required by design.

1.4.7 Right-of-Way Acquisition

The proposed project would require the acquisition of ROW as follows:

**Construction Phase 1.** Temporary construction easements (TCEs) would be required for this construction phase to build soundwalls and retaining walls. Construction may also result in encroachments into existing frontage roads. Encroachment Permits would be required from the cities of Baldwin Park and West Covina for construction adjacent to frontage roads. Two full nonresidential acquisitions would be required near the Vincent Avenue eastbound off-ramp in the City of West Covina, including one restaurant and one restaurant/retail store.

**Construction Phase 2.** TCEs would be required for this construction phase to build soundwalls and retaining walls, as well as for utilities work. Construction may also result in encroachments into existing frontage roads. Encroachment Permits would be required from the cities of West Covina and Covina for construction adjacent to frontage roads.
See Appendix I, Project Acquisitions and Easements, for a full list of potential acquisitions and easements required for the proposed project.

1.4.8 Consistency with Regional Planning Documents
The proposed I-10 HOV Lane Project is part of a regional network of existing and planned HOV facilities (see Figure 2-2). The proposed project would be consistent with the following state and regional transportation plans and programs:

- **2008 RTP**: FHWA issued a transportation and air quality conformity determination for the 2008 RTP, which includes the proposed I-10 HOV Lane Project, on June 5, 2008.

- **Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP)**: The RTIP, approved by FHWA and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) on September 2, 2010, includes the proposed I-10 HOV Lane Project.

- **State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)**: This multi-year capital improvement program of transportation projects on and off the State Highway System identifies the I-10 HOV Lane Project as a programmed project as of the April 2010 California Transportation Commission (CTC) Meeting.

- **Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP)**: The 2009 LRTP is Metro’s long-range planning tool to identify the county’s best transportation options and funding availability; this plan includes the I-10 HOV Lane Project.

- **Final Report – A Recommended HOV System for Los Angeles County** (Metro, October 23, 1996). This 20-year plan includes the proposed I-10 HOV Lane Project.

- **2008 HOV Annual Report** (Caltrans, District 7, January 2009). This report describes the goals and history of the HOV system the Los Angeles metropolitan area and includes profiles of existing HOV facilities and updates on recently completed projects and projects that are under construction.

- **District System Management Plan** (Caltrans, District 7, 1996). This Plan discusses interdistrict and interregional HOV elements, including the proposed I-10 HOV Lane Project.

1.5 Permits and Approvals Required
The proposed project would require permits from federal, state, and local agencies. The permits, reviews, and approvals listed in Table 1-3 could potentially be required for project construction.
### TABLE 1-3. POTENTIAL PERMITS AND APPROVALS FOR PROPOSED PROJECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Permit/Authority</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA</td>
<td>Transportation Conformity/Clean Air Act (CAA)</td>
<td>Conformity determination required, pursuant to CAA and derived regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB)</td>
<td>General Construction Storm Water Permit/Order No. 2009-0009-DWQ; National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) No. CAS000002</td>
<td>Compliance with this permit is triggered for development projects that would affect greater than 1-acre of land within California.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional and Local</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles RWQCB</td>
<td>Waste Discharge Requirements for Discharge of Groundwater from Construction and Project Dewatering to Surface Waters in Coastal Watersheds of Los Angeles and Ventura Counties, Order No. R4-2008-0032, NPDES Permit No. CAG994004</td>
<td>Compliance with Dewatering Permit required for any regulated discharge of groundwater to the environment during construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Baldwin park</td>
<td>Construction and Encroachment Permits</td>
<td>Compliance with City permitting requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of West Covina</td>
<td>Construction and Encroachment Permits</td>
<td>Compliance with City permitting requirements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Parsons, 2011.*

### 1.6 Uses of This Environmental Impact Report

The purpose of this FEIR is to provide decision makers, other responsible or interested agencies, and the general public with appropriate and sufficient information regarding the potential environmental effects of the proposed I-10 HOV Lane Project. This document has been prepared by Caltrans as the Lead Agency in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Cal Pub. Res. Code Section 21000 *et seq.*, as amended) and the implementation guidelines (Cal Code Regs., Title 14, Section 15000 *et seq.*). The environmental review process has been established to enable decision makers, the public, and responsible agencies to evaluate a project in terms of its environmental consequences, to examine and implement methods of eliminating or reducing potential adverse impacts, and to consider alternatives to the proposed project. While CEQA requires that major consideration be given to avoiding environmental damage, the Lead Agency and other responsible public agencies must balance adverse environmental effects against other objectives, including economic and social goals, in determining whether and in what manner the project should be approved.

Caltrans, as the Lead Agency under CEQA, has determined that an EIR is appropriate for this action because of the changes described below that have occurred since preparation of the IS/MND.
1.6.1 Changes to the Project Design

Since completion of the May 24, 2002, Draft Relocation Impact Report (DRIR), changes in project design were made to minimize impacts to adjacent properties. The 2010 revision of the DRIR and revised engineering drawings from 2011 indicated that project design was reconfigured to lessen the impact on adjacent properties. As a result, the residential properties affected by the proposed project are now limited to temporary and permanent easements.

For much of the project corridor, project design allows for an 8- to 10-foot-wide median shoulder, a 12-foot-wide HOV lane, four 12-foot-wide mixed-flow lanes, a 12-foot-wide auxiliary lane where applicable, and a 10-foot-wide outside shoulder in each direction. In addition to these proposed design changes, there would be a 12-foot-wide HOV passing lane when grades exceed 3 percent.

In addition to the design changes described above, the median treatment for the proposed project would be modified. In this regard, the concrete barrier median would have a pattern simulating stone and mortar.

1.6.2 Changes in Environmental Setting

As discussed above, three segments comprised the project corridor in the approved 2003 IS/EA. The three-segment corridor originated at I-605 in the city of Baldwin Park and continued through to the SR 57/SR 71 interchange. At the completion of the environmental process in 2003, funding was only available for Segment 1 of the previously identified project corridor; therefore, Segment 1, which runs from I-605 to Puente Avenue, is not evaluated in this report. The remaining proposed project would be constructed in two segments: Segment 2 from Puente Avenue to Citrus Street and Segment 3 from Citrus Street to the SR 57/SR 71 interchange.

There also have been some isolated changes in the physical land use within the affected corridor. As an example, the Westfield Mall on the south side of I-10 (at Vincent Avenue) has experienced changes in its business structures since 2003.
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2.0 Environmental Setting

2.1 Regional and Local Setting

2.1.1 General Environmental Conditions

As shown in Figure 2-1, the proposed I-10 HOV Lane Project corridor extends just over 9 miles from west to east through the jurisdictions of Baldwin Park, West Covina, Covina, Los Angeles County (unincorporated), Pomona, and San Dimas. The communities along this section of I-10 were largely developed along with the freeway in the 1950s. The project corridor can be characterized as urban, with the mostly unincorporated, hilly east end less densely developed than incorporated land to the west of Grand Avenue. Major land uses within the project corridor are commercial, residential, cemetery, and public (i.e., Cal Poly Pomona).

Climate. The climate in the proposed project area is considered Mediterranean with hot, dry summers and cooler, wet winters. Wind patterns in the area vary from season to season, with predominant westerly winds in the summer and northeasterly winds in the winter. During the late summer through the early fall, dry Santa Ana winds typically occur in southern California. Santa Ana winds are often associated with quickly spreading wildland fires in southern California. Most of the precipitation in the region occurs between November and April. Annual precipitation in the area averages approximately 18 inches. The mean annual maximum temperature in the proposed project area is approximately 77 degrees Fahrenheit (°F), with July and August being the warmest months, averaging in the upper 80 °F. Winter mean annual minimum temperature is approximately 49 °F, with December and January averaging approximately 41 °F (WRCC, 2011).

Landforms. The topography is generally flat across the west part of the I-10 project study area between Puente and Grand avenues. East of Grand Avenue, the elevation rises, with grades of up to 5.5 percent, as the freeway traverses the west side of Kellogg Hill. Kellogg Hill is part of the San Jose Hills complex, which forms a natural physical boundary between the San Gabriel Valley to the west and the San Bernardino Valley to the east. The proposed project region drains westerly to the San Gabriel River via concrete-lined Big Dalton Wash and Walnut Creek.

Biology. Vegetation adjacent to I-10 is typical of developed urban areas, predominantly consisting of nonnative landscaping and ruderal species. Native species are found on the embankment south of I-10 and east of Grand Avenue. Animal species are also typical of urbanized areas in eastern Los Angeles County.

Noise. The dominant source of noise within the proposed project area is traffic on I-10. Vehicles using local arterial and frontage streets are also major generators of noise.
Figure 2-1
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Source: Google Maps.
Socioeconomic. The year 2000 census population of the study area (block groups) is 49,931 persons, of which the largest individual racial group is Hispanic or Latino (of any race) at 46 percent. The second largest individual racial group is White at 30 percent, followed by Asian at 17 percent. The racial mix varies substantially within the study area from city to city. The western end of the project corridor consists of a largely Hispanic or Latino population, while in the eastern end there are high concentrations of White and Asian populations. Overall, the proposed project corridor consists of a variety of socioeconomic and multiethnic populations. Both lower and higher income, and ethnic minority and White populations live close to the I-10 corridor within the proposed project area.

A more detailed description of existing environmental conditions within the project area is provided in Chapter 3 under ‘Existing Conditions’ for each individual issue area heading. Chapter 3 includes a description of the applicable regulatory framework associated with each environmental issue, as applicable, and the existing environmental conditions against which the proposed project’s environmental impacts are to be measured.

2.1.2 Existing Transportation Facility

I-10 extending east from Los Angeles, and along Garvey Avenue through the project corridor, is aligned along the historic “Ramona Expressway” alignment. The expressway was later improved and renamed “Ramona Parkway” in the mid-1940s. On July 15, 1952, the California Highway Commission adopted I-10 as a freeway. The first segment of the "Ramona Freeway" opened on November 16, 1954 (it was renamed the San Bernardino Freeway 1-week later), with a segment running 13.4 miles from Kellogg Hill in Pomona to Archibald Avenue in Ontario. The freeway to the west between El Monte and Covina was still being built, and work had not started east of Ontario.

I-10 became part of the Freeway & Expressway System in 1959 and is also part of the Interstate Highway System. The freeway is included in the State Interregional Road System and is further classified as a “High Emphasis” and “Gateway” route. The entire length of I-10 is included in the National Highway System, the Department of Defense Priority Network, and the Strategic Highway Corridor Network. The 1990 Federal Surface Transportation Assistance Act (STAA) identifies I-10 as a “National Network” route for STAA trucks (www.cahighways.org).

As described in Chapter 1, I-10 currently operates as a four-lane freeway in each direction from the Puente Avenue interchange east to the Citrus Avenue interchange, with auxiliary lanes typically between on- and off-ramps. Going eastbound from Citrus Avenue to the SR 57/SR 71 interchange, the facility operates as a four-lane freeway with one auxiliary lane. In the westbound direction, I-10 operates in a similar fashion to the eastbound direction, with the exception of an additional fifth mixed-flow lane from Via Verde Street to Kellogg Drive. Ramp meters, a Transportation Management Plan (TMP) improvement, are provided on nearly all ramps along the subject corridor. Recurrent congestion occurs westbound in the
morning peak period and eastbound in the evening peak period. Most of the proposed project area currently operates at capacity in the morning and evening peak hours.

Caltrans recommends interchanges be spaced 1-mile apart in an urban setting to allow adequate distance for merging and diverging traffic. There are six interchanges within the proposed project area that are spaced 0.5-mile apart or less. This means that there is insufficient weaving length along portions of the subject freeway corridor. Combining overburdened traffic demands of the mainline freeway with numerous access points results in heavy congestion along this section of I-10 (Caltrans, 2009a).

2.1.3 Current HOV System

There are more than 425 miles of existing HOV lanes within the counties of Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernardino, and Riverside, as shown in Figure 2-2. Numerous additional lane-miles are either in the planning, design or construction stages of development.

The existing El Monte Busway, a separated HOV facility, extends east from Alameda Street in the Los Angeles Central Business District (CBD) to Baldwin Avenue in the city of El Monte. The segment of the El Monte Busway from Alameda Street to Interstate Route 710 (I-710) is located on the north side of I-10. The busway is in the I-10 median from I-710 to I-605. Construction of an easterly extension of the existing HOV facility in the I-10 median is currently (2011) in progress along a 2.3-mile-long stretch between I-605 to just west of Puente Avenue.

2.2 Area and Local Plans

As listed in Section 1.4.8, several state and regional transportation plans and programs apply to the project corridor. In addition, each affected jurisdiction has developed general plan documents that are intended to guide long-term physical development. State law requires that the general plan include the following elements at a minimum: land use, housing, circulation, noise, open space, conservation, and public safety.

2.2.1 Local Agency Plans

City of Baldwin Park. The City of Baldwin Park’s General Plan 2020, approved in 2002, includes all seven required elements plus two elements for Urban Design and Economic Development. An Implementation Plan, adopted separately from the General Plan elements, was also approved to identify specific actions the City will undertake to implement goals and policies contained in the general plan. Only an approximate 0.25-mile-long stretch of the project corridor between approximately Puente and Merced avenues is included within Baldwin Park. Land uses in the freeway vicinity are primarily commercial establishments, including restaurant and motel uses.

City of West Covina. Adopted in 1985, the City of West Covina’s general plan establishes standards for population density and the intensity of land use development. The general plan focuses nonresidential development in two major commercial cores: the CBD and at Eastland
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Shopping Center. More than half (i.e., more than 5 miles) of the 9-mile-long project corridor is encompassed by the City of West Covina.

Existing land uses in West Covina north of I-10 include single- and multi-family residential uses; commercial uses (i.e., retail shopping, restaurants, hotel/motel, office, auto dealership); and institutional uses. Similarly, land uses south of I-10 include single-family, multi-family, and large-lot residential; commercial (i.e., retail shopping, restaurants, hotel/motel, office, auto dealership); institutional (including school); and vacant.

City of Covina. The City of Covina last updated its general plan land use element in 1989. Within the city’s sphere of influence, but currently unincorporated, low-density residential is
designated for areas immediately adjacent to the city boundary, north of I-10, and generally east of Holt Avenue. Approximately 0.75-mile of freeway extends along the city’s boundary. Existing land uses in Covina and north of I-10 consist mostly of single- and multi-family residential with limited commercial retail and a hotel use near Holt Avenue. South of I-10, there are no land uses under jurisdiction of the City of Covina.

**City of San Dimas.** The City of San Dimas last updated its general plan land use element in 1991. The land use element identifies the Via Verde interchange as a gateway to the city and recommends that this area be developed with unique landscaping and a city entry sign on public property to create a sense of identity. Approximately 2 miles of I-10 extends along the southern boundary of the city. Existing land uses north of I-10 are low-density residential, vacant, and open space. There is an existing park-and-ride facility on the north side of I-10 at Via Verde Street.

**City of Pomona.** While Pomona does not extend into the proposed project area, it is within the right of way (ROW) limits of the I-10/SR 57/SR 71 interchange. The 2007 Pomona general plan is focused on economic expansion via strategic development in downtown, commercial corridors, shopping centers, and freeway gateways. Because the interchange is Caltrans ROW, there are no existing or planned development projects in Pomona immediately adjacent to the project corridor. Existing land uses in Pomona nearest to the eastern project terminus are commercial, office, agricultural, and residential.

**Los Angeles County.** The County’s general plan, adopted in 1980, serves as the long-range planning document to provide the framework for future development and resource conservation. The County is currently (2011) in the process of reviewing the ‘Draft 2035 General Plan’ update, with anticipated agency approval in 2012. The unincorporated “Walnut Islands” border the south side of the I-10 ROW for approximately 2.9 miles between West Covina and Pomona. Land uses along the project corridor in unincorporated Los Angeles County include Forest Lawn Memorial Park, a privately owned cemetery; Cal Poly Pomona; single-family (ranchette) residential uses at a maximum density of 1 unit per acre; and open space.

### 2.2.2 Other Applicable Plans

**California State Polytechnic University, Pomona Campus Plan.** In addition to local agency general plans, Cal Poly operates under a Campus Master Plan that was approved in July 2000. The plan aims to create a physical environment that fosters the university’s educational mission of advancing learning and knowledge for students. Key principals of the Master Plan include (1) integrated land use enhancing an academic community, (2) college neighborhoods as an organizing unit, and (3) concentrated pedestrian campus surrounded by large open spaces. The campus borders the south I-10 ROW at the eastern end of the project corridor, between Forest Lawn Memorial Park and the I-10/SR 57/SR 71 interchange.
The university is currently in the process of preparing a Campus Master Plan revision. Figure 2-3 is a map of the proposed master plan facilities, as presented in the April 2011 Environmental Initial Study. The Master Plan is being proposed as both a vision and a program for meeting the university’s future space and place needs. The proposed revision involves demolition or renovation of certain buildings, as well as construction of new buildings and facilities. Improvements to the circulation network in and around campus is planned, involving realignment of main roadways and improved bicycle and pedestrian linkages (Cal Poly Pomona, 2011).
Figure 2-3
Campus Master Plan Map, Cal Poly Pomona
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3.0 Environmental Analysis

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires Caltrans to identify each “significant effect on the environment” resulting from the project and ways to mitigate each significant effect. If the project may have a significant effect on any environmental resource, then an EIR must be prepared. Each and every significant effect on the environment must be disclosed in the EIR and mitigated if feasible. In addition, the CEQA Guidelines list a number of mandatory findings of significance, which also require the preparation of an EIR. This chapter discusses the effects of this project and CEQA significance.

As part of the scoping and environmental analysis conducted for the project, the following environmental issues were considered but no adverse impacts were identified. Consequently, there is no further discussion regarding these issues in this document.

**Forest Resources:** The subject I-10 corridor is within an urban area. No forest land, timberland, or timberland-zoned Timberland Production areas are located within the proposed project vicinity.

**Mineral Resources:** Based on review of General Plans for the jurisdictions through which I-10 passes, there are no known natural mineral resources or locally important mineral resource recovery sites in the I-10 project study area.
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3.1 Aesthetics and Visual Resources

Aesthetics and visual resources are generally defined as the natural and built features of the landscape visible from public views that contribute to an area’s visual quality. This section describes the existing visual environment and changes resulting from the proposed project. Information for this section was obtained from the *Visual Impact Assessment Report* (Caltrans, 1993a) and *Visual Impact Study* (Caltrans, 1995a).

The evaluation of visual resources in the context of environmental analysis typically addresses contrast between visible landscape elements. Collectively, these elements comprise the aesthetic environment, or landscape character. The landscape character is compared to the proposed project’s visual qualities to determine the compatibility or contrast resulting from project buildout.

3.1.1 Existing Conditions

Evaluation of the existing visual quality was based upon field observations and documented with photographs and “street views” taken from key observer viewpoints using Google Maps (2011). The existing visual conditions reveal the visual experience of the adjacent land user and the highway user along the project area. Four observer viewpoints were selected to represent various conditions in the study area, as shown in Figure 3.1-1. Onsite photographs taken from these viewpoints are provided in Figures 3.1-2a and 3.1-2b.

3.1.1.1 Project Setting

A regional landscape defines those elements of the natural and built environment that together form a unique visual identity of a place or corridor. This regional landscape establishes the general visual environment of the project, but the specific visual environment upon which this assessment is focused is determined by defining the landscape units and project viewshed, which are discussed below.

The regional landscape of the project corridor is characterized by two identifying elements: the flat appearance of the foreground landscape and the steep, far-off view of the San Gabriel Mountains. Vegetation exists along the existing corridor in many locations, which is not unique to the I-10 project corridor; however, the freeway median is devoid of vegetation for the entire length of the proposed project. One additional element to be considered in the regional landscape is the smog that frequently develops in the area and obscures the views of the mountains, which influences the overall appearance of the regional landscape.
Figure 3.1-1
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3.1.1.2 Project Viewshed

A viewshed is the area normally visible from an observer’s viewpoint of location and is limited by the screening/obstruction effects of any vegetation or structures. The viewshed includes the locations of viewers likely to be affected by visual changes brought about by the project features.

For most of the proposed project, views from the cross streets into the corridor are generally located near the corridor, within approximately 0.25-mile, due to the relatively flat nature of the eastern San Gabriel Valley. The hillsides along the eastern end of the project corridor provide views looking down toward the freeway, as well as views of hills across the freeway. Areas where multi-story office and hotel buildings are located may have views farther out from the corridor. From within the corridor, views out are also generally limited to a short distance due to the flat ground plane and the proximity of buildings. In addition, existing soundwalls limit both the views and the viewshed into and out from the corridor.

3.1.1.3 Visual Character

The diversity of visual characteristics in the study area is comprised of the following land uses: commercial/light industrial; single-family, multi-family, and estate residential; cemetery; institutional; and open space. Urban development along the highway is visually dominant throughout the project area. The San Gabriel Mountains are visible from some freeway segments on clear days. These land uses afford a wide range of visual characteristics that can be described as urban, semi-urban, and disturbed inland foothills and valleys.

**Urban.** These areas are characterized by high-density development and structured (i.e., man-made) landscaping. Urban developments may be residential, commercial, industrial, or institutional.

**Semi-Urban.** These are areas of suburban development adjacent to existing roads and highways, and they include large single-family properties, cemetery, and open space. These uses are characterized by openness along the roadway and within the adjacent properties.

**Disturbed Inland Foothills and Valleys.** These are areas of hilly topography that have had their natural appearance disturbed by human activities. This disturbance is characterized by vegetative cover removal, grading activities, and installation of roadways, buildings, or utilities.

3.1.1.4 Observer Viewpoints

Four project corridor viewpoints were chosen to show the variable character of the site both within and adjacent to I-10.

**Viewpoint 1.** This view toward westbound I-10, to the east of Ellen Drive, shows a frontage road and vegetation-covered wall in the foreground with the tops of commercial buildings...
providing the background. It received a medium-low visual quality score due to the lack of integration of the street and vegetation-covered wall.

**Viewpoint 2.** This view of westbound I-10 from South Garvey west of Baymar Avenue received a low visual quality rating because few trees dot the landscape, elements flow into one another, little coherent pattern, little integration with the natural environment, and lack of overall unity.

**Viewpoint 3.** This view of westbound I-10 at the Barranca Avenue overpass depicts commercial uses and other urban characteristics with light landscaping buffers. It received a medium-low visual quality score due to the lack of distinctive buildings and sparse landscaping.

**Viewpoint 4.** This view of westbound I-10 shows the Kellogg Hill area of disturbed inland foothills and valleys in the foreground and rural residential in the background. It received a medium visual quality rating due to the surrounding undeveloped hillsides.

### 3.1.1.5 Existing Viewer Groups, Exposure, and Awareness

**Freeway Travelers.** Along the I-10 corridor, thousands of travelers, including regular commuters, frequent travelers, occasional travelers, and tourists, traverse the project area in a typical day. Of these users, the daily commuter would have the greatest sensitivity to changes in the visual environment due in large part to daily exposure to the corridor. Other freeway users would have a decreasing exposure and knowledge of the previous visual environment; therefore, they would be expected to have a decreasing sensitivity to change. With congested traffic, the length of exposure increases – drivers have a longer time to focus attention on the highway elements, and passengers tend to have more time and a wider range of views than drivers.

**Community Residents.** Residents can be expected to have a high concern and a high degree of sensitivity to changes in the visual environment with regard to the project and its effect on views from their homes and neighborhoods. In addition, residents can be expected to have a concern about the views from the highway into their communities. In areas of adjoining cities and communities, there is often a desire to differentiate one community from the next, particularly along freeways that often serve as main entry points to a community.

**Business Owners, Employees, and Customers.** In general, this user group would be expected to have a low sensitivity to the changes in the visual environment. This group is more concerned with maintaining access to the business than the change in the visual environment; however, business owners are often concerned with the aesthetics of the project corridor and how that might reflect on the community.

**Local Street Users.** Local street users, including drivers, bicyclists, and pedestrians, have generally short-duration views into the corridor every day, mostly from the many cross streets over and under the corridor. Because the speed of travel of these viewer groups is
much slower than that of the highway traveler, they are expected to have a high to moderate sensitivity to changes in the visual environment, depending on their familiarity with the current views. Views into the project area can also be broken by vegetation, buildings, or fencing that limit some views or break up the panorama into intermittent views.

### 3.1.2 Regulatory Requirements

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) establishes that it is the policy of the state to take all action necessary to provide the people of the state “with…enjoyment of aesthetic, natural, scenic and historic environmental qualities.” (CA Public Resources Code Section 21001[b])

Urban Design and Open Space elements of the general plans for each jurisdiction were reviewed for regulatory requirements within the project area.

#### 3.1.2.1 City of Baldwin Park

Relevant polices from Baldwin Park’s Open Space Element include:

- **Policy 5.3**: Maintain and conserve existing street trees, and require replacement where trees are removed.
- **Policy 6.2**: Buffer residential from nonresidential uses with aesthetically pleasing walls, landscaping, and/or fencing.

#### 3.1.2.2 County of Los Angeles

Relevant policies from the County’s Open Space Element include:

- **Policy 16**: Protect the visual quality of scenic areas, including ridgelines and scenic views from public roads, trails, and key vantage points.
- **Policy 35**: Support preservation of heritage trees. Encourage tree planting programs to enhance the beauty of urban landscaping.

#### 3.1.2.3 City of San Dimas

A relevant policy from San Dimas’ Open Space Element includes:

- **Policy 5.1.2**: Protect views and viewsheds of the foothills.

#### 3.1.2.4 City of Walnut

A relevant policy from Walnut’s Environmental Resources Management Element includes:

- **Policy 3**: Protect scenic, historic, natural wildlife, archaeological, and cultural resources of this area.
3.1.2.5 City of Pomona

Relevant policies from Pomona’s Community Design Element include:

- **Policy 6-G-5**: Promote attractive community character as viewed from public streets, while providing adequate buffer areas between homes and heavily traveled roads.

- **Policy 6-P-11**: Do not permit soundwalls or perimeter walls along major streets or corridors, except along freeways and railroad tracks. In all other instances, permit soundwalls only upon finding that alternative noise attenuation measures are not available.

- **Policy 6-P-12**: Provide a landscape buffer between public sidewalks and existing perimeter and soundwalls. Plant shrubs, turf, ground cover, and clinging vines within the landscaped area.

- **Policy 6-P-19**: Provide street trees on all public street frontages. Plant street trees linearly within planter strips between curb and sidewalk, with regular spacing that relates to tree canopy width. Coordinate street tree placement with utility placement, lighting, and curb cuts.

- **Policy 6-G-42**: Minimize the intrusion of I-10 and its interchange on the visual character and form of the City.

- **Policy 6-P-118**: Provide planting strips with large canopy trees between the road and sidewalk to buffer pedestrians from traffic and help define street space along residential and commercial streets. Install pedestrian amenities in the planting strip, such as street lighting, seating, open bus stop shelters, bicycle racks, and mailboxes.

- **Policy 6-P-120**: Work with Caltrans to improve landscaping along the I-10 freeway and interchanges, as well as state highways to minimize the visual and physical impact of these highways on neighborhood communities.
  - Recognize interstate off-ramps as important entrances to the City;
  - Establish a consistent scheme of colorful plantings and directional signage; and
  - Initiate or encourage Business Improvement Districts along state highways to improve pedestrian amenities and appearance.

Urban Design and Open Space General Plan elements were unavailable for online review for the cities of West Covina and Covina.

3.1.3 Significance Criteria

Criteria for determining the significance of impacts related to aesthetics and visual resources are based on the CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G – Environmental Checklist. Impacts from the proposed project would be considered significant under the following circumstances:

**VIS-1**: Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.
VIS-2: Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway.

VIS-3: Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.

VIS-4: Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

3.1.4 Impacts

3.1.4.1 No Project Alternative
Activities that would occur under the No Project Alternative include routine maintenance of the project corridor area. The No Project Alternative would not include construction of HOV lanes within the project corridor; therefore, this alternative would not result in aesthetic and visual resource impacts.

3.1.4.2 Proposed Project Alternative
Impact VIS-1: The proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.

There are distant scenic views of the San Gabriel Mountains from some vantage points along the proposed project alignment. These scenic views are currently degraded by the intervening urban environment, and any effect due to soundwalls would not be considered substantially adverse.

Impact VIS-2: The proposed project would not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway.

I-10 is not designated as a state scenic highway within the proposed project area; therefore, the proposed project would not have any effect on scenic resources within a state-designated scenic highway. Furthermore, there are no heritage trees, large rock outcroppings, or historic buildings within the project corridor that would be affected by the proposed project.

Impact VIS-3: The proposed project would not degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.

The visual impact of the proposed project is determined by assessing the visual resource change resulting from the project and predicting viewer response to that change. Visual resource change is the total change in visual character and visual quality. The first step in determining visual resource change is to assess the compatibility of the proposed project with the existing visual character of the landscape. The second step is to compare the visual quality of the existing resources with the projected visual quality after the project is
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constructed. The proposed visual quality described below assumes typical project components such as landscaping of disturbed areas and architectural detailing of all structural elements.

**Temporary.** Project construction would be multi-phased and would occur in different locations at different times. All construction activities, whether for facility demolition, roadway, or bridge and ramp work, would involve the use of a variety of construction equipment, stockpiling of soils and materials, and other visual signs of construction. While evidence of construction activity would be noticeable to motorists, area residents, and others in the project vicinity, such visual disruptions would be short term and are a common feature of the urban environment. Some construction would be accomplished at night. Project specifications would require the project contractor to direct artificial lighting onto the worksite while working in residential areas at night to minimize “spill-over” light or glare effects.

**Permanent.** The proposed project generally would neither substantially alter existing viewsheds, nor change the overall composition of the visual environment. With the exception of the Kellogg Hill viewshed (see Figure 3.1.2-b, Viewpoint 4), views from surrounding land uses are not generally oriented toward I-10. Activities associated with the proposed project that would affect the visual environment include:

- **Vegetation Removal** – Existing trees, shrubs, and grasses would be removed along the entire project corridor where required for construction improvements, including for construction of retaining and soundwalls. This would adversely affect the existing visual quality of the freeway; however, in some areas vegetation removal may open up views of the distant San Gabriel Mountains. The freeway median is currently paved, so there would be no effect along the center of the facility. This change would be most noticeable to motorists, and it would remain until new landscaping has time to mature.

- **HOV Lanes** – A new lane would be added in each direction within the current median of the freeway. The proposed project would result in a permanent change in the visual setting where the HOV lanes can be viewed from the foreground and the middle-ground distance zones in the vicinity of the Cal Poly Pomona campus. The addition of this lane would also require some widening to the outside of the freeway. The result would be a wider pavement section throughout the corridor. The widened pavement would be a noticeable feature for drivers in the corridor; however, much of this area is already paved, and although the pavement type would change from asphalt to concrete, it would not greatly alter the overall visual quality of the corridor.

- **Bridges** – The proposed project would require modifications to existing bridges and construction of retaining and soundwalls. Several bridges, undercrossings, and overcrossings would require widening or partial replacement to the outside, as described in Chapter 1. Given that the existing bridges were generally constructed
without the design and aesthetic considerations usually applied to new projects, the new structure components should be more aesthetically pleasing than the bridge structures. The new bridges would likely maintain or increase the existing visual quality of the corridor.

- **Retaining Walls** – Retaining walls located within the interchange areas are associated with the outside edges of the ramps; therefore, they face outward from the corridor. Because the walls are relatively short and confined to ramp locations, they are expected to be noticeable, but they are not expected to affect the overall visual quality of the interchange area. At Cal Poly Pomona, retaining walls proposed to be constructed on the south side of I-10, between the University House parking lot and the Kellogg Drive off-ramp, would be visible from the campus. While mature vegetation exists between these viewer groups and the retaining walls, this change in the visual setting could constitute a moderate impact to some observers.

- **Soundwalls** – New soundwalls placed at various locations along both sides of the project corridor would affect existing views from the freeway toward surrounding urban areas. Existing distant views to the San Gabriel Mountains may be obstructed in areas where there are no existing soundwalls. In some areas, the proposed project would beneficially obstruct views of freeway travel lanes from surrounding residential properties.

Based on review of local planning policies with the various municipalities within the corridor, including Los Angeles County, viewers familiar with the area would have a moderate sensitivity to changes in the visual environment; however, as seen by many casual observers traveling I-10, the elements proposed by this project would not be unexpected within the freeway corridor.

The project’s anticipated overall moderate visual change, combined with moderate viewer sensitivity level, would result in a moderate visual impact to the corridor.

The proposed project would include landscaping in the remaining available public ROW, consistent with Caltrans’ existing procedures and standards regarding plant materials and placement. Local jurisdictions affected by the proposed project would be invited to work with Caltrans on the landscaping plans associated with construction of the HOV lanes.

Caltrans has an existing program to collect litter, replace landscaping, and clean graffiti within the Caltrans’ ROW, which would continue during operation of the HOV lanes; therefore, the proposed project would not result in significant aesthetic impacts related to litter, degraded landscaping, and graffiti.
Impact VIS-4: The proposed project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

Temporary. Some construction would be accomplished at night. Project specifications would require the project contractor to direct artificial lighting onto the worksite while working in residential areas at night to minimize “spill-over” light or glare effects.

Permanent. Existing light and glare sources in the I-10 project study area include lighting on the I-10 mainline and ramps, on area streets, in parking areas, and around existing land uses. Most of the study area is developed with urban uses, and there are no existing substantial adverse sources of light and glare. Existing shadow sources include structures such as residences, businesses, walls, and overcrossings. The existing visual quality in the study area is not high, and there are no sensitive land uses that would be adversely affected by light, glare, and/or shadow associated with the proposed project. The proposed project would not introduce permanent changes to this condition.

3.1.5 Mitigation Measures
To address the moderate visual impacts to the project area and the change of scale of the highway corridor visually within the community, the following mitigation is recommended.

MM VA-1 (ref. to Impact VIS-3): During the project design stage, architectural detailing will be applied to the retaining walls, including textures and patterns (see Figure 3.1-3).

MM VA-2 (ref. to Impact VIS-3): During the project design and construction stages, existing vegetation in the corridor will be saved and protected to the extent that is feasible.

MM VA-3 (ref. to Impact VIS-3): During the project design stage, and to the extent feasible, skyline trees will be included in the new plantings to replace those removed by construction.

No mitigation measures are required for impacts VIS-1, VIS-2, and VIS-4.

Mitigation was also identified in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Record (MMRP) in 2003 and includes the following measures:

MM VA-4: The final design of the proposed project will include soundwalls and retaining walls designed to be easily cleaned of graffiti, as well as landscaping where feasible to soften the appearance of these walls.

MM VA-5: Coordinate the design of soundwall aesthetics with local agencies.

MM VA-6: During final design, conceptual landscape guidelines for planting in designated right-of-way areas to be revegetated, consistent with existing Caltrans policies and procedures, will be developed, in coordination with the adjacent local jurisdictions.
MM VA-7: For Segment 3, final design will incorporate features to ensure that landscaping plantings are integrated with proposed earth berms and cut slopes to screen undesirable views. The grading guidelines will address issues such as where berms are recommended, the sizes of the berms and the recommended slope gradients to minimize soil erosion.

MM VA-8: Landscape areas that will take the longest time to establish and achieve their desired visual effects will be installed as early as feasible in the construction process. Rehabilitation priorities will be established as a framework based on the size of the area to be landscaped, the visibility of the area and the feasibility of installing landscaping prior to or during construction, rather than after construction is complete.

MM VA-9: Caltrans will require construction contractors to shield construction and storage areas from travelers on I-10 and from viewsheds along I-10 to the extent feasible and where the safety of construction and traffic operations is not compromised.

MM VA-10: Construction will be phased such that areas to be relandscaped are landscaped as soon as possible after construction in the immediate vicinity is completed.

3.1.6 Level of Significance after Mitigation
Less than significant impacts to visual and aesthetic resources are anticipated as a result of the proposed project.
Figure 3.1-3 Concrete Barrier Architectural Treatment
3.2 Traffic

This section has been prepared based on the following technical reports: *I-10 Proposed HOV Traffic Study from Puente Avenue Interchange (PM 33.4) to the SR-57/SR-71 Interchange (PM 42.4)* (Caltrans, 2009a); Traffic Impact Analysis, Interstate Route 10 at Vincent Avenue (Caltrans, 2011); and *Interstate 10 High Occupancy Vehicle Lane from Puente Avenue to the State Route 57/State Route 71/Interstate Route 210 Interchange, Non-Highway Transportation Technical Report* (Caltrans, 2008c). These technical reports analyzed traffic conditions for both the No Project and I-10 HOV Lane Alternatives.

3.2.1 Existing Conditions

This section addresses existing freeway, roadway, and nonmotorized travel conditions in the I-10 HOV Lane project corridor.

3.2.1.1 Interstate 10

Figure 1-4 shows the existing lane configuration of I-10 between the Puente Avenue and SR 57/SR 71 interchanges. There are 12 freeway interchanges on I-10 in the project corridor. I-10 from the Puente Avenue interchange to the Citrus Avenue interchange currently operates as a four-lane freeway with auxiliary lanes typically between on- and off-ramps. Going eastward from the Citrus Avenue interchange to the SR 57/SR 71 interchange, I-10 operates as a four-lane freeway with one auxiliary lane. The westbound direction operates in a similar fashion to the eastbound direction, with the exception of an additional fifth mixed-flow lane from Via Verde Street to Kellogg Drive. See Section 1.3.2 of this EIR for more information about I-10 and connected transportation facilities in the region.

There are numerous ramps providing 50 merge/diverge points with I-10. Each merge/diverge point creates potential conflicts, resulting in congestion. Caltrans recommends interchanges every 1-mile in an urban setting. Ideally, 2,000 feet of weaving length are provided between points of conflict. In the project corridor, there are six interchanges spaced 0.5-mile apart or less. This means that there is insufficient weaving length in these sections of I-10. Combining the overburdened traffic demands of the mainline freeway with the numerous access points in a tight urban setting creates heavy congestion.

The 2008 average daily traffic (ADT) ranged from 222,400 vehicles per day (vpd) on I-10 between Grand and East Holt avenues to 240,300 vpd between Vincent and Azusa avenues. The westbound direction of I-10 experiences delay from recurrent congestion in the AM peak period of 6:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. The eastbound direction experiences delay in the PM peak period of 3:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. The typical AM peak hour is 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 a.m. while the typical PM peak hour is 4:30 p.m. to 5:30 p.m. (Caltrans, 2009).

This existing conditions analysis evaluates the current state of traffic operations along the I-10 corridor using Year 2008 traffic counts. The base year analysis does not account for the ongoing construction of HOV lanes on I-10 between I-605 and just west of Puente Avenue.
Traffic conditions are assessed by calculating the LOS on the freeway mainline (see Figure 1-3 for a definition of LOS criteria used for this proposed action). The existing conditions analysis results will be used to establish baseline conditions for the “proposed project” traffic impact assessment described below. This section summarizes the existing roadway circulation network, peak-hour traffic volumes, and service levels in the corridor.

Table 3.2-1 shows existing AM and PM peak-period traffic volumes on I-10 in the study area.

**Freeway Mainline LOS Conditions.** Under Existing Conditions (2008), the eastbound freeway mainline operates at LOS D or better during the AM peak hour and LOS E or worse during the PM peak hour. The I-10/SR 57 ramp operates at LOS C in the AM peak hour and LOS D in the PM peak hour.

For the westbound freeway mainline, the LOS analysis results indicate that most of the freeway segments currently (2008) operate at an unsatisfactory LOS of E to F. The SR 57/I-10 ramp operates at LOS D in both the AM and PM peak hours.

The peak-hour freeway segment LOSs are determined by the observed traffic volumes on the freeway and are not indicative of all the congested areas on the freeway. Congestion within the study area can also be attributed to heavy merging/weaving volumes, as described above, or by traffic queues backing up onto the freeway from congested off-ramps.

**3.2.1.2 Local Roadways**

I-10 within the project corridor is crossed by several local arterial and collector streets. Garvey Avenue North serves as a frontage road along the north side of freeway segments from Baldwin Park through West Covina into Covina. Garvey Avenue South serves the same purpose along much of the south side of freeway.

For the purpose of this Final EIR, local street traffic conditions at the Vincent Avenue interchange were studied because the interchange would be reconfigured by the proposed project. Proposed improvements to the interchange are listed in Section 1.4.4 of this Final EIR. This interchange, which most closely resembles a partial cloverleaf, has two intersections, as follows: Westbound I-10 Ramps at Vincent Avenue, with one single-lane exit off ramp and two on ramps, one for northbound Vincent Avenue traffic and the other for southbound traffic; and Eastbound I-10 Ramps at Vincent Avenue, with a two-lane exit either to the southbound Vincent Avenue ramp or to a northbound Vincent Avenue loop ramp and two on ramps, one a bypass loop ramp and the other a reverse curve alignment. All four interchange on-ramps are metered, and all but the ramp in the southeast quadrant have carpool lanes. Both intersections are currently operating at LOS D or better, which is considered satisfactory in the City of West Covina. (Caltrans, 2011)
## Table 3.2-1. AM/PM Peak-Period Volume Summary and ADT* for Existing and Future Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I-10 between:</th>
<th>Existing (2008) Conditions</th>
<th>Future (2035) Baseline Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AM Peak</td>
<td>AM LOS*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>WB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puente Avenue to Pacific Avenue</td>
<td>6,255</td>
<td>7,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Avenue to Vincent Avenue</td>
<td>6,267</td>
<td>7,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent Avenue to Azusa Avenue</td>
<td>6,488</td>
<td>8,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azusa Avenue to Citrus Avenue</td>
<td>6,441</td>
<td>8,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citrus Avenue to Berranca Avenue</td>
<td>6,573</td>
<td>8,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berranca Avenue to Grand Avenue</td>
<td>6,656</td>
<td>8,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Avenue to Holt Avenue</td>
<td>6,297</td>
<td>7,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holt Avenue to Via Verde</td>
<td>6,379</td>
<td>7,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via Verde Street to Kellogg Drive</td>
<td>6,218</td>
<td>8,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kellogg Drive to SR 57 off-ramp</td>
<td>5,760</td>
<td>6,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 57 off-ramp to SR 71</td>
<td>3,893</td>
<td>6,561</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Peak Hour LOS (see Figure 1-3 for a definition of LOS criteria)

*Source: Caltrans, 2009.*
3.2.1.3 Nonmotorized Travel

Nonmotorized travel within the proposed project corridor is discussed in this section. ‘Nonmotorized’ as defined for this purpose includes public transit services and facilities.

**Park-and-Ride Lots.** Park-and-ride lots allow transit users to leave their cars close to their original destination to use another form of transportation for the remainder of their trip. Nearly all of the park-and-ride lots are offered to transit users at no cost. Existing park-and-ride lots within the vicinity of the project corridor are listed in Table 3.2-2.

**Metrolink.** The San Bernardino/Los Angeles Metrolink line runs roughly parallel to I-10 from downtown Los Angeles to the city of San Bernardino. It crosses under I-10 to the west of the Puente Avenue interchange and then runs north for much of the project area between West San Bernardino Road and West Cypress Street. As Metrolink nears SR 57, its course veers north of East Covina Boulevard, but still runs parallel to I-10.

**TABLE 3.2-2. EXISTING PARK-AND-RIDE LOTS IN PROPOSED PROJECT VICINITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot Owner</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Lot Characteristics</th>
<th>Estimated Weekday Utilization Percentage (2008)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>718 S. Azusa Avenue, West Covina</td>
<td>Surface; 58 spaces</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>437 W. San Bernardino Road, Covina</td>
<td>Surface; 10 spaces</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Via Verde Street at SR 57, San Dimas</td>
<td>Surface; 88 spaces</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Baldwin Park</td>
<td>14800 Badillo Street, Baldwin Park</td>
<td>Surface; 50 spaces</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3825 Downing Avenue, Baldwin Park</td>
<td>Surface; Baldwin Park Metrolink Station; approximately 180 spaces</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of West Covina</td>
<td>1444 Garvey Avenue, West Covina</td>
<td>Parking structure; 300 spaces; portion leased by Foothill Transit</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1200 W. Covina Parkway, West Covina</td>
<td>Surface; 250 spaces operated by Foothill Transit</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Covina</td>
<td>559 N. Citrus Avenue, Covina</td>
<td>Parking structure; Covina Metrolink Station; 655 spaces</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>600 N. Citrus Avenue, Covina</td>
<td>Surface; 219 spaces</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>124 E. College Street, Covina</td>
<td>Parking structure; Civic Center; 114 spaces</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>250 E. San Bernardino Street, Covina</td>
<td>Surface; approximately 112 spaces</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Dimas</td>
<td>Via Verde at I-10, San Dimas</td>
<td>Surface; 239 spaces</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Caltrans, 2009a; Parsons.*

Two Metrolink stations are located near the project corridor: Baldwin Park Station (3825 Downing Avenue) and Covina Station (600 North Citrus Avenue). As shown in Table 3.2-2, parking exists at these stations for Metrolink users. Some stations require a parking fee; Covina Metrolink Station offers passes at $20.00 per month.
The Metrolink fare is based on the distance traveled. The public has the option of buying round-trip or one-way tickets. Discount rates are available for seniors, students, disabled, and special groups. A regular roundtrip fare is approximately $14.50 from Los Angeles Union Station to Covina Station.

All Metrolink stations are served by numerous bus routes. Bicycles are also allowed on Metrolink trains (Metrolink, 2011).

**Transit Service.** Transit service is provided throughout the project limits by Foothill Transit, Metro, Go West, and Access Paratransit.

**Foothill Transit.** As a joint powers authority (JPA) between various public agencies in southern California, Foothill Transit provides bus service for the San Gabriel and Pomona valleys in Los Angeles County. Foothill Transit operates 13 lines within the subject freeway corridor and services points east as far as Claremont. These service routes include transfer stops at numerous park-and-ride lots and Metrolink stations. Foothill Transit lines typically offer several midday trips, whereas the Metro commuter routes operate only during the peak commute time periods. A ‘Silver Streak’ line runs 24 hours per day. Local adult fares are $1.25 and regular Silver Streak fares are $2.75 (Foothill Transit, 2011).

**Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority.** Metro only operates commuter transit routes between Puente Avenue and the SR 57/SR 71 freeways. Two routes, M-194 and M-190, currently run from El Monte Station to Cal Poly Pomona. Metro operates the Silver Line for service between El Monte Station and downtown Los Angeles. Most buses accommodate bicycles through the use of bicycle racks on the front of the bus. Rates for tickets and passes vary according to distance traveled. Base fares on Metro buses are $1.50 (Metro, 2011).

**Go West.** As a city of West Covina Metrolink shuttle service, Go West serves the city of West Covina and the Covina Metrolink station transit users. Three routes run within West Covina between Puente Avenue and Grand Avenue. Each route crosses I-10 at least once. One way fares on Go West are 50 cents (http://www.westcovina.org/cityhall/rec/transit/).

**Access Paratransit.** Access Paratransit provides services to people with disabilities who are unable to use public fixed-route transportation systems. Unlike Foothill Transit and Metro, Access Paratransit uses only small buses, minivans, or taxis; however, paratransit services are not required to be complimentary to commuter rail or bus services.

Unlike Foothill Transit and Metro, Access Paratransit trips are not provided on a prepublished routing map and do not follow standardized time tables. Trips are coordinated among users and provided on an as-needed basis. For trips up to 20 miles in length there is a fare of $2.25. The fare is $3.00 for trips farther than 20 miles (Access Paratransit, 2011).
Bikeways. Local streets within the project vicinity are used at any time for bicycle travel. Bicyclists may share the road with other motor vehicles, have their own exclusive lane of travel, or ride along separated and designated paths that are removed from the roadway. Bicycle paths, lanes, or routes according to the Caltrans Highway Design Manual, Chapter 10, are as follows:

- **Class I Bikeway (Bike Path)** – Provides a completely separated ROW for the exclusive use of bicycles and pedestrians with crossflow by motorists minimized
- **Class II Bikeway (Bike Lane)** – Provides a striped lane for one-way travel on a street or highway
- **Class III Bikeway (Bike Route)** – Provides shared use with pedestrian or motor vehicle traffic

The Mobility Element of the Draft Los Angeles County General Plan contains a map of existing bikeways in the County of Los Angeles. Most of the bikeways in the proposed project area are located in West Covina (Los Angeles County, 2008). In addition, the Final Los Angeles County Bicycle Master Plan Map (2011) and the Metro LA County Bike Map (2010) show the same existing bikeways.

Existing bikeways in the project study area are classified as Class II (Bike Lanes) or Class III (Bike Routes). There are no Class I bike paths located within the project study area. Four bikeways cross I-10 within the project study area. Two Class II bikeways cross the project alignment at Sunset Avenue and S. Hollenbeck Street in West Covina. In addition, two Class III bike routes traverse the project alignment in Baldwin Park and West Covina at W. Cameron Avenue and S. Lark Ellen Avenue. Further east, a Class III bike route runs along Via Verde Street before terminating just north of I-10. Figure 3.2-1 identifies existing bikeways located within the project study area.

The Los Angeles County General Plan Bikeway map also shows proposed bikeways. Proposed bikeways include many Class I bikeways intended to connect the existing bikeway system in the proposed project area. There are five locations where bikeways are proposed to cross I-10 in the study area. Currently (2011), these ‘paper’ routes are only policy recommendations.

The Los Angeles County General Plan proposes two Class III bike routes that would cross I-10 in Baldwin Park. In addition, one proposed Class I bike path would cross I-10 in Baldwin Park and one in Covina (Los Angeles County, 2008).

Metro’s 2008 Draft LRTP for the region was reviewed for future bikeway development. It identifies the purpose of the Draft 2008 Plan to help implement the 2006 Metro Board-adopted Bicycle Transportation Strategic Plan. A priority of the Strategic Plan is to identify bikeways in relation to transit priorities. Although no specific future projects are identified,
Figure 3.2-1 Existing Bikeways within the Project Study Area
the plan introduces bicycle planning policies that encourage “arterial and parallel corridor improvement projects to include bicycle facilities” (Metro, 2006).

SCAG’s RTP includes a separate report called the Non-Motorized Transportation Report, which serves as a technical and policy guide for the development and maintenance of nonmotorized transportation modes, particularly emphasizing bicycling and walking as alternative modes of transportation (SCAG, 2008). Policy highlights within the report include:

- Decrease bicyclist and pedestrian fatalities and injuries;
- Increase accommodation and planning for bicyclists and pedestrians;
- Increase bicycle and pedestrian use in the SCAG region as an alternative to vehicle trips;
- Produce a comprehensive regional nonmotorized plan; and
- Encourage development of local nonmotorized plans.

Some jurisdictions traversed by the project corridor either have nonmotorized policies or a component in another plan encouraging the use of nonmotorized modes of transportation.

**Pedestrian Paths.** Sidewalks and over and undercrossings are the only pedestrian paths located within the study area. The Mobility Element of the Los Angeles County General Plan also outlines design guidelines and other ways to improve the pedestrian experience throughout Los Angeles County (Los Angeles County, 2008).

The Non-Motorized Transportation Report from SCAG’s RTP describes its policy-driven commitment to nonmotorized modes of transportation, including pedestrian paths.

### 3.2.2 Regulatory Requirements

Caltrans, as assigned by FHWA, directs that full consideration be given to the safe accommodation of pedestrians and bicyclists during the development of federal-aid highway projects (see 23 CFR 652). It further directs that the special needs of the elderly and the disabled must be considered in all federal-aid projects that include pedestrian facilities. When current or anticipated pedestrian and/or bicycle traffic presents a potential conflict with motor vehicle traffic, every effort must be made to minimize the detrimental effects on all highway users who share the facility.

Caltrans is committed to implementing the 1990 Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) by building transportation facilities that provide equal access for all persons. The same degree of convenience, accessibility, and safety available to the general public will be provided to persons with disabilities.
3.2.3 Significant Criteria

Criteria for determining the significance of impacts related to transportation/traffic are based on the CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G – Environmental Checklist. Impacts considered significant under the proposed project would:

**TRAF-1**: Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation, including mass transit and nonmotorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system including, but not limited to, intersections, streets, highways, freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit.

**TRAF-2**: Conflict with an applicable congestion management program (CMP) including, but not limited to, LOS standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency (CMA) for designated roads or highways.

**TRAF-3**: Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment).

**TRAF-4**: Result in inadequate emergency access.

**TRAF-5**: Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.

3.2.4 Impacts

3.2.4.1 No Project Alternative

The No Project Alternative would not include construction or operation of HOV lanes within the subject corridor. Activities that would occur under the No Project Alternative include routine maintenance of the freeway and future mainline and interchange improvement projects as they become programmed.

The corridor would continue to be maintained as is, with a gap between HOV lanes currently operating both to the east and west of the proposed project corridor. It should be noted, however, that the segment of I-10 extending east from the I-605 interchange to Puente Avenue is currently in construction. When completed, the gap would be reduced to 9 miles in length. This alternative also assumes no improvements would be made to local streets.

The future operations of I-10 within the study limits would degrade with the No Project Alternative. Worsening congestion runs counter to the planning goals of Caltrans and SCAG. Compared with the Proposed Project Alternative, a higher expected accident rate is forecast for the No Project Alternative due to greater congestion in both the Opening and Horizon years. Unmitigated congestion in the no project condition would force more trips to local arterials, worsening congestion on the freeway and the local arterial system, thus limiting the total growth of traffic volume. With this scenario, existing nonhighway modes of transportation would need to be increased or proposed modes implemented to mitigate the worsening congestion.
3.2.4.2 Proposed Project Alternative

Impact TRAF-1: The proposed project would not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation, including mass transit and nonmotorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system including, but not limited to, intersections, streets, highways, freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit.

Federal Agency Review. FHWA is the reviewer of record for project design and funding phases of the improvements. For the I-10 HOV Lane Project to be approved by FHWA, it must be part of the current RTP. The 2008 final RTP lists the project as two HOV segments, identified as LA000548 and LA0B875.

Regional Agencies. SCAG’s RTP establishes overall long-term mobility policies for the movement of people and goods, including congestion-relief strategies for all regionally significant facilities and activities (i.e., projects and programs). To meet the federal Congestion Management Process requirements, SCAG and designated county CMAs have come together to develop CMPs for the region. The efforts of each CMA have been brought together and integrated into the SCAG regional congestion management process. All county CMPs share the same goal of reducing congestion and applying congestion-relief strategies. Under state law, the CMP projects must be incorporated into the RTIP to receive federal and state funds (SCAG, 2008).

As the CMA for the project area, Metro has prepared the 2004 CMP for Los Angeles County. It is noted in the Los Angeles County CMP that the focus has shifted from building new freeways to making more efficient use of the existing freeway system through an extensive program of adding HOV lanes. The CMP notes that “carpool lanes make more efficient use of already over-crowded freeways and are critical to maintaining mobility” (Metro, 2004). By closing a 9-mile gap between existing HOV lanes, the proposed project would fulfill and be consistent with the 2004 CMP for Los Angeles County.

Local Agencies. Consistency of the proposed project with local general plan circulation element policies is discussed in Section 3.10 of this Final EIR. The following is a summary of this review, by jurisdiction:

- City of Baldwin Park. The City’s General Plan Circulation Element contains provisions encouraging direct coordination with Caltrans to improve I-10.
- City of West Covina. General Plan policies relevant to the proposed project emphasize provision of a safe and efficient means of circulation.
- City of Covina. General Plan policies relevant to the proposed project emphasize provision of sufficient public facilities and services.
- **City of San Dimas.** The General Plan includes a circulation provision with the objective to increase vehicle occupancy rates.

- **City of Walnut.** There are no Circulation Element policies relevant to the proposed project.

- **City of Pomona.** The General Plan includes circulation provisions to reduce single-occupancy vehicle travel and manage congestion on nearby freeways.

As an I-10 improvement activity, the proposed project would be consistent with general plan circulation element policies for each of the above jurisdictions, because it would increase the person-carrying capacity and improve the LOS of the freeway.

**Impact TRAF-2:** The proposed project would not conflict with an applicable CMP including, but not limited to, LOS standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county CMA for designated roads or highways.

See response to Impact TRAF-1 with regard to the proposed project’s operational consistency with the local CMP.

**Temporary Impacts.** During construction, motorists traveling in the immediate vicinity of street, ramp, and lane closures would at times experience some inconvenience from temporary traffic congestion. These temporary impacts to the traveling public would be reduced through the following approach, which would become part of the proposed project.

- **Construction Staging:** As described in the two Project Reports for the proposed project, construction would be conducted in stages. Specific construction staging requirements would be defined during the final design process, and an actual construction staging plan would be developed by the contractor. Each construction stage would maintain the same number of traveled lanes for the mainline.

- **Bridge and Ramp Construction:** Movements at each of the bridge interchanges during construction would be staged and accommodated either by use of detours or temporary ramps. Freeway lane, ramp, or local street closures during bridge construction would occur during nighttime hours. Adjacent bridges would not be reconstructed concurrently to ease the increased traffic congestion that may impact local residents and the business community.

- **Traffic Management:** In accordance with Deputy Directive 60 (DD-60), a TMP\(^1\) would be prepared and implemented to help minimize motorist delays during

---

\(^1\) “A TMP, when implemented, results in minimized project-related traffic delay and accidents by the effective application of traditional traffic mitigation strategies and an innovative combination of public and motorist information, demand management, incident management, system management, alternate route strategies, construction strategies, or other strategies.” (Source: DD-60)
construction. Approval of the TMP involves extensive coordination with managers of other concurrent projects in the area, particularly along other segments of I-10 in the vicinity.

- **Local Street Impacts:** While there would be temporary lane closures, it is anticipated that full local street closures during daytime hours should not be required during construction. Access to businesses and driveways would remain open at all times during the construction period.

- **Coordination:** All congestion-related activities would be coordinated with Metro, Foothill Transit, Metrolink, Access Services, major employers, and emergency service providers. During construction, motorists would be encouraged to make use of existing transit systems.

**Permanent Impacts.** Caltrans is implementing its *2009 HOV Business Plan* to encourage the development and construction of HOV projects as a congestion management alternative to adding general purpose lanes. The I-10 corridor has been highlighted in the *Business Plan* as a route that would benefit from a complete HOV system.

**Peak-Period Volumes.** Peak-period volumes were gathered for the Existing Year (2008) and generated for the Opening and Horizon years. The SCAG model was interpolated to base year 2008 and normalized to match Caltrans data (from Traffic Data Branch) at logical points for year 2008 data. Forecasted data was obtained from SCAG for the years 2015 and 2035, including modeling data for the project alternatives. In coordination with SCAG staff, computer model runs were executed by retrieving pertinent data, socioeconomic data preparation, network preparation, preparation of trip tables, and base year model validation.

Model results indicate the proposed project would generate greater peak-period volumes in the Opening (2015) and Horizon (2035) years compared to the No Project Alternative. Despite existing congestion, there is reserve capacity in the freeway to accommodate minor traffic growth.

**Persons Moved per Peak Period – Existing and Projected.** The Proposed Project Alternative is predicted to move more people than the No Project Alternative, which shows little appreciable increase in persons moved. To calculate the number of persons moved per peak period, the vehicle occupancy distribution for existing volumes was estimated and multiplied per peak-period volume. HOV lane vehicle occupancy distribution was estimated from a comparison of existing similar nonstandard HOV freeways statewide.

Table 3.2-3 shows the projected occupancy distribution of persons per vehicle:
TABLE 3.2-3. OCCUPANCY DISTRIBUTION (PERSONS/VEHICLE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Alternatives</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Project Mixed Flow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Flow Lanes</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Nonstandard HOV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Flow Lanes</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOV Lanes (2+)</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Caltrans, 2009a.

Peak-Hour Volumes (PHV) and LOS\(^2\). As shown in Table 3.2-1, the proposed project would also improve the current LOS within the project corridor. The combination of mixed-flow and HOV lanes under this alternative would operate better than the mixed-flow-only lanes under the No Project Alternative. This is due in part to the reduced volumes in the Proposed Project Alternative’s mixed-flow lanes as a result of higher HOV lane utilization. Contrarily, the No Project Alternative require greater utilization of the mixed-flow lanes, compounding existing congestion problems, and resulting in continued, ongoing unacceptable LOS for the freeway segment.

Vincent Avenue Interchange. For the purpose of this Final EIR, a network was established consisting of the aforementioned two intersections, from the eastbound I-10 ramps at Vincent Avenue through its intersection with Plaza Drive/Lakes Drive in the City of West Covina. The operations of this network were analyzed for the PM peak hour, which represented the worst case scenario for Buildout (2015) and Future (2035) conditions using Synchro/Simtraffic (Version 5.0).

Analysis results, shown in Table 3.2-4, indicate that the eastbound I-10 ramps intersection would operate at an unsatisfactory LOS E in 2015. In this regard, the movement from northbound Vincent Avenue to the eastbound I-10 on-ramp is the primary area of need. The shared through and right turn lane may be a contributing factor, as vehicles intending to conduct a through movement in the shared lane may potentially impact the capacity of right turn movements to the on-ramp. The proposed realignment and increased capacity of the eastbound I-10 on-ramp from northbound Vincent Avenue, coupled with the signalization of the right turn movements, appears to offset the queuing and spillback issues experienced under existing conditions.

\(^2\) LOS analysis was conducted using the HCM methods for freeway segments. Mixed-flow, HOV, and auxiliary lanes were analyzed with the applicable factors set forth in the HCM. The LOS evaluations are based on free-flow traffic conditions. When v/c ratios approach or exceed a value of 1.0, traffic is considered to be in nonfree-flow conditions (i.e., LOS F congestion). LOS ratings based on v/c ratios greater than 1.0 are of limited value, as congested traffic flows are unstable and result in highly variable LOS ratings from day to day.
### TABLE 3.2-4. PROJECTED VINCENT AVENUE LOS FOR BUILDOUT (2015) AND FUTURE (2030) CONDITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Leg</th>
<th>Delay (Sec.)</th>
<th>LOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buildout Conditions (2015) - Intersection</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB I-10 Ramps at Vincent Avenue</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent Avenue at Plaza Drive / Lakes Drive</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buildout Conditions (2015) - Approach</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB I-10 Ramps at Vincent Avenue</td>
<td>EB I-10 Off-ramp</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NB Vincent Avenue</td>
<td>134.3</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB Vincent Avenue</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent Avenue at Plaza Drive / Lakes Drive</td>
<td>EB Plaza Drive</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NB Vincent Avenue</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB Vincent Avenue</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WB Lakes Drive</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Future Conditions (2030) - Intersection</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB I-10 Ramps at Vincent Avenue</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>84.3</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent Avenue at Plaza Drive / Lakes Drive</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Future Conditions (2030) - Approach</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB I-10 Ramps at Vincent Avenue</td>
<td>EB I-10 Off-ramp</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NB Vincent Avenue</td>
<td>144.6</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB Vincent Avenue</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent Avenue at Plaza Drive / Lakes Drive</td>
<td>EB Plaza Drive</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NB Vincent Avenue</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB Vincent Avenue</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WB Lakes Drive</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Caltrans, 2011.*

The same intersection is projected to operate at LOS F in 2030. At this intersection, the right turn demand for the eastbound I-10 off-ramp is nearly double that of left turn movements. The northbound Vincent Avenue approach is hindered by the proposed signalization plus the lack of capacity for the right turn movement to the eastbound I-10 on-ramp. The shared through/right lane at this approach may impact the capacity of right turn movements. An increase in capacity at this approach may be appropriate mitigation.

While the intersection of Vincent Avenue and Plaza / Lakes Drive, as a whole, would operate at a satisfactory LOS in 2030, the north, east and west approaches would operate at an unsatisfactory LOS E. The northbound Vincent Avenue approach experiences saturated conditions, which impacts left turn movements at certain intervals with queuing beyond the combination of available storage and deceleration length provided. Modifications in lane...
designation (i.e., convert shared through / right lane to exclusive through) may be a potential countermeasure to further improve operations at this approach and the intersection. (Caltrans, 2011)

**Impact TRAF-3:** The proposed project would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment).

**Nonstandard Design Features.** The existing freeway facility has nonstandard design features, some of which would be corrected by the proposed project. For example, several existing on- and off-ramps have nonstandard radius curves and short sight distances that result in lower design speeds. On-line bus turnout facilities within the local access interchanges also have nonstandard geometrics and lower design speeds (Caltrans, 2002e). When completing substantial modifications to particular areas within the proposed project limits, every effort will be made to ensure the design meets current standards (Caltrans, 1994).

As stated in Chapter 1, the proposed project would mainly involve use of standard design features; however, the use of some nonstandard design features would be applied, largely to minimize the need for substantial ROW property acquisition. These features include a nonstandard 8-foot-wide inside shoulder west of Holt Avenue and solid double line striping in lieu of an HOV buffer for the entire corridor; and a reduced-width CHP enforcement area shoulder between West Covina Parkway and Vincent Avenue (3.3 feet versus 9.8 feet standard). These design features have been reviewed and approved under Caltrans’ established internal procedures, as described in the Project Development Procedures Manual, Chapter 21. Caltrans does not approve any nonstandard designs that could adversely affect public safety.

**Accidents per MVM.** Accident conditions on I-10 within the project corridor are described in Section 1.2.2 of this Final EIR. Most of the recorded accidents for this segment of I-10 have been sideswipes, rear-ends, and broadsides. These types of accidents are usually associated with end-of-queue or stop-and-go conditions, which are typical on this segment of I-10.

Existing accident rates per MVM are shown in Table 3.2-5. It is anticipated that the existing accident rates would decrease after implementation of the proposed project. The addition of median HOV lanes would result in reduced congestion, which is anticipated to lead to a reduction in the types of accidents currently occurring on this section of I-10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor (MP)</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MP 33.4 to 42.4</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Caltrans, 2009a.
Impact TRAF-4: The proposed project may result in inadequate emergency access.

The proposed project would involve construction that could contribute to short-term impacts to fire protection and emergency services due to delayed response times. This potential impact would be minimized by implementation of a TMP, as required by Caltrans, and described below to contain access routes and detour plans to be implemented during construction. The TMP should be reviewed and approved by the County Fire Department and any potentially affected fire or law enforcement agency; therefore, construction-related traffic impacts would not cause an adverse effect to public and emergency services. Minimization measure PS-1 will be implemented to further minimize impacts.

Impact TRAF-5: The proposed project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.

Potential project impacts are discussed below for park-and-ride lots, passenger rail, transit service, bikeways, and pedestrian paths.

Park-and-Ride Lots. One park-and-ride lot would experience minor temporary construction impacts as a result of the proposed project. The lot located on the north side of I-10 at Via Verde Street in San Dimas may be used to accommodate 5- to 10-foot-wide TCEs along the I-10 ROW. Because the parking spaces are located farther than 10 feet from the ROW, landscaped slopes would be the only component of the park-and-ride lot that would be affected by construction; therefore, temporary use of the park-and-ride lot would not be a significant impact because it would not result in any loss of parking.

Metrolink. A Metrolink line runs roughly parallel to I-10 between the city of San Bernardino and downtown Los Angeles. There are no railroad crossings within the project area (Caltrans 1994, 2002); however, the railroad tracks do cross Francisquito Avenue near the western project terminus. The proposed project would therefore not result in any temporary or permanent impacts to existing Metrolink stations or passenger service.

Transit Service. Project impacts to transit service are expected to occur during construction, as described below; however, long-term transit service benefits are expected after the HOV lanes are operational.

Within the project corridor, there are several street undercrossings and one overcrossing used by local transit service providers. The proposed project would not eliminate any of these access points. Several of these crossings would be widened as part of the proposed project. The local streets would be affected by the erection and removal of falsework. These construction activities may be performed at night, if warranted, when traffic volumes are lower.
Local streets adjacent to I-10, including but not limited to, Garvey Avenue, would experience construction activities. Shoulder or lane widths on local streets may be reduced to allow work within the construction zone to be safely performed, potentially resulting in congestion. The affected local streets are identified in Chapter 1. The duration and effect of temporary delays would vary depending upon the extent of work required, and traffic conditions on the affected street segment at any given time. Nighttime work may be required to avoid peak congestion periods. The aforementioned TMP would be prepared to minimize the effects of temporary congestion caused by work activities.

Foothill Transit and Metro provide local and commuter transportation services by entering I-10 at several ramp locations and traveling on I-10 to and from downtown Los Angeles. During construction work on the I-10 mainline, lane widths may be reduced and shoulders eliminated. Congestion on I-10 is anticipated to increase during construction in the AM and PM peak periods. This would result in some transit service delays and may have an effect on the scheduling of transit operations.

Any connector or ramp closures for one or more days during construction would temporarily impact transit operations. During the closure, access to I-10 would be relocated to another connector or ramp. The additional time required to travel on local streets to the next available entrance point would delay transit service. Connector or ramp closures would also increase the severity of congestion to the immediate adjacent connector or ramp, which would also add delay to transit service.

It is reasonable to assume that transit service may be temporarily delayed during construction by more than 10 minutes by the combined impact of reduced lane widths on local streets, reduced lane widths on I-10, and periodic ramp and local street closures. Mitigation is required to reduce construction impacts to a level of insignificance.

**Bikeways.** All existing bicycle and pedestrian access on the local roads would be maintained throughout the construction period, except during critical short-term construction activities requiring closure to perform the work or for safety reasons; however, most of these street closures are anticipated during nonpeak hours and should not affect most bicycle traffic. No bicycle paths would be affected as a result of this project during construction nor once the project is completed. Maintaining safe bicycle access at all times through the proposed project work zones would be addressed in the TMP.

**Pedestrian Paths.** While operation of the proposed project would not affect pedestrian paths or access, there would be some disruptions during construction. During construction, pedestrian access on local streets may be temporarily closed, requiring detour of pedestrian traffic to the other side of the street or via alternative route. If required, street closures would likely be scheduled to occur during nonpeak hours to minimize the effect on pedestrian traffic. Maintaining safe pedestrian access at all times through the project corridor would be
addressed in the TMP. With implementation of a TMP, proposed project construction activities should not result in any significant impacts to pedestrians.

### 3.2.5 Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required; however, the following minimization measures are proposed:

- A TMP will be prepared to offset the effects of traffic congestion and access during construction on the freeway, ramps, and local streets. In addition to the standard requirements of a TMP, special focus will be placed on improving transit services during construction, as well as traffic incident management. Reducing the frequency of incidents, detection time, response time, and clearance time will all be addressed in the TMP. The TMP will include a public awareness program, including informational sources such as radio, Caltrans overhead changeable message board, and Internet. Some best practices to be considered include:
  - Designated towing services for keeping the work zone free of disabled vehicles;
  - Contractor-provided 24-hour-per-day monitoring of traffic control devices;
  - Establishing proper communication channels with “first responder” agencies; and
  - Providing safe pullout locations for disabled vehicles.

- Area residents will be regularly informed through public outreach of proposed project development and construction plans prior to and during the construction period so that they are aware of the construction timing, traffic/transit detour plans, and lane/road closures.

- At the northbound Vincent Avenue approach to eastbound I-10 on-ramp, modify the existing shared (through/right) lane to an exclusive through lane and add an exclusive full right turn lane.

- Increase the capacity of the eastbound I-10 on-ramp from northbound Vincent Avenue through the addition of a lane and the relocation of the proposed ramp meter approximately 370 feet downstream.

- Caltrans will periodically coordinate with the transit companies to discuss changes in the construction operations and potential impacts to the transit providers. Caltrans will coordinate all street, connector, and ramp closures with the transit service. Wherever possible, these closures should not take place during the peak commute hours. In addition, consecutive ramp and street closures will be avoided.

In addition to the above-mentioned minimization measures, the following minimization measures were identified in the MMRP (2003):
Prior to the initiation of site preparation, grading or construction activities, Caltrans will require construction contractors to provide travel plans to the local jurisdictions along the project study area. The travel plans will indicate the expected travel routes of construction trucks carrying construction materials and construction debris.

During final design, a Traffic Management Plan (TMP) will be prepared in consultation with emergency service providers, area transit operators, local agencies, and major traffic generators (such as large shopping centers and businesses including Forest Lawn Cemetery) which may include the following elements:

- Identification of ramps near large retail centers (including Westfield West Covina, Eastland Shopping Center and Gateway Crescent Properties). These ramps shall remain open from mid-November to January 2.
- A commitment has been made to Forest Lawn Cemetery that the eastbound and westbound off-ramps at Via Verde Drive will not be closed simultaneously.
- Media coverage outlining the work to be completed, the hours and duration of lane closures and potential alternative travel routes to avoid the construction area or the areas with temporary lane closures.
- Surveillance and control techniques and strategies using electronic surveillance devices such as loop detectors, ramp meters, closed circuit television, congestion management systems and the services of the existing Caltrans Traffic Management Center, among others.
- Caltrans will provide assistance to commuters in the area in forming carpools and vanpools and provide information on available bus services in the area.
- Provision of freeway patrol services to assist disabled vehicles and to remove disabled vehicles, accidents, debris and other materials from travel lanes.
- Coordination with local area school districts, transit operators and emergency service providers to provide alternative travel routes and construction related information.

Prior to the initiation of site preparation, grading or construction activities, Caltrans will require construction contractors to provide construction and traffic management plans (TMPs) to the affected police, fire and emergency medical services in the project area indicating possible detours, lane and ramp closures, and areas which may experience overall traffic delays.

3.2.6 Level of Significance after Mitigation
No mitigation measures are required for the proposed project.
3.3 Air Quality

This section addresses potential impacts to regional and local air quality associated with implementation of the proposed project. Air quality impacts were evaluated for short-term construction emissions and long-term operational emissions of the proposed project. Detailed analytical methodology and data input and output information can be found in the Air Quality Report (Caltrans, 2011a) prepared for this project.

3.3.1 Existing Conditions

3.3.1.1 Climatic and Meteorological Condition

The project site is located in the South Coast Air Basin (Basin) that includes the following counties: Orange, Los Angeles (non-desert portions), and the urban areas of Riverside and San Bernardino. Air quality regulation in the Basin is administered by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD).

The Basin climate is determined by its terrain and geographical location. The Basin is a coastal plain with connecting broad valleys and low hills. The Pacific Ocean forms the southwestern boundary and high mountains surround the rest of the Basin. The region lies in the semi-permanent high-pressure zone of the eastern Pacific. The resulting climate is mild and tempered by cool ocean breezes. This climatological pattern is rarely interrupted. However, periods of extremely hot weather, winter storms, and Santa Ana wind conditions do occur.

The annual average temperature varies little throughout the Basin, ranging from the low to middle 60s, measured in degrees Fahrenheit. With a more pronounced oceanic influence, coastal areas show less variability in annual minimum and maximum temperatures than inland areas. The climatological station closest to the site that monitors temperature is the San Gabriel Fire Dept. Station (#047785) maintained by the Western Regional Climate Center. The annual average maximum temperature recorded from January 1971 to December 2000 at this station is 26.4°C (79.3°F), and the annual average minimum is 11.2°C (52.1°F). December and January are typically the coldest months in this area of the Basin.

The majority of annual rainfall in the basin occurs between November and April. Summer rainfall is minimal and generally limited to scattered thunderstorms in coastal regions and slightly heavier showers in the eastern portion of the Basin along the coastal side of the mountains. The San Gabriel Fire Dept. Station also monitors rainfall levels. Average monthly rainfall measured at this station varied from 12.4 centimeters (cm) (4.87 inches [in]) in February to 4.30 cm (1.69 in) or less between May and October, with an average annual total of 47.37 cm (18.65 in). Patterns in monthly and yearly rainfall totals are unpredictable due to fluctuations in the weather.

The Basin experiences a persistent temperature inversion (increasing temperature with increasing altitude) as a result of the Pacific high. This inversion limits the vertical dispersion...
of air contaminants, holding them relatively near the ground. Temperature inversion plays a significant role in determining ozone formation. Ozone precursors will mix and undergo photochemical reactions to produce smog. The closer the inversion cap is to the ground, the higher the concentrations of ozone precursors, and hence the ozone. Concentration levels of ozone are directly related to inversion layers height due to the limitation of the vertical mixing space.

Winds in the vicinity of the project area are usually driven by the dominant land/sea breeze circulation system. Wind speeds in the project area average about 6.4 kilometers per hour (kph) or 4 mph. Summer wind speeds average slightly higher than winter wind speeds. Low average wind speeds together with a persistent temperature inversion limit the vertical dispersion of air pollutants throughout the Basin.

In the winter, the greatest pollution problems are carbon monoxides and oxides of nitrogen because of extreme inversions and air stagnation during the night and early morning hours. During the summer days, the longer daylight hours and the brighter sunshine combine to cause a reaction between hydrocarbons and oxides of nitrogen to form photochemical smog or ozone.

**Attainment Status**

The Basin is designated as maintenance for NO₂ and CO; and non-attainment for the following criteria pollutants: O₃ (1-hour [revoked] and 8-hour), PM₂.₅ and PM₁₀, and lead. A SIP is required for each criterion pollutant designated as in maintenance or non-attainment. The Basin currently has five applicable SIPs: The 1997 NO₂ SIP, 1997 O₃ SIP/AQMP (amended in 1999), the 2003 CO SIP, the 2002 PM₁₀ SIP, and 2007 8-hour ozone and PM₂.₅. The 2003 AQMPs/SIPs were approved by SCAQMD and have received an adequacy finding by the EPA on the emissions budgets for conformity determination. The EPA issued final non-attainment area designations on April 15, 2004 for 8-hour O₃. Designations and Phase I of the implementation regulations were published in the Federal Register on April 30, 2004, effective June 15, 2004. An 8-hour conformity determination for Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG’s) 2004 RTP and Regional Transportation Program (RTIP) was made by the FHWA and FTA on June 15, 2005. On November 9, 2005, the EPA issued a final rule that will take the next steps to protect the public from ground-level ozone pollution. This rule, called the Phase II Ozone Rule, describes the actions states must take to reduce ground level ozone.

On June 15, 2005 the 1-hour O₃ standard was rescinded along with all non-attainment and attainment-maintenance designations; however, the 1-hour O₃ NAAQS designation and classification status was retained in reference to the effective date of designation for the 8-hour NAAQS for purposes of the anti-backsliding regulations (40 CFR 51.905). Designation of PM₂.₅ non-attainment areas was published in the Federal Register on January 5, 2005, and became effective on April 5, 2005. On March 10, 2006, the EPA published a final rule that establishes the transportation conformity criteria and procedures for
determining which transportation projects must be analyzed for local air quality impacts in PM$_{2.5}$ and PM$_{10}$ non-attainment and maintenance areas (71 FR 12468). This rule requires PM$_{2.5}$ and PM$_{10}$ hot-spot analyses to be performed for Project of Air Quality Concern (POAQC) in non-attainment/maintenance areas. Regional conformity determinations for PM$_{2.5}$ have been made by the FHWA on March 30, 2006.

For a non-attainment area, the CAA provides for voluntary reclassification of the area to a higher classification by submitting a request to EPA. The SCAQMD requested (as part of its 2007 AQMP submittal to EPA) a reclassification for the Basin from “severe-17’ to “extreme” nonattainment. On April 15, 2010 EPA’s Region 9 Administrator signed a final rule to grant the reclassification request. This extends the 8-hour O$_3$ attainment date to 2024 (from 2021 with severe-17 status) and allows attainment demonstration to rely on emission reductions from measures that anticipate the development of new technologies or improvement of existing control technologies.

Recently, the approval of the 2005 CO Redesignation Request and CO Maintenance Plan for the Basin was published in the Federal Register on May 11, 2007, and became effective on June 11, 2007. As a result, the Basin was redesignated from non-attainment to attainment-maintenance for the CO NAAQS under CAA Section 107 (d)(3)(E).

Finally, the 2007 AQMP, adopted by the AQMD governing board on June 1, 2007 includes basin strategies and control measures to attain the new Federal 8-hour ozone deadline by 2024; and the new annual and 24-hour PM$_{2.5}$ standards by 2015 per 40 CFR §93.123(c)(4). The 2007 AQMP employs the most up-to-date science, analytical tools, the most recent planning assumptions (i.e., within the last 5 years), and approved motor vehicle emission model; and incorporates comprehensive strategies aimed at controlling pollution as required by the EPA. The 2007 AQMP has been incorporated into the SIP submittal by the California Air Resources Board (ARB) to address attainment strategies for PM$_{2.5}$ and 8-hour ozone. Based on their review, the EPA has found that the “baseline” reasonable further progress motor vehicle emissions budgets for 8-hour ozone and PM$_{2.5}$ in the 2007 South Coast SIP, as amended on April 30, 2008, are adequate for transportation conformity purposes. The EPA, at the same time, has found that the “SIP-based” motor vehicle emissions budgets for 8-hour ozone and PM$_{2.5}$ in the amended 2007 South Coast SIP are inadequate for transportation conformity purposes (73 FR 28110).

The goal of a SIP is to secure an attainment designation for the criteria pollutant at a future year. As such, a SIP is created if a pollutant is in non-attainment. Of the six criteria pollutants, two are in attainment: lead and sulfur dioxide SO$_2$; and two are in attainment-maintenance: NO$_2$ and CO. The remaining pollutants have or will have its respective SIP to address attainment for future years. The proposed project will comply with any federal, state, and local rules and regulations developed as part of implementing control measures in the respective SIPS. Table 3.3-1 below lists the designations per federal and state AAQS:
### TABLE 3.3-1. STATE AND FEDERAL CRITERIA AIR POLLUTANT STANDARDS, EFFECTS, AND SOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>Averaging Time</th>
<th>State Standard</th>
<th>Federal Standard</th>
<th>Principal Health and Atmospheric Effects</th>
<th>Typical Sources</th>
<th>Attainment Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ozone (O₃)</td>
<td>1 hour 8 hours (conformity process)</td>
<td>0.09 ppm 0.070 ppm</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>High concentrations irritate lungs. Long-term exposure may cause lung tissue damage and cancer. Long-term exposure damages plant materials and reduces crop productivity. Precursor organic compounds include many known toxic air contaminants. Biogenic VOC may also contribute.</td>
<td>Low-altitude ozone is almost entirely formed from reactive organic gases/volatile organic compounds (ROG or VOC) and nitrogen oxides (NOx) in the presence of sunlight and heat. Major sources include motor vehicles and other mobile sources, solvent evaporation, and industrial and other combustion processes.</td>
<td>Federal (8 hours): Nonattainment Extreme State (1 hour and 8 hours): Nonattainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Monoxide (CO)</td>
<td>1 hour 8 hours (Lake Tahoe)</td>
<td>20 ppm 9.0 ppm 6 ppm</td>
<td>35 ppm 9 ppm ---</td>
<td>CO interferes with the transfer of oxygen to the blood and deprives sensitive tissues of oxygen. CO also is a minor precursor for photochemical ozone.</td>
<td>Combustion sources, especially gasoline-powered engines and motor vehicles. CO is the traditional signature pollutant for on-road mobile sources at the local and neighborhood scale.</td>
<td>Federal: Attainment-Maintenance State: Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respirable Particulate Matter (PM₁₀)</td>
<td>24 hours Annual</td>
<td>50 μg/m³ 20 μg/m³</td>
<td>150 μg/m³ --- 2</td>
<td>Irritates eyes and respiratory tract. Decreases lung capacity. Associated with increased cancer and mortality. Contributes to haze and reduced visibility. Includes some toxic air contaminants. Many aerosol and solid compounds are part of PM₁₀.</td>
<td>Dust- and fume-producing industrial and agricultural operations; combustion smoke; atmospheric chemical reactions; construction and other dust-producing activities; unpaved road dust and re-entrained paved road dust; natural sources (wind-blown dust, ocean spray).</td>
<td>Federal: Nonattainment Serious State: Nonattainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Particulate Matter (PM₂.₅)</td>
<td>24 hours (conformity process)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>35 μg/m³ 15.0 μg/m³ 65 μg/m³ (4th highest in 3 years)</td>
<td>Increases respiratory disease, lung damage, cancer, and premature death. Reduces visibility and produces surface soiling. Most diesel exhaust</td>
<td>Combustion including motor vehicles, other mobile sources, and industrial activities; residential and agricultural burning; also formed through atmospheric</td>
<td>Federal: Nonattainment State: Nonattainment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 3.3-1. STATE AND FEDERAL CRITERIA AIR POLLUTANT STANDARDS, EFFECTS, AND SOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>Averaging Time</th>
<th>State Standard</th>
<th>Federal Standard</th>
<th>Principal Health and Atmospheric Effects</th>
<th>Typical Sources</th>
<th>Attainment Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen Dioxide (NO₂)</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>0.18 ppm</td>
<td>0.100 ppm (98th percentile over 3 years)</td>
<td>Irritating to eyes and respiratory tract. Colors atmosphere reddish-brown. Contributes to acid rain. Part of the “NOx” group of ozone precursors.</td>
<td>Motor vehicles and other mobile sources; refineries; industrial operations.</td>
<td>Federal: Attainment Maintenance State: Nonattainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>0.030 ppm</td>
<td>0.053 ppm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfur Dioxide (SO₂)</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>0.25 ppm</td>
<td>0.075 ppm (98th percentile over 3 years)</td>
<td>Irritates respiratory tract; injures lung tissue. Can yellow plant leaves. Destructive to marble, iron, steel. Contributes to acid rain. Limits visibility.</td>
<td>Fuel combustion (especially coal and high-sulfur oil), chemical plants, sulfur recovery plants, metal processing; some natural sources like active volcanoes. Limited contribution possible from heavy-duty diesel vehicles if ultra-low sulfur fuel not used.</td>
<td>Federal: Attainment State: Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 hours</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.04 ppm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24 hours</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.030 ppm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead (Pb)³</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>1.5 μg/m³</td>
<td>1.5 μg/m³</td>
<td>Disturbs gastrointestinal system. Causes anemia, kidney disease, and neuromuscular and neurological dysfunction. Also a toxic air contaminant and water pollutant.</td>
<td>Lead-based industrial processes like battery production and smelters. Lead paint, leaded gasoline. Aerially deposited lead from gasoline may exist in soils along major roads.</td>
<td>Federal: Nonattainment State: Nonattainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.15 μg/m³</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rolling 3-month average</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfate</td>
<td>24 hours</td>
<td>25 μg/m³</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Premature mortality and respiratory effects. Contributes to acid rain. Some toxic air contaminants attach to sulfate aerosol particles.</td>
<td>Industrial processes, refineries and oil fields, mines, natural sources like volcanic areas, salt-covered dry lakes, and large sulfide rock areas.</td>
<td>State Only: Attainment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. 3.3-5
### TABLE 3.3-1. STATE AND FEDERAL CRITERIA AIR POLLUTANT STANDARDS, EFFECTS, AND SOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>Averaging Time</th>
<th>State Standard</th>
<th>Federal Standard</th>
<th>Principal Health and Atmospheric Effects</th>
<th>Typical Sources</th>
<th>Attainment Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hydrogen Sulfide (H₂S)</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>0.03 ppm</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Colorless, flammable, poisonous. Respiratory irritant. Neurological damage and premature death. Headache, nausea.</td>
<td>Industrial processes such as: refineries and oil fields, asphalt plants, livestock operations, sewage treatment plants, and mines. Some natural sources like volcanic areas and hot springs.</td>
<td>State Only: Unclassified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility Reducing Particles (VRP)</td>
<td>8 hours</td>
<td>Visibility of 10 miles or more (Tahoe: 30 miles) at relative humidity less than 70%</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Reduces visibility. Produces haze. NOTE: not related to the Regional Haze program under the Federal Clean Air Act, which is oriented primarily toward visibility issues in National Parks and other “Class I” areas.</td>
<td>See particulate matter above.</td>
<td>State Only: Unclassified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinyl Chloride³</td>
<td>24 hours</td>
<td>0.01 ppm</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Neurological effects, liver damage, cancer. Also considered a toxic air contaminant.</td>
<td>Industrial processes</td>
<td>State Only: Unclassified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the California ARB Air Quality Standards chart [http://www.arb.ca.gov/research/aaqs/aaqs2.pdf](http://www.arb.ca.gov/research/aaqs/aaqs2.pdf).

**Notes:**
- ppm = parts per million; μg/m³ = micrograms per cubic meter; ppb=parts per billion (thousand million)
- Rounding to an integer value is not allowed for the State 8-hour CO standard. Violation occurs at or above 9.05 ppm. Violation of the Federal standard occurs at 9.5 ppm due to integer rounding.
- Annual PM₁₀ NAAQS revoked October 2006; was 50 μg/m³. 24-hr. PM₂·₅ NAAQS tightened October 2006; was 65 μg/m³. In 9/09 U.S. EPA began reconsidering the PM₅·₅ NAAQS; the 2006 action was partially vacated by a court decision.
- The ARB has identified vinyl chloride and the particulate matter fraction of diesel exhaust as toxic air contaminants. Diesel exhaust particulate matter is part of PM₁₀ and, in larger proportion, PM₂·₅. Both the ARB and U.S. EPA have identified lead and various organic compounds that are precursors to ozone and PM₂·₅ as toxic air contaminants. There are no exposure criteria for adverse health effect due to toxic air contaminants, and control requirements may apply at ambient concentrations below any criteria levels specified above for these pollutants or the general categories of pollutants to which they belong. Lead NAAQS are not required to be considered in Transportation Conformity analysis.
- Prior to 6/2005, the 1-hour NAAQS was 0.12 ppm. The 1-hour NAAQS is still used only in 8-hour ozone early action compact areas, of which there are none in California. However, emission budgets for 1-hour ozone may still be in use in some areas where 8-hour ozone emission budgets have not been developed.
- The 65 μg/m³ PM₂·₅ (24-hr) NAAQS was not revoked when the 35 μg/m³ NAAQS was promulgated in 2006. Conformity requirements apply for all NAAQS, including revoked NAAQS, until emission budgets for the newer NAAQS are found adequate or SIP amendments for the newer NAAQS are completed.
- As of 9/16/09, U.S. EPA is reconsidering the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS (0.075 ppm): U.S. EPA is expected to tighten the primary NAAQS to somewhere in the range of 60-70 ppb and to add a secondary NAAQS. U.S. EPA plans to finalize reconsideration and promulgate a revised standard by August 2010.
- Final 1-hour NO₂ NAAQS published in the Federal Register on 2/9/2010, effective 3/9/2010. Initial nonattainment area designations should occur in 2012 with conformity requirements effective in 2013. Project-level hot spot analysis requirements, while not yet required for conformity purposes, are expected.
- U.S. EPA finalized a 1-hour SO₂ standard of 75 ppb in June 2010.
- State standards are “not to exceed” unless stated otherwise. Federal standards are “not to exceed more than once a year” or as noted above.
- For Los Angeles County portion of SCAB only.
3.3.2 Regulatory Requirements

The Federal Clean Air Act (FCAA) as amended in 1990 is the federal law that governs air quality. The California Clean Air Act of 1988 is its companion state law. These laws, and related regulations by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) and California Air Resources Board (ARB), set standards for the quantity of pollutants that can be in the air. At the federal level, these standards are called National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). NAAQS and State ambient air quality standards (CAAQS) have been established for six transportation-related criteria pollutants that have been linked to potential health concerns. The criteria pollutants are: carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), ozone (O₃), particulate matter (PM, broken down for regulatory purposes into particles of 10 micrometers or smaller – PM₁₀ and particles of 2.5 micrometers and smaller - PM₂.₅), lead (Pb), and sulfur dioxide (SO₂). In addition, State standards exist for visibility reducing particles, sulfates, hydrogen sulfide (H₂S), and vinyl chloride. The NAAQS and CAAQS are set at a level that protects public health with a margin of safety, and are subject to periodic review and revision. Both State and Federal regulatory schemes also cover toxic air contaminants (air toxics). Some criteria pollutants are also air toxics or may include certain air toxics within their general definition.

Federal and State air quality standards and regulations provide the basic scheme for project-level air quality analysis under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). In addition to this type of environmental analysis, a parallel “Conformity” requirement under the FCAA also applies.

FCAA Section 176(c) prohibits the U.S. Department of Transportation and other federal agencies from funding, authorizing, or approving plans, programs, or projects that are not first found to conform to the State Implementation Plan (SIP) for achieving the goals of Clean Air Act requirements related to the NAAQS. “Transportation Conformity” Act takes place on two levels: the regional, or planning and programming, level, and the project level. The proposed project must conform at both levels to be approved. Conformity requirements apply only in nonattainment and “maintenance” (former nonattainment) areas for the NAAQS, and only for the specific NAAQS that are or were violated. U.S. EPA regulations at 40 CFR 93 govern the conformity process.

Regional conformity is concerned with how well the regional transportation system supports plans for attaining the standards set for CO, NO₂, O₃, PM₁₀ and PM₂.₅, and in some areas SO₂. California has nonattainment or maintenance areas for all of these transportation-related “criteria pollutants” except SO₂, and also has a nonattainment area for lead. However, lead is not currently required by the FCAA to be covered in transportation conformity analysis. Regional conformity is based on Regional Transportation Plans (RTPs) and Federal Transportation Improvement Programs (FTIPs) that include all of the transportation projects planned for a region over a period of at least 20 years for the RTP, and 4 years for the FTIP. RTP and FTIP conformity is based on use of travel demand and, air quality models to determine whether or not the implementation of those projects would conform to emission
budgets or other tests showing that requirements of the Clean Air Act and the SIP are met. If the conformity analysis is successful, the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and Federal Transit Administration (FTA), make determinations that the RTP and FTIP are in conformity with the SIP for achieving the goals of the Clean Air Act. Otherwise, the projects in the RTP and/or FTIP must be modified until conformity is attained. If the design concept, scope, and open to traffic schedule of a proposed transportation project are the same as described in the RTP and FTIP, then the proposed project is deemed to meet regional conformity requirements for purposes of project-level analysis.

Conformity at the project-level also requires “hot spot” analysis if an area is “nonattainment” or “maintenance” for CO and/or PM$_{10}$ or PM$_{2.5}$. A region is “nonattainment” if one or more of the monitoring stations in the region measures violation of the relevant standard, and U.S. EPA officially designates the area nonattainment. Areas that were previously designated as nonattainment areas but subsequently meet the standard may be officially redesignated to attainment by the U.S. EPA, and are then called “maintenance” areas. “Hot spot” analysis is essentially the same, for technical purposes, as CO or particulate matter analysis performed for NEPA purposes. Conformity does include some specific procedural and documentation standards for projects that require a hot spot analysis. In general, projects must not cause the “hot spot”-related standard to be violated, and must not cause any increase in the number and severity of violations in nonattainment areas. If a known CO or particulate matter violation is located in the project vicinity, the project must include measures to reduce or eliminate the existing violation(s) as well.

3.3.3 Impacts
Regional Conformity

**No-Build Alternative**

The No-Build Alternative would not implement the proposed improvements to the project corridor along the I-10 corridor; and would not result in any anticipated improvements to operational air quality impacts when compared to the Build Alternative. The No-Build Alternative is not consistent with regional goals and policies for improving air quality within the Basin. In particular, the No-Build Alternative would be inconsistent with the “High Occupancy Vehicle Strategy” contained in SCAG’s AQMP. The AQMP incorporates control strategies from the 2008 RTP and 2011 FTIP; so the No-Build Alternative would, in turn, not be consistent with these documents. The No-Build Alternative would therefore not be consistent with local government goals and policies for reduction of air quality emissions within their respective jurisdictions.

**Build Alternative**

The Transportation Conformity Rule requires a regional emission analysis to be performed by the MPO for projects within its jurisdiction. The regional emissions analysis includes all projects listed in the RTP and TIP. Both RTP and TIP must support an affirmative
conformity finding to obtain FHWA approval. Projects that are included in the regional emissions analysis are listed in the FTIP and referenced in the RTP, and they are considered to have met the conformity requirement for regional emissions analysis.

The proposed project is listed in the 2008 financially constrained RTP Making the Connections Amendment #4 which was adopted by SCAG on November 4, 2010; and FHWA and FTA made a regional conformity determination on December 8, 2010. The project is also included in SCAG’s financially constrained 2011 FTIP Amendment #1-15 and 17-19 which was adopted by SCAG on December 14, 2011. The SCAG FTIP amendments were determined to conform by FHWA and FTA on January 18, 2012. The design concept and scope of for the proposed project is consistent with the project description in the 2008 RTP and the 2011 FTIP, and the “open to traffic” assumptions of the SCAG’s regional emissions analysis.

As mentioned, the proposed project is fully funded and it is identified in the latest 2008 RTP and 2011 FTIP including Amendments as one of the Los Angeles Congestion Reduction Demonstration (LACRD) initiative projects. The project is also listed in the 2008-2009 Annual Listing of Obligated Projects Federal Funds – Los Angeles County on page 15. The following project information is excerpted from the FTIP Listing with RTP IDs: LA000548, LA0B875; Program Code: CAN69 as follows: Lead Agency – Caltrans; Project ID # - LA000548 & LA0B875; Air Basin – SCAB; Model # - L465 & L466; Program Code – CAN69; Route – 10; Begin Post Mile – 33.4; End Post Mile – 42.4; Description from the 2011 FTIP, State Project List on page 6 of 19 – In Los Angeles – Route 10: from Puente to Citrus HOV lanes from 8 to 10 lanes & sound walls (EA# 117080, 11172, 1170U, PPNO# 0309N, 0309S); Route 10: HOV lanes from Citrus to Route 57/210 (EA# 11934, PPNO# 0310B).

The current design concept and scope of the proposed project is consistent with the project description in the FTIP document and the assumptions in SCAG’s regional emission analysis. As such, the project would not interfere with the timely implementation of TCMs identified in the currently approved SIP. Because the proposed project is included in the list of projects in the FTIP, the regional emissions contemplated by the RTP would not change due to the implementation of this project.

**Project-Level Conformity**

The local analysis is commonly referred to as project-level air quality or hot-spot analysis. Project-level conformity is required for projects in CO, PM$_{10}$, and PM$_{2.5}$ nonattainment and maintenance areas. As discussed previously, a region is a nonattainment area if one or more monitoring stations in the region fail to attain the relevant CAAQS or NAAQS. In general, projects must not cause the standards to be violated, and in nonattainment areas, the project must not cause or contribute to any increase in the number and severity of violations.
**No-Build Alternative**
As mentioned, the No-Build Alternative would not implement the proposed improvements to the project corridor along I-10 and no change to physical environment would occur. Thereby, it would not result in any construction or operational air quality impacts.

**Build Alternative**
The project is located in an area that is classified as nonattainment for PM$_{10}$ and PM$_{2.5}$ and as attainment or attainment-maintenance for CO. Consequently, CO and PM hot-spot analysis has been performed in the *Air Quality Report*.

**CO Hot-spot Analysis**
Caltrans, in cooperation with the University of California, Davis, Institute of Transportation Studies, has developed the *Transportation Project-Level Carbon Monoxide Protocol* (CO Protocol) (Garza et al. 1997). The CO Protocol details a qualitative step-by-step screening procedure to determine if project-related CO concentrations have the potential to generate new air quality violations, worsen existing violations, or delay attainment of the NAAQS for CO. If the screening procedure reveals that such a potential may exist, the CO Protocol details a quantitative method to ascertain project-related CO impacts.

A CO hot-spot analysis was previously conducted in May 2001 in support of the MND/FONSI approved in January 2003; and concluded that the proposed project would not cause or contribute to new localized CO violations or increase severity/frequency of existing violations in the area affected by the project. Based on some scope changes later and in accordance with the CO Protocol, a screening CO hot-spot analysis was conducted for the modified Vincent Avenue interchange to supplement the previous CO analysis conducted in May 2001. Based on the traffic data and the CO screening criteria evaluation, the proposed project is not anticipated to result in worsening of air quality within the project limits. Therefore, no further qualitative or quantitative CO analysis would be required. Additional details of the CO analysis can be found in the Air Quality Report.

**PM Hot-spot Analysis**
The EPA promulgated the NAAQS for PM on July 18, 1997, establishing a new standard for PM$_{2.5}$. The EPA then published their final rule on PM designations and classifications in the Federal Register on January 5, 2005, and established areas designated as nonattainment, unclassifiable or attainment/classifiable. The EPA again published a final rule on March 10, 2006 (became effective as of April 5, 2006) that supersedes the FHWA September 21, 2001 “Guidance for Qualitative Project-Level Hot-Spot Analysis in PM$_{10}$ Nonattainment and Maintenance Areas” and establishes conformity criteria and procedures for transportation projects when determining impacts on ambient PM$_{2.5}$ and PM$_{10}$ levels in nonattainment and maintenance areas (71 FR 12468). The March 10, 2006 final rule requires a qualitative PM$_{2.5}$ and PM$_{10}$ hot-spot analysis to be completed for a project of air quality concern (POAQC).
The project proposes to construct an HOV lane in each direction of travel along the I-10. Based on the current and forecast traffic data, the I-10 corridor within the limits of the projects currently experiences and is projected to have a significant number of diesel vehicles. The project is therefore considered to be of air quality concern as described in 40 CFR 93.123(b)(1)(i) and requires a detailed conformity hot-spot analysis.

A conformity hot-spot analysis was prepared according to the procedures and methodology provided in the “Transportation Conformity Guidance for Qualitative Hot-Spot Analyses in PM$_{2.5}$ and PM$_{10}$ Nonattainment and Maintenance Areas” jointly published by EPA and FHWA in March 2006 (March 2006 Guidance). Interagency consultation concluded on September 11, 2009 and concurred that the proposed project is of local air quality concern for PM$_{2.5}$ and PM$_{10}$ and that the conformity hot-spot analysis was acceptable. The interagency consultation also reviewed the changes to the project scope since their concurrence in 2009; and reaffirmed their concurrence on July 12, 2011. Appendix A contains the detailed PM Hot-Spot Analysis as concurred with by the SCAG’s Transportation Conformity Working Group (TCWG), the interagency consultation for the Basin; and documentation of reaffirmation.

Traffic and speed data along the I-10 corridor and the surrounding areas were considered in estimating PM$_{2.5}$ and PM$_{10}$ emissions, including re-entrained road dust. Within the San Gabriel Valley subregion, VMTs on arterials, secondary streets, and portions of neighboring freeways were considered in estimating PM emissions. CT-EMFAC (v 2.1) was utilized in estimating the current and future project-level PM$_{2.5}$ and PM$_{10}$ emissions for the project alternatives. A summary of tailpipe, brake wear, and tire wear PM$_{2.5}$ and PM$_{10}$ emissions data is presented in Table 3.3-2.

Re-entrained road dust was estimated based on the existing and projected traffic data encompassing the San Gabriel Valley subregion that is affected by the proposed project. Computations were performed using the emission factor equations provided in the Fifth Edition, Volume I of EPA’s AP-42 document dated November 1, 2006. A summary of the PM$_{2.5}$ and PM$_{10}$ re-entrained road dust data is presented in Table 3.3-3.

### TABLE 3.3-2. EXISTING AND FUTURE EMISSIONS BY PROJECT ALTERNATIVES (LB/DAY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing Year, 2008</th>
<th>Opening Year, 2015</th>
<th>Horizon Year, 2035</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emissions</td>
<td>Change from No-Bld</td>
<td>Emissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PM$_{2.5}$</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No-Build</td>
<td>162.8</td>
<td>134.4</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build</td>
<td>133.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PM$_{10}$</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No-Build</td>
<td>178.5</td>
<td>145.4</td>
<td>-3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build</td>
<td>142.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Qualitative PM$_{2.5}$ and PM$_{10}$ Hot-Spot Analysis, Caltrans, 2009*
TABLE 3.3-3. SUB-REGIONAL RE-ENTRAINED ROAD DUST BY PROJECT ALTERNATIVES (LB/DAY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing Year, 2008</th>
<th>Opening Year, 2015</th>
<th>Horizon Year, 2035</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emissions</td>
<td>Change from No-Bld</td>
<td>Emissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM$_{2.5}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No-Build</td>
<td>1,122</td>
<td>1,170</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build</td>
<td>1,160</td>
<td>1,382</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM$_{10}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No-Build</td>
<td>29,950</td>
<td>31,178</td>
<td>-166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build</td>
<td>31,012</td>
<td>36,056</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Qualitative PM$_{2.5}$ and PM$_{10}$ Hot-Spot Analysis, Caltrans, 2009

Summaries of PM$_{2.5}$ and PM$_{10}$ emissions in Tables 3.3-2 and 3.3-3 indicate that the implementation of the project would result in reduction of PM$_{2.5}$ and PM$_{10}$ emissions when compared to the No-Build Alternative. It should be noted that this reduction in the emissions for the Build Alternative is despite the overall increase in the truck traffic and total traffic volumes along the I-10 within the project limits. The State vehicle codes prohibit the use of an HOV lane by trucks with 3 or more axles and school buses; therefore, the addition of an HOV lane in the EB and westbound (WB) directions would accommodate primarily gasoline-fueled light duty and alternative fueled (typically CNG or LNG) transit vehicles.

As indicated in Table 3.3-3, the implementation of the proposed project is anticipated to result in reduction of re-entrained PM$_{2.5}$ and PM$_{10}$ road dust in the subregion. The proposed project is anticipated to affect traffic patterns in the subregion where the projects are located. In addition, it will redistribute traveling from local arterials to the freeways as suggested by the respective decreases and increases of the VMTs between the No-Build and Build Alternatives.

Federal and state requirements would help further reduce PM$_{2.5}$ and PM$_{10}$ emissions in the future by essentially lowering per-vehicle emissions for each of the diesel vehicles. Thus the project is not expected to cause any concern with respect to localized concentrations of PM$_{2.5}$ and PM$_{10}$. The above discussions demonstrate that future new or worsened violations of PM NAAQS are not anticipated; therefore, the project meets the project-level conformity requirements for PM$_{2.5}$ and PM$_{10}$ as defined in 40 CFR Sections 93.116 and 93.123. For further details of the PM analysis, please refer to the August 2011 Air Quality Report.

Construction (Short-Term) Impacts

**No-Build Alternative**

The No-Build Alternative would not result in the construction of any of the proposed project improvements. Therefore, the No-Build Alternative would not result in any temporary construction-related impact to air quality.
**Build Alternative**

According to 40CFR93.123(c)(5), hot-spot analyses are not required to consider construction-related activities that cause temporary increases in emissions. Temporary increases in emissions are defined as those that occur only during the construction phase and that last 5 years or less at any individual site. Under the Build Alternative, the proposed project has construction durations of approximately 49 and 36 months for Segments 2 and 3, respectively, which are less than 5 years at each site. Emissions from the construction activities therefore may be considered temporary pursuant to 40CFR93.123(c)(5) and a qualitative analysis is provided accordingly. In addition, an estimate of approximate construction emissions is also provided, using the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District's Road Construction Model (http://airquality.org/ceqa/RoadConstructionModelVer6.3-2.xls). While the model was developed for Sacramento conditions in terms of fleet emission factors, silt loading, and other modeling assumptions, it is considered adequate for estimating road construction emissions by the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District under its Indirect Source regulations and the South Coast Air Quality Management District in its CEQA guidance, and is used for that purpose in this project analysis.

During construction, short-term degradation of air quality may occur due to the release of particulate emissions (airborne dust) generated by excavation, grading, hauling, and other activities related to construction. Emissions from construction equipment also are anticipated and would include CO, NOx, VOCs, directly-emitted particulate matter (PM$_{10}$ and PM$_{2.5}$), and toxic air contaminants such as diesel exhaust particulate matter. Ozone is a regional pollutant that is derived from NOx and VOCs in the presence of sunlight and heat.

Site preparation and roadway construction typically involve clearing, cut-and-fill activities, grading, removing or improving existing roadways, building bridges, and paving roadway surfaces. Construction-related effects on air quality from most highway projects would be greatest during the site preparation phase because most engine emissions are associated with the excavation, handling, and transport of soils to and from the site. These activities could temporarily generate enough PM$_{10}$, PM$_{2.5}$, and small amounts of CO, SO$_2$, NOx, and VOCs to be of concern. Sources of fugitive dust would include disturbed soils at the construction site and trucks carrying uncovered loads of soils. Unless properly controlled, vehicles leaving the site could deposit mud on local streets, which could be an additional source of airborne dust after it dries. PM$_{10}$ emissions would vary from day to day, depending on the nature and magnitude of construction activity and local weather conditions. PM$_{10}$ emissions would depend on soil moisture, silt content of soil, wind speed, and the amount of equipment operating. Larger dust particles would settle near the source, while fine particles would be dispersed over greater distances from the construction site.

Construction activities for large development projects are estimated by the EPA to add 1.09 tonne (1.2 tons) of fugitive dust per acre of soil disturbed per month of activity. If water or other soil stabilizers are used to control dust, the emissions can be reduced by up to 50 percent. Caltrans' Standard Specifications (Section 14-9.02) pertaining to dust minimization...
requirements requires use of water or dust palliative compounds and will reduce potential fugitive dust emissions during construction. The proposed project is located within the Basin and is required to comply with the SCAQMD Fugitive Dust Rule 403 to minimize emissions of fugitive dust during construction activities.

In addition to dust-related PM$_{10}$ emissions, heavy-duty trucks and construction equipment powered by gasoline and diesel engines would generate CO, SO$_2$, NO$_x$, VOCs and some soot particulate (PM$_{10}$ and PM$_{2.5}$) in exhaust emissions. If construction activities were to increase traffic congestion in the area, CO and other emissions from traffic would increase slightly while those vehicles are delayed. These emissions would be temporary and limited to the immediate area surrounding the construction site. In order to minimize the temporary exhaust emissions from the heavy-duty trucks and construction equipment adjacent to certain sensitive receptors, certain construction activities, e.g., extended idling, material storage, and equipment maintenance, would need to be conducted in areas at least 500 feet from those sensitive receptors.

SO$_2$ is generated by oxidation during combustion of organic sulfur compounds contained in diesel fuel. Off-road diesel fuel meeting Federal standards can contain 300 parts per million (ppm) or more of sulfur, whereas on-road diesel is restricted to less than 15 ppm of sulfur. However, under California law and ARB regulations, off-road diesel fuel used in California must meet the same sulfur and other standards as on-road diesel fuel (not more than 15 ppm), so SO$_2$-related issues due to diesel exhaust will be minimal. Some phases of construction, particularly asphalt paving, would result in short-term odors in the immediate area of each paving site(s). Such odors would be quickly dispersed below detectable thresholds as distance from the site(s) increases.

During construction, contractors are required to comply with the requirements of applicable state and local regulations. These regulations include, but are not limited to, SCAQMD Rules 401 (Visible Emissions), 402 (Nuisance), and 403 (Fugitive Dust). The construction contractor shall also comply with Caltrans’ Standard Specifications in Section 14 (2010).

Section 93.122(d)(2) of the EPA Transportation Conformity Rule requires that, in PM$_{10}$ and PM$_{2.5}$ nonattainment and maintenance areas (for which the SIPs identify construction-related fugitive dust as a contributor to the area problem), the RTIP should conduct the construction-related fugitive PM emission analysis. The 2003 PM10 and 2007 SIP AQMP emissions budgets for SCAB include the construction and unpaved road emissions. The 2008 RTIP PM10 and PM2.5 regional emissions analysis includes the construction and unpaved road emissions for conformity finding.

For informational purposes, a summary of temporary construction emissions of some criteria pollutants and CO$_2$ is provided in Tables 3.3-4 and 3.3-5, using the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District's Road Construction Model.


### TABLE 3.3-4. SUMMARY OF TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS FOR SEGMENT 2 OF THE PROJECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment 2</th>
<th>Grubbing Land Clearing (lbs/day)</th>
<th>Grading Excavation (lbs/day)</th>
<th>Drainage Utilities Sub-Grade (lbs/day)</th>
<th>Paving (lbs/day)</th>
<th>Maximum (lbs/day)</th>
<th>Total (tons)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROG</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOx</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhaust PM$_{10}$</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fugitive PM$_{10}$</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhaust PM$_{2.5}$</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fugitive PM$_{2.5}$</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO$_2$</td>
<td>4,508.6</td>
<td>6,221.1</td>
<td>4,280.5</td>
<td>2,499.2</td>
<td>6,221.1</td>
<td>2,620.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Caltrans, 2011.*

### TABLE 3.3-5. SUMMARY OF TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS FOR SEGMENT 3 OF THE PROJECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment 3</th>
<th>Grubbing Land Clearing (lbs/day)</th>
<th>Grading Excavation (lbs/day)</th>
<th>Drainage Utilities Sub-Grade (lbs/day)</th>
<th>Paving (lbs/day)</th>
<th>Maximum (lbs/day)</th>
<th>Total (tons)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROG</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOx</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhaust PM$_{10}$</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fugitive PM$_{10}$</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhaust PM$_{2.5}$</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fugitive PM$_{2.5}$</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO$_2$</td>
<td>4,853.7</td>
<td>6,574.7</td>
<td>4,624.7</td>
<td>2,843.0</td>
<td>6,571.7</td>
<td>2,120.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Caltrans, 2011.*

During the project construction, objectionable odors would be mainly related to operation of diesel-powered equipment and to off-gas emissions during road-building activities, such as paving and asphalting. SCAQMD Rule 1113 (Architectural Coatings) limits the amount of
VOC emissions from paving, asphalt, concrete curing and cement coatings operations. Construction of the proposed project shall comply with all applicable SCAQMD Rules. While construction equipment on site would generate some objectionable odors primarily arising from diesel exhaust, these emissions would generally be limited to the project site and would be temporary in nature. Objectionable odors should also be minimized by conducting certain construction activities in areas at least 500 feet from the sensitive receptors as feasible.

3.3.4 Mitigation Measures
Most of the construction impacts to air quality are short-term in duration and, therefore, will not result in long-term adverse conditions. Implementation of the following measures, some of which may also be required for other purposes such as storm water pollution control will reduce any air quality impacts resulting from construction activities:

**MM AQ-1:** The construction contractor shall comply with Caltrans’ Standard Specifications in Section 14 (2010).

- Section 14-9.01 specifically requires compliance by the contractor with all applicable laws and regulations related to air quality, including air pollution control district and air quality management district regulations and local ordinances.
- Section 14-9.02 is directed at controlling dust. If dust palliative materials other than water are to be used, material specifications are contained in Section 18.

**MM AQ-2:** Apply water or dust palliative to the site and equipment as frequently as necessary to control fugitive dust emissions. Fugitive emissions generally must meet a “no visible dust” criterion either at the point of emission or at the right of way line, depending on local regulations.

**MM AQ-3:** Spread soil binder on any unpaved roads used for construction purposes, and all project construction parking areas.

**MM AQ-4:** Wash off trucks as they leave the right-of-way as necessary to control fugitive dust emissions.

**MM AQ-5:** Properly tune and maintain construction equipment and vehicles. Use low-sulfur fuel in all construction equipment as provided in California Code of Regulations Title 17, Section 93114.

**MM AQ-6:** Develop a dust control plan documenting sprinkling, temporary paving, speed limits, and expedited revegetation of disturbed slopes as needed to minimize construction impacts to existing communities.
MM AQ-7: Locate equipment and materials storage sites shall be kept at least 500 feet from the sensitive receptors. Keep construction areas clean and orderly.

MM AQ-8: Establish Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESAs) or their equivalent near sensitive air receptors within which construction activities involving extended idling of diesel equipment would be prohibited, to the extent feasible.

MM AQ-9: Use track-out reduction measures such as gravel pads at project access points to minimize dust and mud deposits on roads affected by construction traffic.

MM AQ-10: Cover all transported loads of soils and wet materials prior to transport, or provide adequate freeboard (space from the top of the material to the top of the truck) to minimize emission of dust (particulate matter) during transportation.

MM AQ-11: Promptly and regularly remove dust and mud that are deposited on paved, public roads due to construction activity and traffic to decrease particulate matter.

MM AQ-12: Route and schedule construction traffic to avoid peak travel times as much as possible, to reduce congestion and related air quality impacts caused by idling vehicles along local roads.

MM AQ-13: Install mulch or plant vegetation as soon as practical after grading to reduce windblown particulate in the area. Be aware that certain methods of mulch placement, such as straw blowing, may themselves cause dust and visible emission issues, and may need to use controls such as dampened straw.

In addition to the above-mentioned mitigation measures, the following two measures were identified in the MMRP (2003):

MM AQ-14: Caltrans will require the construction contractors to prepare a dust control plan and to submit the plan to the South Coast Air Quality Management District (AQMD) prior to construction. The plan is expected to include, but not be limited to: stabilization of construction roads to 24 kilometers per hour (15 miles per hour); daily removal of dirt spilled onto paved roads; ceasing grading and excavation activities when wind speeds exceed 40.2 kilometers per hour (25 miles per hour) and during extreme air pollution episodes; phasing and scheduling of construction activities to avoid days with high ozone (O3) levels; possibly interrupting construction activities on days with elevated smog levels (such as Stage 2 smog alerts); use of alternative fuel/clean fuel equipment when available; covering haul trucks; phasing of grading to minimize daily emissions; property maintenance of construction vehicles to maximize efficiency and minimize emissions; and prompt revegetation of exposed cut slopes, road medians and shoulders.

MM AQ-15: Caltrans will require construction contractors to maintain and tune equipment engines consistent with the manufacturers’ requirements to maximize the efficiency of the
equipment and to minimize air and noise emissions, including the use of noise mufflers and/or other noise abatement features.

**Minimization of PM\(_{10}\) during Construction**

As noted above, Caltrans Standard Specifications specifically requires compliance with all applicable laws and regulations related to air quality, which would include applicable SCAQMD rules and regulations such as Rules 401, 402, and 403.

SCAQMD Rule 401 requires no visible emissions be discharged in the atmosphere of such opacity for a period or periods aggregating more than three minutes in any one hour as to obscure an observer’s view to a degree equal to or greater than the dark shade of smoke as that designated No. 1 on the Ringelmann Chart, as published by the United States Bureau of Mines. SCAQMD Rule 402 requires that air pollutant emissions not be a nuisance off-site. SCAQMD Rule 403 requires that fugitive dust be controlled with the best available control measures in order to reduce dust so that it does not remain visible in the atmosphere beyond the property line of the proposed project.

The 2004 PM\(_{10}\) SIP contains provisions calling for mitigation of PM\(_{10}\) emissions during construction. Pursuant to § 93.117, Caltrans, the project sponsor, is required to stipulate to include, in its final plans and specification, control measures that will limit the emission of PM\(_{10}\) during construction.

The PM\(_{10}\) emission is a composite of geologic and aerosol varieties. The prime concern during construction is to control geologic PM\(_{10}\) that occurs from earth movement such as grading. The agency who sponsored the PM\(_{10}\) SIP is SCAQMD with concurrence by the CARB. The SCAQMD has amended the 2004 Rule 403 Implementation Handbook in June 2005 (Handbook). It addresses the control of PM\(_{10}\) by reducing the ambient entrainment of fugitive dust. Fugitive dust consists of solid particulate matters that become airborne due to human activity (i.e. construction) and is a subset of total suspended particulates. Likewise, PM\(_{10}\) is a subset of total suspended particulates. The Handbook states that 50 percent of total particulate matter suspended comprise of PM\(_{10}\). Hence, in controlling for fugitive dust, emissions of geologic PM\(_{10}\) are reduced. The Handbook categorizes control of fugitive dust into three sections: Table 1, 2, and 3. Table 1 of the Handbook lists the best available control measures (BACM) and is applicable to all construction projects within the Basin.

The SCAQMD requires that “Large Projects” notify the SCAQMD by submitting Form 403N, implement the control actions in Tables 2 and 3 of the Handbook, and maintain records of control measure implementation. A Large Project is defined as “any active operations on property which contains 50 or more acres of disturbed surface area; or any earth-moving operation with a daily earth-moving or throughput volume of 3,850 cubic meters (5,000 cubic yards) or more three times during the most recent 365 day period. Depending on the scheduling of grading operations, the project may be considered as a Large
Project under Rule 403. Therefore, the project may be required to implement the applicable actions specified in Table 2 of the Handbook.

The Handbook also requires that the construction activities “shall not cause or allow PM$_{10}$ levels exceed 50 micrograms per cubic meter when determined by simultaneous sampling, as the difference between upwind and downwind sample.” Large Projects that cannot meet this performance standard are required to implement the applicable actions specified in Table 3 of Rule 403. Rather than performing monitoring to determine conformance with the performance standard, which will not reduce PM$_{10}$ emissions, the project shall implement all applicable measures presented in Rule 403 Table 3 regardless of conformance with the Rule 403 performance standard. This potentially results in a higher reduction of particulate emissions than if these measures were implemented only after being determined to be required by monitoring.

In summary, Rule 403 entails the implementation of best available fugitive dust control measures during active operations capable of generating dust. All measures presented in Tables 1 through 3 of the Rule 403 applicable to the construction activities associated with the project should be implemented to the greatest extent feasible. The proposed project will comply with any federal, state, and local rules and regulations developed as part of implementing control measures in the respective SIPs.

**Toxic Air Contaminant**

In 1998, the EPA’s Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) completed a comprehensive health assessment of diesel exhaust. This assessment formed the basis for a decision by the ARB to formally identify particles in diesel exhaust as a TAC that may pose a threat to human health.

TACs consist of a variety of compounds, including metals, minerals, soot, and hydrocarbon-based chemicals. There are hundreds of different types of air toxics, with varying degrees of toxicity. Sources of TACs include industrial processes, such as petroleum refining and chrome-plating operations; commercial operations, such as gasoline stations and dry cleaners; and motor vehicle exhaust. TACs are a concern in the Basin because of the large number of mobile sources and industrial facilities throughout the basin. Toxicity of TACs is studied by the OEHHA. California regulates TACs through its Air Toxics Program, which is mandated in Chapter 3.5 of the Health and Safety Code – *Toxic Air Contaminants*, and Part 6 – *Air Toxics Hot Spots Information and Assessment* (H&SC Sections 39660 *et seq.* and 44300 *et seq.*, respectively).

The regulatory approach used in controlling TAC levels relies on a quantitative risk assessment process rather than ambient air conditions to determine allowable emission levels from the source. In addition, for carcinogenic air pollutants, there is no safe concentration in the atmosphere. Local concentrations can pose a health risk and are termed “toxic hot spots.”
The most comprehensive study on air toxics in the Basin is the *Multiple Air Toxics Exposure Study* (MATES-II, March 2000), which was conducted by the SCAQMD. The monitoring program measured more than 30 air toxics, including both gaseous and particulate TACs. MATES-II found that the maximum cancer risk in the region from carcinogenic air pollutants ranged from approximately 1,100 to 1,750 in a million, with an average regional risk of approximately 1,400 in a million. The higher risk levels were found in the urban core areas in south central Los Angeles County, in Wilmington adjacent to the San Pedro Bay Ports, and near freeways. Overall, the study showed that airborne DPM contributed approximately 70 percent of the total cancer risk. Mobile sources accounted for nearly 90 percent of the cancer risk, and industries and other stationary sources accounted for the remaining 10 percent.

The MATES III Study Final Report, a follow-up to the MATES II study, was released in September 2008. The results of the MATES III study indicated that:

- Across the Basin, the population-weighted risk was 853 in one million, approximately 8 percent lower compared to the MATES II period of 931 per million;

- The overall average lifetime risk from TACs in the Ports area experienced an approximate 17 percent increase in risk. The 2005 average population-weighted air toxics risk in the Ports area was estimated to be approximately 1,415 per million, compared with 1,208 per million lifetime cancer risk as estimated for MATES II period (1998-1999);

- Mobile source air toxics account for 94 percent of risk; and

- Diesel accounts for 84 percent of air toxics risk.

However, the CARB has adopted a Diesel Risk Reduction Plan (DRRP) with control measures that would reduce the overall diesel PM emissions by about 85% from 2000 to 2020. In addition, total toxic risk from diesel exhaust may only be exposed for a much shorter duration. Furthermore, DPM is only one of many environmental toxics and those of other toxics and other pollutants in various environmental media may overshadow its cancer risks. Thus, while diesel exhaust may pose potential cancer risks to receptors spending time on or near high risk DPM facilities, most receptors’ short-term exposure would only cause minimal harm, and these risks would also greatly diminish in the future operating years of the project due to planned emission control regulations.

Based on the finding that DPM is a significant contributor to cancer risk in the region, SCAQMD has approved fleet rules to limit diesel exhaust emitted by municipal vehicle fleets, trash trucks, street sweepers, taxis, and buses in the region. That rule is one of many measures outlined in a comprehensive plan to reduce toxic air pollution from mobile and stationary sources. Other programs to reduce diesel emissions include SCAQMD grant programs that cover conversion of diesel equipment to alternative fuels.
**Naturally Occurring Asbestos (NOA)**

Asbestos is a term used for several types of naturally occurring fibrous minerals that are a human health hazard when airborne. The most common type of asbestos is chrysotile, but other types such as tremolite and actinolite are also found in California. Asbestos is classified as a known human carcinogen by state, federal, and international agencies and was identified as a toxic air contaminant by the CARB in 1986. All types of asbestos are hazardous and may cause lung disease and cancer. Asbestos can be released from serpentinite and ultramafic rocks when the rock is broken or crushed. Asbestos may be released to the atmosphere due to vehicular traffic on unpaved roads, during grading for development projects, and at quarry operations. Natural weathering and erosion processes can act on asbestos bearing rock and make it easier for asbestos fibers to become airborne if such rock is disturbed.

The California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology have developed a map of the state showing the general location of ultramafic rock in the state. Los Angeles County is one of the Counties identified as one of the Counties containing serpentinite and ultramafic rock. However, only the Catalina Island portion of Los Angeles County has been found to contain such rock; hence, it is not found in the project area. Therefore, no potential impacts from naturally occurring asbestos during project construction would occur. Please refer to the Air Quality Report for further details.

**Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSATs)**

Controlling air toxic emissions became a national priority with the passage of the CAA Amendments of 1990, whereby Congress mandated that the EPA regulate 188 air toxics, also known as hazardous air pollutants. The EPA has assessed this expansive list in their latest rule on the Control of Hazardous Air Pollutants from Mobile Sources (Federal Register, Vol. 72, No. 37, page 8430, February 26, 2007) and identified a group of 93 compounds emitted from mobile sources that are listed in their IRIS (http://cfcpub.epa.gov/ncea/iris/index.cfm). In addition, EPA identified seven compounds with significant contributions from mobile sources that are among the national and regional-scale cancer risk drivers from their 1999 NATA (http://www.epa.gov/ttn/atw/nata1999/). These are acrolein, benzene, 1,3-butadiene, DPM plus DEOG, formaldehyde, naphthalene, and POM. While FHWA considers these the priority mobile source air toxics, the list is subject to change and may be adjusted in consideration of future EPA rules.

The 2007 EPA rule mentioned above requires controls that will dramatically decrease MSAT emissions through cleaner fuels and cleaner engines. According to an FHWA analysis using EPA’s MOBILE6.2 model, even if vehicle activity or VMT increases by 145 percent as assumed, a combined reduction of 72 percent in the total annual emission rate for the priority MSAT is projected from 1999 to 2050, as shown in Figure 3.3-1.
Air toxics analysis is a continuing area of research. While much work has been done to assess the overall health risk of air toxics, many questions remain unanswered. In particular, the tools and techniques for assessing project-specific health outcomes as a result of lifetime MSAT exposure remain limited. These limitations impede the ability to evaluate how the potential health risks posed by MSAT exposure should be factored into project-level decision-making within the context of the NEPA.

Nonetheless, air toxics concerns continue to be raised on highway projects during the NEPA process. Even as the science emerges, we are duly expected by the public and other agencies to address MSAT impacts in our environmental documents. The FHWA, EPA, the Health Effects Institute, and others have funded and conducted research studies to try to more clearly define potential risks from MSAT emissions associated with highway projects. The FHWA will continue to monitor the developing research in this emerging field.
Incomplete or Unavailable Information for Project Specific MSAT Impacts
Analysis

In FHWA’s view, information is incomplete or unavailable to credibly predict the project-specific health impacts due to changes in MSAT emissions associated with a proposed set of highway alternatives. The outcome of such an assessment, adverse or not, would be influenced more by the uncertainty introduced into the process through assumption and speculation rather than any genuine insight into the actual health impacts directly attributable to MSAT exposure associated with a proposed action.

The EPA is responsible for protecting the public health and welfare from any known or anticipated effect of an air pollutant. They are the lead authority for administering the CAA and its amendments and have specific statutory obligations with respect to hazardous air pollutants and MSAT. The EPA is in the continual process of assessing human health effects, exposures, and risks posed by air pollutants. They maintain the IRIS, which is “a compilation of electronic reports on specific substances found in the environment and their potential to cause human health effects” (EPA, https://www.epa.gov/iris/). Each report contains assessments of non-cancerous and cancerous effects for individual compounds and quantitative estimates of risk levels from lifetime oral and inhalation exposures with uncertainty spanning perhaps an order of magnitude.

Other organizations are also active in the research and analyses of the human health effects of MSAT, including the Health Effects Institute (HEI). Two HEI studies are summarized in Appendix D of FHWA’s Interim Guidance. Among the adverse health effects linked to MSAT compounds at high exposures are cancer in humans in occupational settings; cancer in animals; and irritation to the respiratory tract, including the exacerbation of asthma. Less obvious is the adverse human health effects of MSAT compounds at current environmental concentrations (HEI, http://pubs.healtheffeets.org/view.php?id=282) or in the future as vehicle emissions substantially decrease (HEI, http://pubs.healtheffeets.org/view.php?id=306).

The methodologies for forecasting health impacts include emissions modeling; dispersion modeling; exposure modeling; and then final determination of health impacts – each step in the process building on the model predictions obtained in the previous step. All are encumbered by technical shortcomings or uncertain science that prevents a more complete differentiation of the MSAT health impacts among a set of project alternatives. These difficulties are magnified for lifetime (i.e., 70 year) assessments, particularly because unsupportable assumptions would have to be made regarding changes in travel patterns and vehicle technology (which affects emissions rates) over that time frame, since such information is unavailable. The results produced by the EPA’s MOBILE6.2 model, the CARB’s EMFAC2007 model, and the EPA’s MOVES2009 model in forecasting MSAT emissions are highly inconsistent. Indications from the development of the MOVES model are that MOBILE6.2 significantly underestimates DPM emissions and significantly overestimates benzene emissions.
Regarding air dispersion modeling, an extensive evaluation of EPA’s guideline CAL3QHC model was conducted in an NCHRP study (http://www.epa.gov/scram001/dispersion_alt.htm#hyroad), which documents poor model performance at ten sites across the country – three where intensive monitoring was conducted plus an additional seven with less intensive monitoring. The study indicates a bias of the CAL3QHC model to overestimate concentrations near highly congested intersections and underestimate concentrations near uncongested intersections. The consequence of this is a tendency to overstate the air quality benefits of mitigating congestion at intersections. Such poor model performance is less difficult to manage for demonstrating compliance with NAAQS for relatively short time frames than it is for forecasting individual exposure over an entire lifetime, especially given that some information needed for estimating 70-year lifetime exposure is unavailable. It is particularly difficult to reliably forecast MSAT exposure near roadways, and to determine the portion of time that people are actually exposed at a specific location.

There are considerable uncertainties associated with the existing estimates of toxicity of the various MSAT, because of factors such as low-dose extrapolation and translation of occupational exposure data to the general population, a concern expressed by HEI (http://pubs.health effects.org/view.php?id=282). As a result, there is no national consensus on air dose-response values assumed to protect the public health and welfare for MSAT compounds, and in particular for DPM. The EPA (http://www.epa.gov/risk/basicinformation.htm#g) and the HEI (http://pubs.health effects.org/getfile.php?u=395) have not established a basis for quantitative risk assessment of diesel PM in ambient settings.

There is also the lack of a national consensus on an acceptable level of risk. The current context is the process used by the EPA as provided by the CAA to determine whether more stringent controls are required in order to provide an ample margin of safety to protect public health or to prevent an adverse environmental effect for industrial sources subject to the maximum achievable control technology standards, such as benzene emissions from refineries. The decision framework is a two-step process. The first step requires EPA to determine a “safe” or “acceptable” level of risk due to emissions from a source, which is generally no greater than approximately 100 in a million. Additional factors are considered in the second step, the goal of which is to maximize the number of people with risks less than one in a million due to emissions from a source. The results of this statutory two-step process do not guarantee that cancer risks from exposure to air toxics are less than one in a million; in some cases, the residual risk determination could result in maximum individual cancer risks that are as high as approximately 100 in a million. In a June 2008 decision, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit upheld EPA’s approach to addressing risk in its two step decision framework. Information is incomplete or unavailable to establish that even the largest of highway projects would result in levels of risk greater than safe or acceptable.

Because of the limitations in the methodologies for forecasting health impacts described, any predicted difference in health impacts between alternatives is likely to be much smaller than the uncertainties associated with predicting the impacts. Consequently, the results of such
assessments would not be useful to decision makers, who would need to weigh this information against project benefits, such as reducing traffic congestion, accident rates, and fatalities plus improved access for emergency response, that are better suited for quantitative analysis.

**Relevance of Unavailable or Incomplete Information to Evaluating Reasonably Foreseeable Significant Adverse Impacts on the Environment, and Evaluation of Impacts Based upon Theoretical Approaches or Research Methods Generally Accepted in the Scientific Community**

Because of the uncertainties outlined above, a reliable quantitative assessment of the effects of air toxic emissions impacts on human health cannot be made at the project level. While available tools do allow us to reasonably predict relative emissions changes between alternatives for larger projects, the amount of MSAT emissions from each of the project alternatives and MSAT concentrations or exposures created by each of the project alternatives cannot be predicted with enough accuracy to be useful in estimating health impacts. As noted above, the current emissions model is not capable of serving as a meaningful emissions analysis tool for smaller projects. Therefore, the relevance of the unavailable or incomplete information is that it is not possible to make a determination of whether any of the alternatives would have "significant adverse impacts on the human environment."

**Tiered Approach for MSAT Impacts Analysis**

FHWA, in its updated Interim Guidance published on September 30, 2009, recommends a range of options deemed appropriate for addressing and documenting the MSAT issue in NEPA documents as described below:

**No Analysis** required for projects with no potential for meaningful MSAT effects – Applicable for categorically excluded projects under 23 CFR 771.117(c); exempt projects under 40 CFR 93.126; or projects with no meaningful impacts on traffic volumes or vehicle mix.

**Qualitative analysis** required for projects with low potential MSAT effects – Projects that serve to improve operations of highway, transit, or freight without adding substantial new capacity or without creating a facility that is likely to meaningfully increase emissions.

**Quantitative analysis** to differentiate for projects with higher potential MSAT effects – Projects that have the potential for meaningful differences among project alternatives. In order to fit into this category, a project must meet the two pronged test, as defined by FHWA.

1) A project must create or significantly alter a major intermodal freight facility that has the potential to concentrate high levels of diesel particulate matter in a single location; or a project must create new or add significant capacity to urban highways such as interstates, urban arterials, or urban collector-distributor routes with traffic volumes where the
AADT is projected to be in the range of 140,000 to 150,000 or greater by the design year; and

2) A project is proposed to be located in proximity to populated areas.

The scope of the proposed project is to construct one median HOV lane in each direction on I-10 between Puente Avenue and the SR 57/SR 71/I-210 Interchange, from PM 33.4 to PM 42.4. The project would include widening of the existing freeway on the outside of the existing traffic lanes, with restriping to accommodate the HOV lanes in the median. A climbing lane would be provided in the uphill direction at locations where existing grades exceed three percent. The traffic data shows that the ADT throughout the project corridor exceeds the FHWA criteria of 140,000 to 150,000 AADT. The data also shows that the proposed project would increase the capacity of I-10 within the project limits. In addition, the project is mostly located in urban areas with pockets of sensitive land uses nearby.

Based on a review of the traffic data, proposed scope, and settings, this project is anticipated to have meaningful differences in MSAT emissions among project alternatives. In accordance with the FHWA Interim Guidance, the project therefore requires a quantitative analysis in an effort to: (1) evaluate the levels of emissions for the priority MSATs for the project alternatives for the current, opening, and horizon years; and (2) utilize its result as a basis for comparison and differentiate among the project alternatives.

**MSAT Emissions Analysis**

Although an emissions analysis cannot identify and measure health impacts from MSATs, it can provide a basis for identifying and comparing the potential differences in MSAT emissions from various alternatives and between various project milestone years.

For the purposes of the emissions analysis, the total project length was divided into 11 segments in the EB direction and 12 segments in the WB direction. The segments were of various lengths determined based on the locations of intersections with local arterials. Table 3.3-6 presents the extent of each segment within the project limits and a brief summary of sensitive land uses near the proposed project. The latest version of CT-EMFAC (v 4.1), which was released in early 2011, was used to estimate MSAT emissions along the various segments within the project limits for the alternatives in the base year (2010) and in the future years (2015 and 2035).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Length (mile)</th>
<th>Potential Sensitive Land Uses Within 500 ft of Freeway*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Puente</td>
<td>Pacific/Orange</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>SFR, MFR, Country Villa West Covina Healthcare Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pacific/Orange</td>
<td>Vincent</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>Doctors Hospital West Covina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Vincent</td>
<td>Azusa</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>SFR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Azusa</td>
<td>Citrus</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>SFR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Citrus</td>
<td>Barranca</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>MFR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Barranca</td>
<td>Grand</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>SFR, MFR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Grand</td>
<td>Holt</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>SFR, Temple Ami-Shalom &amp; Jewish Center, Seventh Day Adventist Church, West Covina Hills Adventist School, Jalapa Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Holt</td>
<td>Via Verde</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>SFR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Via Verde</td>
<td>Kellogg</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>CalPoly Pomona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Kellogg</td>
<td>SR-57 Off</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>CalPoly Pomona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>SR-57 Off</td>
<td>SR-71</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>DeVry University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SR-57 Off</td>
<td>Kellogg</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Kellogg</td>
<td>SR-57 On</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>SFR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SR-57 On</td>
<td>Via Verde</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>SFR, MFR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Via Verde</td>
<td>Holt</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>SFR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Holt</td>
<td>Grand</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>SFR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Grand</td>
<td>Barranca</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>SFR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Barranca</td>
<td>Citrus</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>SFR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Citrus</td>
<td>Azusa</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>SFR, Discovery Montessori Preschool, Mikkon Adult Healthcare Center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Azusa</td>
<td>Vincent</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>SFR, MFR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Vincent</td>
<td>Sunset</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>SFR, MFR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Sunset</td>
<td>Pacific/Orange</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>SFR, MFR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Pacific/Orange</td>
<td>Puente</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>SFR, MFR, Learning Garden Montessori School, West Covina Education Center.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
SFR = Single-Family Residential
MFR = Multi-Family Residential
*Refer to Figures 5 and 6 of the August 2011 Air Quality Report for a comprehensive list.
Source: Caltrans, 2011.
Discussion of Results

Tables 3.3-7 and 3.3-8 summarize estimates of projected MSAT emissions in 2015 and 2035, respectively, in comparison to the MSAT emissions estimates in 2010. Based on the emissions analysis, the Build Alternative, in general, would result in higher emissions compared to the No-Build alternative in 2015 and 2035. It should be noted though that the level of increase in the future MSAT emissions for the Build Alternative is smaller in 2035 than in 2015. The analysis also indicates that the MSAT emissions for both Alternatives in 2015 or 2035 would be less than the existing (2010) conditions, except for emissions of Naphthalene and POM increasing in the future years. Further details of the MSAT analysis are available in the Air Quality Report.

**TABLE 3.3-7. MSAT EMISSIONS FOR ALL SEGMENTS IN OPENING YEAR (2015)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010, Existing (g/day)</th>
<th>2015, No-Build (g/day)</th>
<th>2015 Build</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Emissions (g/day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel PM</td>
<td>24,839</td>
<td>19,305</td>
<td>21,874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEOG</td>
<td>41,293</td>
<td>32,963</td>
<td>36,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benzene</td>
<td>10,276</td>
<td>6,207</td>
<td>6,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acrolein</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formaldehyde</td>
<td>11,871</td>
<td>8,240</td>
<td>9,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,3-Butadiene</td>
<td>1,924</td>
<td>1,078</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naphthalene</td>
<td>4,680</td>
<td>4,554</td>
<td>4,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POM</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>691</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Minus (-) sign denotes a decrease from existing or No-Build emissions.
Source: Caltrans, 2011.

**TABLE 3.3-8. MSAT EMISSIONS FOR ALL SEGMENTS IN HORIZON YEAR (2035)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010, Existing (g/day)</th>
<th>2035, No-Build (g/day)</th>
<th>2035 Build</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Emissions (g/day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel PM</td>
<td>24,839</td>
<td>10,640</td>
<td>11,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEOG</td>
<td>41,293</td>
<td>21,059</td>
<td>21,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benzene</td>
<td>10,276</td>
<td>3,624</td>
<td>3,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acrolein</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formaldehyde</td>
<td>11,871</td>
<td>4,781</td>
<td>4,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,3-Butadiene</td>
<td>1,924</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naphthalene</td>
<td>4,680</td>
<td>5,151</td>
<td>5,163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POM</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>725</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Minus (-) sign denotes a decrease from existing or no-build.
Source: Caltrans, 2011.
The CARB’s “Air Quality and Land Use Handbook” identifies the following land uses as particularly sensitive to MSATs: residential areas, schools, hospitals and other health care facilities, day care and other child care facilities, and parks and playgrounds. However, as discussed above, the magnitude and the duration of potential increases and exposure compared to the No-Build Alternative cannot be accurately quantified due to the inherent deficiencies of current models. On a regional basis, EPA’s and California’s vehicle and fuel regulations, coupled with fleet turnover, will over time cause substantial reductions that, in almost all cases, will cause region-wide MSAT levels to be significantly lower than today.

**Minimization of Construction MSAT Emissions**

Construction activity may generate a temporary increase in MSAT emissions. Project-level assessments that render a decision to pursue construction emission minimization will benefit from a number of technologies and operational practices that should help lower short-term MSAT. In addition, the SAFETEA-LU has emphasized a host of diesel retrofit technologies in the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) Program provisions – technologies that are designed to lessen a number of MSATs.

Minimization of construction MSAT emissions includes strategies that reduce engine activity or reduce emissions per unit of operating time, such as reducing the numbers of trips and extended idling. Operational agreements that reduce or redirect work or shift times to avoid community exposures can have positive benefits when sites are near populated areas. For example, agreements that stress work activity outside normal hours of an adjacent school campus would be operations-oriented minimization. Verified emissions control technology retrofits or fleet modernization of engines for construction equipment could be appropriate minimization strategies. Technology retrofits could include PM traps, oxidation catalysts, and other devices that provide an after-treatment of exhaust emissions. Implementing maintenance programs per manufacturers’ specifications to ensure engines perform at EPA certification levels, as applicable, and to ensure retrofit technologies perform at verified standards, as applicable, could also be deemed appropriate. The use of clean fuels, such as ultra-low sulfur diesel, biodiesel, or natural gas also can be a very cost-beneficial strategy.

The EPA has listed a number of approved diesel retrofit technologies; many of these can be deployed as emissions minimization measures for equipment used in construction. This listing can be found at: www.epa.gov/otaq/retrofit/index.htm.

**Post-Construction Minimization for Projects with Potentially Significant MSAT Levels**

Travel demand management strategies and techniques that reduce overall VMTs; reduce a particular type of travel, such as long-haul freight or commuter travel; or improve the transportation system’s efficiency will minimize MSAT emissions. Examples of such strategies include congestion pricing, commuter incentive programs, and increases in truck weight or length limits. Operational strategies that focus on speed limit enforcement or traffic management policies may help reduce MSAT emissions even beyond the benefits of fleet...
turnover. Well-traveled highways with high proportions of heavy-duty diesel truck activity may benefit from active Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) programs, such as traffic management centers or incident management systems. Similarly, anti-idling strategies, such as truck-stop electrification can complement projects that focus on new or increased freight activity.

The benefits of establishing buffer zones between new or expanded highway alignments and populated areas should be considered. Modifications of local zoning or the development of guidelines that are more protective also may be useful in separating emissions and receptors.

**Climate Change**

Climate change is analyzed in Chapter 4. Neither the United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) nor the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) has promulgated explicit guidance or methodology to conduct project-level greenhouse gas analysis. As stated on FHWA’s climate change website (http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/hep/climate/index.htm), climate change considerations should be integrated throughout the transportation decision-making process—from planning through project development and delivery. Addressing climate change mitigation and adaptation up front in the planning process will facilitate decision-making and improve efficiency at the program level, and will inform the analysis and stewardship needs of project level decision-making. Climate change considerations can easily be integrated into many planning factors, such as supporting economic vitality and global efficiency, increasing safety and mobility, enhancing the environment, promoting energy conservation, and improving the quality of life.

Because there have been more requirements set forth in California legislation and executive orders regarding climate change, the issue is addressed in the California Environmental Quality Act chapter of this environmental document and may be used to inform the National Environmental Policy Act decision. The four strategies set forth by FHWA to lessen climate change impacts do correlate with efforts that the State has undertaken and is undertaking to deal with transportation and climate change; the strategies include improved transportation system efficiency, cleaner fuels, cleaner vehicles, and reduction in the growth of vehicle hours travelled.
3.4 Noise and Vibration

This section has been prepared based upon the Traffic Noise Study Report (NSR) (Environmental Re-Evaluation), Route 10 HOV Project, in Los Angeles County from Puente Avenue in Baldwin Park to State Route 57 in Pomona (Caltrans, 2008a), the Supplemental Traffic NSR, Route 10 HOV Project, from Route 605 to Route 10/57/210/71 Interchange, Forest Lawn Cemetery of Covina Hills (Caltrans, 2004). This study was required to satisfy Caltrans’ Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol (2006), which is based on FHWA noise regulations (23 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 772). In addition, this section was prepared using the Traffic Noise Analysis prepared for Forest Lawn Memorial Park (2012).

3.4.1 Existing Conditions

The existing noise environment is described in the following paragraphs. For a detailed discussion of fundamental traffic noise concepts, please refer to Caltrans’ Technical Noise Supplement (TeNS) (Caltrans, 2009), a technical supplement to the Protocol, that is available on the Caltrans Web site (http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/env/noise/pub/tens_complete.pdf).

3.4.1.1 Existing Noise Levels

A field investigation was conducted to identify frequent outdoor use areas that could be subject to traffic noise impacts. Multiple outdoor noise measurements were conducted throughout the study corridor to evaluate existing noise levels and to calibrate the computer noise model. Locations that are expected to receive the greatest traffic noise impacts, such as the first row of houses from the noise source, are generally chosen.

Specific measurement sites were chosen to be representative of receiver sites with similar topography, orientation to the highway, exposure angles, etc. Noise measurements were conducted in conformance with guidelines outlined in Caltrans’ TeNS and FHWA’s Measuring of Highway Related Noise (FHWA-PD-96-046). Noise monitoring was conducted using Metrosonics M3280 and Quest SoundPro DL models 2238 and 2250 sound level meters. Additional details of measurement procedures can be reviewed in the NSR.

Existing noise levels were recorded at 100 frequent human use area locations and modeled at 19 locations, which were acoustically representative of the entire area within the limits of the project. Figures showing the locations of noise receptors and noise measurement sites can be found in appendices to the technical reports.

The existing ambient noise levels measured were between 56 and 77 dBA. Twelve (12) long-term (i.e., 24-hour) noise level readings were conducted to determine the noisiest hour within the project limits. The community background noise levels were taken at 8 locations within the project limits and ranged from 44 to 60 dBA-Leq(h). Results for the short- and long-term measurements for the general corridor are presented in the technical reports (see Chapter 6 tables of Traffic NSR and Table 1 of Supplemental Traffic NSR for Forest Lawn).
Additional existing ambient noise level measurements were taken at the Forest Lawn Memorial Park in February 2012. These levels measured between 43 and 78 dBA. The entire cemetery was acoustically represented by 22 noise site locations. Exterior noise sites included 20 locations, while two noise sites were monitored for inside chapel noise.

### 3.4.1.2 Predicted Noise Levels

Tables 3.4-1 and 3.4-2 summarize the traffic noise levels for existing conditions, as well as for both the design-year (2038) No Project Alternative and Proposed Project Alternative. Predicted Year 2038 traffic noise levels with the proposed project are compared to existing conditions (i.e., without the proposed project) and to the Year 2038 under the no project conditions. The comparison to existing conditions is included in the analysis to identify traffic noise impacts under 23 CFR 772. The comparison to no project conditions indicates the direct effects of the project. As stated in the TeNS, modeling results are rounded to the nearest decibel before comparisons are made.³

#### TABLE 3.4-1. TRAFFIC NOISE, $L_{eq}(H)$, PREDICTION SUMMARY (DBA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receiver ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Existing Noise Level (2011)</th>
<th>Year 2038 Noise Level without Project</th>
<th>Year 2038 Noise Level with Project</th>
<th>Year 2038 Noise Level with Project minus Existing Conditions</th>
<th>Year 2038 Noise Level with Project minus No Project Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EASTBOUND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7</td>
<td>725 S. Orange Avenue</td>
<td>Hos</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8</td>
<td>850 S. Sunkist Avenue</td>
<td>Hos</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9</td>
<td>2134 Sienna Crest</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10</td>
<td>1020 Willow Avenue</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>75.6**</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM11*</td>
<td>Mossberg Avenue and Garvey Avenue</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A12</td>
<td>14624 Dalewood Street</td>
<td>Hot</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A13</td>
<td>1304 Halinor Avenue</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM13*</td>
<td>1305 Halinor Avenue</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8</td>
<td>1601 West Covina Parkway</td>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>64.5**</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7</td>
<td>111 S. Ashdale Street</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>67.1**</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C8</td>
<td>105 S. Astell Avenue</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>67.7**</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C9</td>
<td>105 Gardenglen Street</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>68.2**</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C10</td>
<td>104 S. Turner Avenue</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

³ In some cases, this can result in relative changes that may not appear intuitive. An example would be a comparison between sound levels of 64.4 and 64.5 dBA. The difference between these two values is 0.1 dB; however, after rounding, the difference is reported as 1 dB.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receiver ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Existing Noise Level (2011)</th>
<th>Year 2038 Noise Level without Project</th>
<th>Year 2038 Noise Level with Project</th>
<th>Year 2038 Noise Level with Project minus Existing Conditions</th>
<th>Year 2038 Noise Level with Project minus No Project Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DM4*</td>
<td>End of Homerest Avenue near off-ramp at Azusa Avenue</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM5*</td>
<td>End of Homerest Avenue near off-ramp at Azusa Avenue</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6</td>
<td>101 S. Fernwood Street</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>70.8**</td>
<td>70.8**</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7</td>
<td>111 S. Fernwood Street</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>63.7**</td>
<td>63.7**</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8</td>
<td>1532 E. Garvey Avenue</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>73.2**</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9</td>
<td>101 S. Butterfield Road</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>72.4**</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F24</td>
<td>100 S Fircroft Street</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>72.2**</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>109 Baymar Street</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>71.1**</td>
<td>71.1**</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2</td>
<td>106 Baymar Street</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>74.4**</td>
<td>74.4**</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3</td>
<td>101 S Fircroft Street</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>74.5**</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM1*</td>
<td>Backyard of home on E. James Avenue at E. Garvey Avenue and Hollenbeck Avenue</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4</td>
<td>2340 E. Garvey Avenue S</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>77.3**</td>
<td>77.3**</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5</td>
<td>110 S. Mockingbird Lane</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>68.6**</td>
<td>68.6**</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F6</td>
<td>2516 E. James Avenue</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>66.4**</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F7</td>
<td>2517 James Avenue</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>66.6**</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F8</td>
<td>2531 James Avenue</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>63.6**</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G24</td>
<td>3249 E. Drycreek Road</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>66.3**</td>
<td>66.3**</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1</td>
<td>3030 E. Garvey Avenue S (McDonald's)</td>
<td>Com</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>69.9**</td>
<td>69.9**</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2</td>
<td>130 S. Barranca Street S</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>61.6**</td>
<td>61.6**</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3</td>
<td>3047 Joy Street</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>58.6**</td>
<td>58.6**</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G9</td>
<td>2748 E. Garvey Avenue S</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>66.9**</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>3508 E. Temple Way</td>
<td>Church</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>3601 E. Holt Avenue</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>73.0**</td>
<td>73.0**</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM1*</td>
<td>3601 E. Holt Avenue</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I24</td>
<td>100 Buckboard Circle</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1</td>
<td>3700 E. Garvey Avenue S</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I2M*</td>
<td>Backyard residence at</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 3.4-1. TRAFFIC NOISE, $L_{eq}(H)$, PREDICTION SUMMARY (DBA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receiver ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Existing Noise Level (2011)</th>
<th>Year 2038 Noise Level without Project</th>
<th>Year 2038 Noise Level with Project</th>
<th>Year 2038 Noise Level with Project minus Existing Conditions</th>
<th>Year 2038 Noise Level with Project minus No Project Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-3</td>
<td>Holt Avenue on-ramp to I-10 at E. Garvey Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-4</td>
<td>3800 E. Garvey Avenue S</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5M*</td>
<td>112 Stagecoach Circle</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-6</td>
<td>Corner of Stagecoach Circle and E. Garvey Avenue S</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-7M*</td>
<td>I-111 Horseshoe Circle</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>20450 E. Garvey Avenue S</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-9</td>
<td>20529 Mesquite Lane</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>56.5**</td>
<td>56.5**</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-2</td>
<td>3801 W. Temple Avenue (Cal Poly University Pomona)</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>61.2**</td>
<td>61.2**</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-3</td>
<td>3801 W. Temple Avenue (Cal Poly University Pomona)</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>64.9**</td>
<td>64.9**</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### WESTBOUND

<p>| A-24        | 2310 Havenbrook Street                                                   | Res      | 69.6                         | 70.4                                 | 70.4                             | 0.8                                          | 0.8                                          |
| A1          | 14510 Garvey Avenue                                                      | Motel    | 63.0                         | 63.0**                               | 63.0**                          | 0.0                                          | 0.0                                          |
| A2          | 14635 N. Garvey Avenue                                                   | Hotel    | 67.5                         | 70.1                                 | 68.8                             | 1.3                                          | 2.6                                          |
| A3          | 2320 W. Havenbrook Street                                                | Res      | 72.0                         | 73.2                                 | 73.3                             | 1.3                                          | 1.2                                          |
| A4          | 2212 W. Havenbrook Street                                                | Res      | 69.7                         | 70.7                                 | 71.2                             | 1.5                                          | 1.0                                          |
| A5          | 2133 W. Garvey Avenue                                                    | School   | 67.8                         | 67.8**                               | 67.8**                          | 0.0                                          | 1.1                                          |
| A6          | 2000 W. Pacific Avenue                                                   | Res      | 68.5                         | 70.4                                 | 69.7                             | 1.2                                          | 1.9                                          |
| A14         | 2301 W. Cedarwood Street                                                 | Res      | 65.2                         | 653.5                                | 65.3                             | 0.1                                          | 0.3                                          |
| AM-15*      | Near 2005 W. Garvey Avenue                                              | School   | ---                          | 78.1                                 | 78.1                             | 0.2                                          | 0.2                                          |
| B-24        | 105 Poxon Place                                                          | Res      | 72.4                         | 72.4**                               | 74.2                             | 1.8                                          | 2.0                                          |
| B1          | 1637 N. Garvey Avenue                                                    | Motel    | 76.7                         | 76.7**                               | 76.7**                          | 0.0                                          | 1.9                                          |
| MB-2*       | Near 1437 W. Garvey Avenue                                              | Motel    | ---                          | 80.1                                 | 81.3                             | 1.7                                          | 0.5                                          |
| B3          | 1333 Garvey Avenue                                                       | Res      | 77.5                         | 77.5**                               | 77.5**                          | 0.0                                          | 2.0                                          |
| B4          | 111 N. Morada Avenue                                                     | Res      | 76.2                         | 76.2**                               | 76.2**                          | 0.0                                          | 2.9                                          |
| B5          | 124 Hartley Street                                                       | Res      | 66.2                         | 66.2**                               | 67.6                             | 1.4                                          | 1.2                                          |
| B6          | 1015 Garvey Street                                                       | Res      | 67.0                         | 67.0**                               | 68.4                             | 1.4                                          | 2.2                                          |
| B7          | 1001 W. Garvey Street                                                    | Res      | 63.2                         | 63.2**                               | 63.2**                          | 0.0                                          | 2.0                                          |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receiver ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Existing Noise Level (2011)</th>
<th>Year 2038 Noise Level without Project</th>
<th>Year 2038 Noise Level with Project</th>
<th>Year 2038 Noise Level with Project minus Existing Conditions</th>
<th>Year 2038 Noise Level with Project minus No Project Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C24</td>
<td>1230 E. Mardina Street</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>74.0**</td>
<td>74.0**</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>128 Maplewood Avenue</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>66.5**</td>
<td>66.5**</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>118 Maplewood Avenue</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>71.1**</td>
<td>71.1**</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>1139 E. Garvey Avenue</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>76.1**</td>
<td>76.1**</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM4*</td>
<td>Corner of Mardina Street and Toland Avenue</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>71.12</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>1320 E. Mardina Street</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>75.5**</td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>101 N. Lark Ellen Avenue</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>70.6**</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C11</td>
<td>1408 E. Mardina Street</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>69.9**</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C12</td>
<td>1506 E. Mardina Street</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D24</td>
<td>1626 E. Mardina Street</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>72.0**</td>
<td>72.0**</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>1639 Mardina Street</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>64.3**</td>
<td>64.3**</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td>1730 E. Mardina Street</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>72.3**</td>
<td>72.3**</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E24</td>
<td>2327 E. Garvey Avenue N</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>70.0**</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>1909 E. Garvey Avenue N</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>72.9**</td>
<td>72.9**</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2</td>
<td>121 Baymar Avenue</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>62.7**</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3</td>
<td>2033 Garvey Avenue</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>74.4**</td>
<td>74.4**</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4</td>
<td>2123 Garvey Avenue</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>71.5**</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5</td>
<td>2047 E. Garvey Avenue</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>71.6**</td>
<td>71.6**</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6</td>
<td>2309 E. Garvey Avenue N</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>74.3**</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E7</td>
<td>121 N. Meadow Road</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E8</td>
<td>2359 E. Garvey Avenue</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>69.1**</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E9</td>
<td>2451 E. Garvey Avenue</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>70.3**</td>
<td>70.3**</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G4</td>
<td>3145 E. Garvey Avenue N</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>66.9**</td>
<td>66.9**</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G5</td>
<td>3223 E. Garvey Avenue N</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>71.5**</td>
<td>71.5**</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G6</td>
<td>3275 E. Garvey Avenue N</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>70.2**</td>
<td>70.2**</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G7</td>
<td>101 N. Barranca Street (Starbucks)</td>
<td>Com</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>68.8**</td>
<td>68.8**</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G8</td>
<td>143 N. Barranca Street (Starbucks)</td>
<td>Com</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>67.6**</td>
<td>67.6**</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H24</td>
<td>3553 E. Miriam Drive</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>1211 E. Garvey Street</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>72.7**</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>2576 E. Craiglee Circle</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 3.4-1. TRAFFIC NOISE, $L_{EQ}(H)$, PREDICTION SUMMARY (DBA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receiver ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Existing Noise Level (2011)</th>
<th>Year 2038 Noise Level without Project</th>
<th>Year 2038 Noise Level with Project</th>
<th>Year 2038 Noise Level with Project minus Existing Conditions</th>
<th>Year 2038 Noise Level with Project minus No Project Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>3501 E. Hillhaven Drive</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6</td>
<td>3421 E. Miriam Drive</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J$^24$</td>
<td>20564 Exbury Place</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J1</td>
<td>1580 E. Via Verde Street</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>61.4**</td>
<td>61.4**</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J2</td>
<td>1580 E. Via Verde Street</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>66.7**</td>
<td>66.7**</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JM1*</td>
<td>South of Exbury Place next to I-10</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JM2*</td>
<td>20768 E. Via Verde Street</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J3</td>
<td>20832 E. Via Verde Street</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JM3*</td>
<td>In rear of homes located on Via Verde Street adjacent to I-10</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JM4*</td>
<td>In rear of homes located on Via Verde Street adjacent to I-10</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JM5*</td>
<td>20930 E. Via Verde Street</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J4</td>
<td>21163 E. Via Verde Street</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>69.4**</td>
<td>69.4**</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J5</td>
<td>21101 E. Terry Way</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>65.2**</td>
<td>65.2**</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J6</td>
<td>21245 E. Via Verde Street</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>66.4**</td>
<td>66.4**</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JM6*</td>
<td>21355 E. Via Verde Street</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K$^{24}$</td>
<td>21554 Covina Hills Road</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>64.4**</td>
<td>64.4**</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1</td>
<td>21434 E. Via Verde Street</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>63.9**</td>
<td>63.9**</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K2</td>
<td>21436 E. Covina Hills Road</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>69.9**</td>
<td>69.9**</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K3</td>
<td>21542 E. Covina Hills Road</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KM1*</td>
<td>Backyard of house on E Covina Hills Road</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4</td>
<td>2335 Via Fresa</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K5</td>
<td>2457 Via Mariposa</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L$^{24}$</td>
<td>2499 Via Mariposa</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>1030 Via Romales</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Modeled Site
**Future Noise Level is adjusted to existing worst-hour noise level because TNM model predicted noise level is less than existing worst-hour noise level

Res = Residential; Com= Commercial; Hos = Hospital; Lib = Library

$^{24}$ = 24-hour noise measurement site
### TABLE 3.4-2. TRAFFIC NOISE, $L_{eq}(H)$, PREDICTION SUMMARY (DBA)
AT FOREST LAWN MEMORIAL PARK CEMETERY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site #</th>
<th>Existing Noise Level [dBA-$L_{eq}(h)$]</th>
<th>Predicted Noise Level [dBA-$L_{eq}(h)$]</th>
<th>Noise Increase (dBA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3*</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5*</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Site is more than 500 feet away from freeway – out of validity range for computer software.

#### 3.4.2 Regulatory Requirements
Regulatory requirements applicable to the proposed project as assessed in this FEIR are described below.

**California Environmental Quality Act**
In California, CEQA provides the broad basis for analyzing and abating highway traffic noise effects. The intent of CEQA is to promote general welfare and to foster a healthy environment.

CEQA requires a strictly baseline-versus-build analysis to assess whether a proposed project will have a noise impact. If a proposed project is determined to have a significant noise impact under CEQA, then CEQA dictates that mitigation measures must be incorporated into the project unless such measures are not feasible.

Figure 3.4-1 lists the noise levels of common activities to enable readers to compare the actual and predicted highway noise-levels discussed in this section with common activities.

In accordance with Caltrans’ *Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol for New Highway Construction, Reconstruction, and Retrofit Barrier Projects, May 2011*, a noise impact occurs when the future noise level with the project results in a substantial increase in noise level. If it is determined that the project will have noise impacts, then potential abatement measures must be considered. Noise abatement measures that are determined reasonable and feasible at the time of final design are incorporated into the project plans and specifications. This document discusses noise abatement measures that would likely be incorporated in the project.

---

4 A Supplemental Traffic Noise Study Report was prepared by Caltrans in 2004 to assess potential traffic noise impacts, and to determine the feasibility of traffic noise abatement for any location with impacts. The report concludes that the cemetery is not considered a frequent human use area that would benefit from a lowered noise level.
The Caltrans’ *Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol* sets forth the criteria for determining when an abatement measure is feasible and reasonable. The feasibility of a noise abatement measure is primarily an acoustical criterion. A minimum 5-dB reduction in the future noise level must be achieved for an abatement measure to be considered feasible. The reasonableness determination is basically a cost-benefit analysis. Factors used in determining whether a proposed noise abatement measure is reasonable include residents’ acceptance, the absolute noise level, build versus existing noise, environmental impacts of abatement, public and local agencies input, newly constructed development versus development pre-dating 1978, and the cost per benefited residence.

**23 CFR 772**

Caltrans’ *Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol for New Highway Construction, Reconstruction, and Retrofit Barrier Projects* is based heavily on Title 23, CFR Part 772. 23 CFR 772, Procedures for Abatement of Highway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise, defines Activity Categories and their respective Noise Abatement Criteria (NAC). Several changes have been made to Table 1, Activity Categories and Noise Abatement Criteria. Additional Activity Categories have been added and more activities have been added to the Description.
of Activities previously listed. For example, the NAC for exterior noise levels at hotels and motels was previously 67 dBA-L_{eq}(h). With the revised 23 CFR 772, the NAC for exterior noise levels at hotels and motels is now 72 dBA-L_{eq}(h). Previously, cemeteries were not specifically identified in Table 1 and, as a result, the applicable NAC was subject to interpretation. Now, cemeteries are specifically listed as Activity Category C with an exterior NAC of 67 dBA-L_{eq}(h).

### 3.4.3 Significance Criteria

Criteria for determining the significance of impacts related to the noise environment are based on the CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G – Environmental Checklist. Impacts from the proposed project would be considered significant under the following circumstances:

**NOI-1:** Exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies.

**NOI-2:** Exposure of persons to generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

**NOI-3:** Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.

**NOI-4:** Result in a temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.

### 3.4.4 Impacts

#### 3.4.4.1 No Project Alternative

There would be no construction under the No Project Alternative; therefore, no construction noise impacts would occur.

Under the No Project Alternative, there would be no improvements to I-10. Therefore, noise level increases or decreases as a result of the proposed project would not occur; however, freeway traffic along I-10 would continue to increase at the natural growth rate. Modeling results, shown in Table 3.4-1, indicate that predicted traffic noise levels (L_{eq}[h]) within the project study area for the year 2038 without the proposed project would increase up to 2.9 dBA. Based on this information, under the No Project Alternative, sensitive receptors along the subject I-10 corridor would not be impacted by traffic noise.\(^5\)

#### 3.4.4.2 Proposed Project Alternative

Impact NOI–1: The proposed project may expose persons to, or result in generation of, noise levels in excess of standards published in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies.

---

\(^5\) A noise increase of less than 3 dB is not considered an impact.
Construction. During the construction phases of the project, noise from construction activities may intermittently dominate the noise environment in the immediate area of construction.

Table 3.4-3 summarizes noise levels produced by construction equipment commonly used on roadway construction projects. As indicated, equipment involved in construction is expected to generate noise levels ranging from 80 to 89 dBA at a distance of 50 feet. Noise produced by construction equipment is typically reduced over distance at a rate of approximately 6 dBA per doubling of distance.

**TABLE 3.4-3. CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT NOISE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Maximum Noise Level (dBA at 50 feet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scrappers</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulldozers</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Trucks</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backhoe</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pneumatic Tools</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Pump</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: FTA, 2006.*

Construction noise is regulated by Caltrans’ Standard Specifications, Section 7-1.011, Sound Control Requirements. The specifications state that noise levels generated during construction shall comply with applicable local, state, and federal regulations and that all equipment shall be fitted with adequate mufflers according to the manufacturers’ specifications. There are many standard construction procedures that would be included in the project specifications to minimize intrusion without placing unreasonable constraints on the construction process or substantially increasing costs. The following are possible control measures that can be implemented to minimize noise and vibration disturbances at sensitive areas during construction:

1. Use newer equipment with improved noise muffling and ensure that all equipment items have the manufacturers’ recommended noise abatement measures, such as mufflers, engine covers, and engine vibration isolators, intact and operational. Newer equipment will generally be quieter in operation than older equipment. All construction equipment should be inspected at periodic intervals to ensure proper maintenance and presence of noise control devices (e.g., mufflers and shrouding).

2. Perform all construction in a manner that minimizes noise and vibration. Utilize construction methods or equipment that will provide the lowest level of noise and ground vibration impact.

3. Perform independent noise and vibration monitoring to demonstrate compliance with applicable noise limits, especially in particularly sensitive areas. Require contractors
to modify and/or reschedule their construction activities if monitoring determines that maximum limits are exceeded at residential land uses.

4. Conduct truck loading, unloading, and hauling operations so that noise and vibration are kept to a minimum by carefully selecting routes to avoid passing through residential neighborhoods to the greatest possible extent.

5. Turn off idling equipment.

6. Minimize construction activities during evening, nighttime, weekend, and holiday periods.

7. The construction contractor should be required by contract specification to comply with the City noise ordinances and obtain all necessary permits, particularly in relation to nighttime construction work.

8. When possible, limit the use of construction equipment that creates high vibration levels, such as vibratory rollers and hammers. When such equipment must be used within 25 feet of any existing building, select equipment models that generate lower vibration levels.

9. Restrict the hours of vibration-intensive equipment or activities, such as vibratory rollers, so that annoyance to residents is minimal (e.g., limit to daytime hours as defined in the noise ordinance).

With implementation of the specifications, no adverse noise impacts from temporary construction activities are anticipated.

**Operation.** The CEQA noise analysis entails looking at the setting of the noise impact and then how large or perceptible any noise increase would be in the given area. Key considerations include the uniqueness of the setting, the sensitive nature of the noise receptors, the magnitude of the noise increase, the number of residences affected, and the absolute noise level. For the purposes of CEQA analysis, a change in future noise conditions is not considered perceptible unless the increase is 5 dBA or greater.

Operation of the proposed project would result in a slight increase in noise at some adjacent uses due to the freeway widening bringing traffic noise closer to sensitive noise receptors. Additional noise would also be created by the higher speeds of vehicles traveling in the HOV lanes and an incremental increase in freeway speeds in the general purpose lanes due to the reduction in congestion. As detailed in the *Traffic NSR (Environmental Re-Evaluation), Route 10 HOV Project, in Los Angeles County from Puente Avenue in Baldwin Park to State Route 57 in Pomona*, existing noise levels range from 57 to 78 dBA and are primarily due to freeway noise. The proposed project would increase noise levels up to 3 dBA compared to existing conditions. This increase is below the above-mentioned threshold of 5 dBA.

Modeling results, as shown in Table 3.4-1, show that the difference between predicted traffic noise levels ($L_{eq}[h]$) for the Proposed Project Alternative and No Project Alternative would
be a maximum of 1 dBA in noise level; therefore, it can be concluded that under CEQA the project itself would not result in noise impacts to the surrounding area.

However, Caltrans is required to incorporate noise abatement measures into the proposed project because the predicted traffic noise levels in Year 2038 would approach or exceed the NAC of 67 dBA for Activity Category B land uses. Hence, NEPA noise impacts from freeway traffic are predicted to occur under the proposed project.

In accordance with 23 CFR 772, noise abatement is considered where traffic noise impacts are predicted in areas of frequent human use that would benefit from a lowered noise level. Potential noise abatement measures identified in the Protocol include:

- Avoiding the impact by using design alternatives, such as altering the horizontal and vertical alignment of the project;
- Constructing noise barriers;
- Acquiring property to serve as a buffer zone;
- Using traffic management measures to regulate types of vehicles and speeds; and
- Acoustically insulating public-use or nonprofit institutional structures.

All of these abatement options were considered in the Traffic NSR (Environmental Re-Evaluation), Route 10 HOV Project, in Los Angeles County from Puente Avenue in Baldwin Park to State Route 57 in Pomona; however, because of the configuration and location of the project, abatement in the form of noise barriers is the only abatement that is considered to be feasible. Soundwalls would therefore be constructed where determined to be reasonable and feasible to reduce existing traffic noise levels at frequent outdoor use areas. The general locations of these soundwalls are shown in Appendix E. The final soundwall locations, heights, and lengths would be determined during final design.

The analysis was conducted with barrier heights ranging from 8 to 16 feet. The barrier heights and locations were evaluated to determine if a minimum 5-dB attenuation at the outdoor frequent use areas of the representative receivers could be achieved. The results are summarized in Table 3.4-4. No soundwalls were recommended for Forest Lawn Memorial Park Cemetery because the analysis indicated that the exterior area of this cemetery does not have an area of frequent human use that could benefit from lowered noise levels. In addition, the predicted operational noise levels for both chapels did not approach or exceed the FHWA NAC D of 52 dB.

For all receivers at the Forest Lawn Memorial Park, however, noise barriers of various heights were evaluated to determine the approximate area that would benefit (achieve a 5-dB noise reduction). Based on the modeling results, less than one percent of the cemetery’s usable area would benefit from a 16-ft-high noise barrier. The amount of area that would benefit would be small because the cemetery is primarily situated on steep slopes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soundwall Number</th>
<th>Location of Soundwall</th>
<th>Number of Benefited Receptors*</th>
<th>Height Range of Soundwalls/Total Length (ft)</th>
<th>Additional Soundwall Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| SW 1758          | From Puente Avenue to Garvey Avenue off-ramp (south side of I-10) | 4                             | 8-16 / 685                                   | Location: Stations 1758+17 to 1765+02. Minimum Barrier Height to Achieve 5 dBA Reduction:  
  - Height: 8 ft  
  - Receptors abated : 4 |
| SW 1770          | From Garvey Avenue on-ramp to Sunkist Avenue (south side of I-10) | 6-26                          | 8-16 / 3,664                                 | Location: Stations 1769+36 to 1806+00. Minimum Barrier Height to Achieve 5 dBA Reduction:  
  - Height: 8 ft  
  - Receptors abated : 6 |
| SW 1775          | Along Garvey Avenue to Sunkist Avenue (north side of I-10) | 11-23                         | 12-16 / 2,327                               | Location: Stations 1774+93 to 1798+20. Minimum Barrier Height to Achieve 5 dBA Reduction:  
  - Height: 12 ft  
  - Receptors abated : 11 |
| SW 1805          | From Sunkist Avenue to Pacific Avenue (north side of I-10) | 16-20                         | 8-16 / 1,021                                | Location: Stations 1804+23 to 1814+44. Minimum Barrier Height to Achieve 5 dBA Reduction:  
  - Height: 8 ft  
  - Receptors abated : 16 |
| SW 1831          | North Roberto Avenue to Sunset Avenue (north side of I-10) | 8-16                          | 8-16 / 834                                  | Location: Stations 1831+60 to 1839+94. Minimum Barrier Height to Achieve 5 dBA Reduction:  
  - Height: 8 ft  
  - Receptors abated : 8 |
| SW 1847          | Sunset Avenue to Vincent Avenue (north side of I-10) | 25-33                         | 8-16 / 2,262                                | Location: Stations 1845+78 to 1868+40. Minimum Barrier Height to Achieve 5 dBA Reduction:  
  - Height: 8 ft  
  - Receptors abated : 25 |
| SW 1871          | Vincent Avenue to Lark Ellen Avenue (north side of I-10) | 18-45                         | 10-16 / 3,392                               | Location: Stations 1870+67 to 1904+59. Minimum Barrier Height to Achieve 5 dBA Reduction:  
  - Height: 10 ft  
  - Receptors abated : 18 |
| SW 1888          | Glendora Avenue at Garvey Avenue to Azusa Avenue off-ramp (south side of I-10) | 11-36                        | 10-16 / 3,477                               | Location: Stations 1887+80 to 1922+57. Minimum Barrier Height to Achieve 5 dBA Reduction:  
  - Height: 10 ft  
  - Receptors abated : 11 |
### TABLE 3.4-4. SUMMARY OF SOUNDWALL EVALUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soundwall Number</th>
<th>Location of Soundwall</th>
<th>Number of Benefited Receptors*</th>
<th>Height Range of Soundwalls/Total Length (ft)</th>
<th>Additional Soundwall Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| SW 1899          | Lark Ellen Avenue to Azusa Avenue (north side of I-10)                                | 26-34                          | 12-16 / 2,690                               | Location: Stations 1899+00 to 1925+90. Minimum Barrier Height to Achieve 5 dBA Reduction:  
- Height: 12 ft  
- Receptors abated: 26                                                                 |
| SW 1935          | Azusa Avenue off-ramp to Hollenbeck Street (north side of I-10)                       | 19-42                          | 14-16 / 1,804                               | Location: Stations 1934+36 to 1952+40. Minimum Barrier Height to Achieve 5 dBA Reduction:  
- Height: 12 ft  
- Receptors abated: 19                                                                 |
| SW 1946          | Baymar Avenue to Fircroft Street (south side of I-10)                                  | 3-38                           | 8-16 / 1,795                                | Location: Stations 1945+05 to 1963+00. Minimum Barrier Height to Achieve 5 dBA Reduction:  
- Height: 8 ft  
- Receptors abated: 3                                                                 |
| SW 1959          | Along Garvey Avenue from Hollenbeck Street to Meadow Road (north side of I-10)       | 12-14                          | 12-16 / 434                                 | Location: Stations 1958+66 to 1979+90. Minimum Barrier Height to Achieve 5 dBA Reduction:  
- Height: 12 ft  
- Receptors abated: 12                                                                 |
| SW 1963          | Fircroft Street to Citrus Street (south side of I-10)                                 | 3-38                           | 8-16 / 1,640                                | Location: Stations 1963+00 to 1979+40. Minimum Barrier Height to Achieve 5 dBA Reduction:  
- Height: 8 ft  
- Receptors abated: 3                                                                 |
| SW 1964          | Along Garvey Avenue at Meadow Road to Citrus Street (north side of I-10)             | 12-14                          | 12-16 / 1,120                               | Location: Stations 1963+00 to 1974+20. Minimum Barrier Height to Achieve 5 dBA Reduction:  
- Height: 12 ft  
- Receptors abated: 12                                                                 |
| SW 2018          | In front of hotel along Garvey Avenue west of Grand Avenue (north side of I-10)      | 3-5                            | 8-16 / 1,147                                | Location: Stations 2018+38 to 2029+85. Minimum Barrier Height to Achieve 5 dBA Reduction:  
- Height: 8 ft  
- Receptors abated: 3                                                                 |
| SW 2037          | Grand Avenue along Temple Way (south side of I-10)                                   | 12-25                          | 8-16 / 501                                  | Location: Stations 2044+79 to 2049+80. Minimum Barrier Height to Achieve 5 dBA Reduction:  
- Height: 8 ft  
- Receptors abated: 12                                                                 |
### TABLE 3.4-4. SUMMARY OF SOUNDWALL EVALUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soundwall Number</th>
<th>Location of Soundwall</th>
<th>Number of Benefited Receptors*</th>
<th>Height Range of Soundwalls/Total Length (ft)</th>
<th>Additional Soundwall Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| SW 2049          | Along I-10 and Temple Way (south side of I-10)                                        | 12-25                    | 8-16 / 488                              | Location: Stations 2049+80 to 2054+68. Minimum Barrier Height to Achieve 5 dBA Reduction:  
  - Height: 8 ft  
  - Receptors abated: 12 |
| SW 2052          | From Forest Hills Drive along Garvey Avenue (north side of I-10)                      | 14-23                    | 8-16 / 546                              | Location: Stations 2051+16 to 2056+62. Minimum Barrier Height to Achieve 5 dBA Reduction:  
  - Height: 8 ft  
  - Receptors abated: 14 |
| SW 2055          | Adjacent to Holt Avenue on-ramp (south side of I-10)                                  | 6-16                     | 10-16 / 207                             | Location: Stations 2058+47 to 2060+54. Minimum Barrier Height to Achieve 5 dBA Reduction:  
  - Height: 10 ft  
  - Receptors abated: 6 |
| SW 2056          | Adjacent to I-10 along Holt Avenue on-ramp (north side of I-10)                      | 14-23                    | 8-16 / 219                              | Location: Stations 2056+00 to 2058+19. Minimum Barrier Height to Achieve 5 dBA Reduction:  
  - Height: 8 ft  
  - Receptors abated: 14 |
| SW 2059          | Along Holt Avenue on-ramp (south side of I-10)                                        | 6-16                     | 10-16 / 170                             | Location: Stations 2063+30 to 2065+00. Minimum Barrier Height to Achieve 5 dBA Reduction:  
  - Height: 10 ft  
  - Receptors abated: 6 |
| SW 2060          | Along Holt Avenue on-ramp (north side of I-10)                                       | 14-23                    | 8-16 / 132                              | Location: Stations 2060+64 to 2061+96. Minimum Barrier Height to Achieve 5 dBA Reduction:  
  - Height: 8 ft  
  - Receptors abated: 14 |
| SW 2063          | East of Holt Avenue along Garvey Avenue to east of Horseshoe Circle (south side of I-10) | 6-16                     | 10-16 / 2,195                          | Location: Stations 2064+95 to 2086+90. Minimum Barrier Height to Achieve 5 dBA Reduction:  
  - Height: 10 ft  
  - Receptors abated: 6 |
| SW 2074          | Holt Avenue off-ramp to Via Verde Street (north side of I-10)                         | 2-3                      | 10-16 / 2,475                          | Location: Stations 2074+25 to 2099+00. Minimum Barrier Height to Achieve 5 dBA Reduction:  
  - Height: 10 ft  
  - Receptors abated: 2 |
| SW 2118          | East of Roycove Drive along Via Verde Street (north side of I-10)                    | 6-8                      | 12-16 / 1,055                          | Location: Stations 2117+50 to 2128+05. Minimum Barrier Height to Achieve 5 dBA Reduction:  
  - Height: 12 ft  
  - Receptors abated: 6 |
### TABLE 3.4-4. SUMMARY OF SOUNDWALL EVALUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soundwall Number</th>
<th>Location of Soundwall</th>
<th>Number of Benefited Receptors*</th>
<th>Height Range of Soundwalls/Total Length (ft)</th>
<th>Additional Soundwall Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| SW 2128          | Immediately adjacent to I-10 west of The Mall (north side of I-10) | 6-8                            | 12-16 / 628                                | Location: Stations 2128+05 to 2134+33. Minimum Barrier Height to Achieve 5 dBA Reduction:  
|                  |                       |                                |                                             |  
|                  |                       |                                |                                             |  
|                  |                       |                                |                                             | Height: 12 ft  
|                  |                       |                                |                                             | Receptors abated: 6 |
| SW 2134          | Immediately adjacent to I-10 west of The Mall (north side of I-10) | 6-8                            | 12-16 / 288                                | Location: Stations 2133+00 to 2135+88. Minimum Barrier Height to Achieve 5 dBA Reduction:  
|                  |                       |                                |                                             |  
|                  |                       |                                |                                             |  
|                  |                       |                                |                                             | Height: 12 ft  
|                  |                       |                                |                                             | Receptors abated: 6 |
| SW 2140          | East of The Mall immediately adjacent to I-10 (north side of I-10) | 6-8                            | 12-16 / 551                                | Location: Stations 2137+49 to 2143+00. Minimum Barrier Height to Achieve 5 dBA Reduction:  
|                  |                       |                                |                                             |  
|                  |                       |                                |                                             |  
|                  |                       |                                |                                             | Height: 12 ft  
|                  |                       |                                |                                             | Receptors abated: 6 |
| SW 2142          | Along Via Verde Street east of The Mall immediately adjacent to I-10 (north side of I-10) | 3-11                          | 10-16 / 265                                | Location: Stations 2143+00 to 2145+65. Minimum Barrier Height to Achieve 5 dBA Reduction:  
|                  |                       |                                |                                             |  
|                  |                       |                                |                                             |  
|                  |                       |                                |                                             | Height: 10 ft  
|                  |                       |                                |                                             | Receptors abated: 3 |
| SW 2148          | Along Via Verde Street to Via Romales immediately adjacent to I-10 (north side of I-10) | 3-11                          | 10-16 / 1,697                              | Location: Stations 2148+40 to 2165+37 Minimum Barrier Height to Achieve 5 dBA Reduction:  
|                  |                       |                                |                                             |  
|                  |                       |                                |                                             |  
|                  |                       |                                |                                             | Height: 10 ft  
|                  |                       |                                |                                             | Receptors abated: 3 |

*The number of benefited receptors is based on the 2009 Noise Study Report and does not represent changes to soundwalls since that report. Therefore, these may have changed slightly due to changes to soundwalls.

During the design phase, changes to recommended noise abatement may occur. These changes may be required due to constructability, safety, or cost issues. However, these changes do not necessarily require a re-evaluation of the noise abatement. A re-evaluation of noise abatement is required when the scope of the project changes, such as vertical and horizontal alignment change, addition or deletion of lanes, or addition or removal of shielding.

**Impact NOI–2: The proposed project is not expected to expose persons to generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.**

Construction activity can result in varying degrees of ground vibration, depending on the equipment and methods used. The operation of construction equipment causes vibrations that spread through the ground and diminish in strength with traveled distance. Buildings in the vicinity of construction sites can be affected by these vibrations, with resulting damage in the most severe cases. Vibratory rollers and impact pile driving would be the most dominant sources of overall construction vibration for the proposed project. The vibration levels created by the normal movement of vehicles, including graders, front loaders, and backhoes, are comparable in order-of-magnitude to groundborne vibrations created by heavy vehicles traveling on streets and highways.

Building damage can be cosmetic or structural. Normal buildings that are not particularly fragile would not experience any cosmetic damage (e.g., plaster cracks) at distances beyond 25 feet based on typical construction equipment vibration levels. This distance can vary substantially depending on the soil composition between vibration source and receiver. There are many standard construction procedures that would be included in project specifications to minimize intrusion without placing unreasonable constraints on the construction process or substantially increasing costs.

Regarding facility operation, significant vibration impact from rubber-tire-fitted vehicles is extremely rare. Rubber-tire-fitted vehicles are typically well isolated by the vehicle suspension design, and tires also act as a highly effective barrier to vibration transmission from the vibration-generating carriage and the main propagation medium for vibration excitation (i.e., the ground); therefore, potential vibration impacts from traffic on the freeway can be reasonably dismissed. It is possible that there could be slight vibration issues at residences close to the traveled way if there are cracks, uneven slabs, and/or damaged expansion joints. Given the above considerations, the proposed project would not result in substantial levels of vibration.
Impact NOI–3: The proposed project is not expected to result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.

The proposed project with soundwall abatement is not expected to result in a substantial permanent ambient noise increase above levels existing without the project at frequent outdoor use areas. For more details, see response to Impact NOI-1, Operations.

Impact NOI–4: The proposed project may result in a temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.

Equipment involved in construction is expected to generate noise levels ranging from 80 to 89 dB at a distance of 50 feet. Noise produced by construction equipment would be reduced at a rate of approximately 6 dB per doubling of distance from the source. Measures would be applied during construction to reduce short-term noise disturbances at sensitive receptors. These include, but are not limited to, using equipment with noise mufflers in good condition; applying construction methods and using equipment that would provide the lowest level of noise impact; turning off idling equipment; and using temporary noise barriers, as needed. For more details, see response to Impact NOI-1, Construction.

3.4.5 Mitigation Measures

3.4.5.1 No Project Alternative

The No Project Alternative would not result in any impacts under CEQA; therefore, no mitigation is required.

3.4.5.2 Proposed Project Alternative

With the proposed soundwalls to abate future traffic noise described in this section of the FEIR, no further avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures would be required.

The following minimization measures were identified in the MMRP (2003):

- Soundwalls will be implemented as a part of this project to reduce existing traffic noise levels in excess of the Noise Abatement Criteria. Final locations, heights and lengths of these soundwalls would be determined in final design.

- Caltrans will require construction contractors to maintain and tune equipment engines consistent with the manufacturers’ requirements to maximize the efficiency of the equipment and to minimize air and noise emissions, including the use of noise mufflers and/or other noise abatement features.

- Construction of soundwalls will be incorporated as early as possible in the phasing of the project, consistent with Caltrans’ construction procedures and as reasonable and feasible.
• Caltrans will require construction contractors to comply with applicable Los Angeles County and local jurisdiction noise control regulations and ordinances.

• Caltrans will require construction contractors to use construction techniques that reduce or minimize construction noise including, but not limited to:
  
  o Grouping construction activities that will occur outside normal construction hours to avoid continuing periods of noise disturbances during the evening and night hours.
  
  o Scheduling work, as feasible, at times that would cause the least amount of impact to the surrounding land uses.
  
  o Scheduling, as feasible, the noisiest activities as close together as possible.
  
  o Use of the quietest type of equipment available, which will perform identically to equipment types which generate more noise.
  
  o Use of haul trucks that do not rely on air or jake brakes.
  
  o Locating stockpiles and vehicle staging areas away from occupied residences and other sensitive receptors whenever possible.
  
  o Use of approved haul routes, which minimize the exposure of sensitive receptors to potential noise impacts associated with hauling operations.

3.4.6 Level of Significance after Mitigation

No mitigation is required.
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3.5 Biological Resources

Implementation of the proposed project would change existing conditions adjacent to I-10. This section presents those existing conditions and the evaluation of likely consequences to biological resources attributable to construction of HOV lanes between Puente Avenue and the SR 57/SR 71 interchange. Possible biological effects are compared with changes likely to result from the No Project Alternative. Information presented is drawn from the *Natural Environment Study (NES) (Minimal Impacts)* conducted for this project in July 2011. Previous studies completed for this resource area include the *Natural Environmental Study Report (NESR) Reevaluation* (September 2000), the *Natural Environment Study Report Provide High Occupancy Vehicle Lanes on Interstate 10 Between Puente and Citrus Avenues in Los Angeles County 07-LA-10-33.4/37.5* (January 1995), and the *I-10 High Occupancy Vehicle Lanes Project 07H003 Segment 3 Biological Resources Technical Report* (January 1995).

Three surveys were conducted by a senior terrestrial ecologist with more than 17 years of experience in qualitative and quantitative characterization of southern California biomes and communities. Existing conditions were determined by walking parts of the project area on May 18 and June 7, 2011, and by windshield surveys with stops at appropriate vantage points on June 7 and June 29, 2011. The I-10 biological study area (BSA) extends 105 feet to either side from the midline of the existing freeway. At locations where loop ramps convey traffic on or off the freeway, the BSA was enlarged to overlap the interiors and outside margins of those loops because these are places where various plant species of potential interests occur. Toward the eastern end of the proposed project, the study area was asymmetrically wider to the south side to account for proposed cut and fill slopes into existing embankments to be supported by retaining walls. Parts of the freeway and loop ramps were examined from safe vantage points with binoculars (10x).

The California Native Plant Society’s (CNPS) Inventory of Rare and Endangered Vascular Plants of California and the California Department of Fish and Game’s (CDFG) California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) were reviewed prior to the field survey to identify special-status plants, wildlife, and habitats known to occur in the vicinity of the survey area.

The biological survey was conducted to assess the biological conditions of the site, inventory the wildlife habitat and vegetation types, and evaluate the site’s potential to support special-status plant and wildlife species within the survey area. Plant species were identified in the field. Taxonomy follows Hickman (1993) and Munz (1974) and current scientific data (e.g., scientific journals) for scientific and common names. The *Sunset Western Garden Book* (Brenzel, 2001) was used for ornamental species that were not included in the references listed above.
3.5.1 Existing Conditions

3.5.1.1 Urban Development

I-10 carries a tremendous volume of vehicular traffic through very densely inhabited parts of greater Los Angeles. Interchanges that join it with local major surface roads (e.g., Pacific Avenue/West Covina Parkway, Azusa Avenue, Grand Avenue) expedite commuter access to I-10 from the residential suburbs along its route. From approximately Grand Avenue westward to Puente Avenue, all of the study area can be characterized as thoroughly developed urban environs. Land use combines residential with commercial and transportation needs entirely; no biotic communities native to the general region remain anywhere in the western part of the study area. The land slopes very gradually downhill westward toward the San Gabriel River.

East of Grand Avenue, I-10 ascends a shoulder on the northern side of the San Jose Hills, locally known as Kellogg Hill. Residential development is comparatively less dense around Kellogg Hill, in part because residential neighborhoods feature larger lots. The Forest Lawn Memorial Park occupies much acreage immediately south of I-10 near the top of Kellogg Hill. Cal Poly Pomona occupies virtually all lands south of I-10 on the east side of Kellogg Hill. Stormwater runoff from the Cal Poly Pomona side of Kellogg Hill flows southerly to San Jose Creek, then westward to the San Gabriel River.

3.5.1.2 Open Space

Kellogg Hill rises east of Grand Avenue, and the terrain makes the climb towards its top more sinuous through steeper hillsides. I-10 adjoins open space set aside as conservation for biological species known to inhabit that varied terrain, small draws, and a few small creek beds found in the San Jose Hills. Despite large-lot residential neighborhoods and the Forest Lawn Memorial Park, open space has been retained along the edge of I-10 on both the western and eastern side of Kellogg Hill. Dedicated open space extends from Caltrans’ ROW around to the south-facing slopes of the San Jose Hills on the southern side of I-10. An intermittent seasonal creek descends toward I-10 as part of this open space. Additional open space flanks the north side of I-10 and extends easterly to the SR 57 ROW.

3.5.1.3 Landscape Vegetation

To the west of Grand Avenue, and with the exception of the ramp-loop on the northwest corner at Grand Avenue, all plants in other loops and along I-10 are not native. The exception at Grand Avenue amounted to finding a toyon (Heteromeles arbutifolia) growing within the loop. Planted for their horticultural properties, they include most frequently gum trees of two or three different species (Eucalyptus spp.), jacaranda (Jacaranda mimosifolia), oleander (Nerium oleander), Brazilian and ‘California’ pepper trees (Schinus terrebinthifolia, S. molle, respectively), tulip tree (Liriodendron tulipifera), sweetgum (Liquidambar styraciflua), Canary Island and probably Aleppo pines (Pinus canariensis and P. halepensis), Chinese elm, arborescent wattles (Acacia sp.), crepe myrtle (Lagerstromia sp.), and occasional Shamel ash
(Fraxinus uhdei), and Mexican palo verde (Parkinsonia aculeata). Iceplant (Carprobotus edulis) and ivy (Hedera algeriensis) are very common and abundantly planted groundcovers.

### 3.5.1.4 Native Vegetation

Many native species grow on the embankment along the south side of I-10 and east of Grand Avenue, some (*) are quite abundant: California walnut* (*Jugans californica*), toyon, holly-leafed cherry (*Prunus ilicifolia*), coyote brush (*Baccharis pilularis*), mulefat (*B. salisifolia*), golden bush* (*Ericameria cf. pinifolia*), poison oak* (*Toxicodendron diversilobum*), flat-topped buckwheat* (*Eriogonum fasciculatum*), white sage (*Salvia apianna*), California sagebrush* (*Artemisia californica*), lupine (*Lupinus sp.*), groundsel (*Senecio sp.*), pearly everlasting (*Gnaphalium sp.*), live for ever (*Dudleya lanceolata*), telegraph weed* (*Heterotheca grandiflora*), California cudweed aster* (*Lessingia filaginifolia*), elderberry (*Sambucus mexicanus*), deer weed (*Lotus scoparius*), laurel sumac (*Malosma laurina*), and jimpson weed (*Datura wrightii*). Farther east, nearly to the SR 57/SR 71 interchange, four coast live oaks (*Quercus agrifolia*) grow on the south side of I-10.

Most of these native species grow on a small sliver of embankment at the very top of Kellogg Hill. While there are natives on the sloped embankment, comparatively dense growth occurs at the top of the embankment, approximately 75 feet south of the existing edge of I-10 and 35 feet higher than the pavement. Concrete drainage ditches interconnect and essentially bound this isolated sliver of native community. Manicured grounds of Forest Lawn Memorial Park form a complete biologically effective barrier between this sliver within Caltrans ROW and like plant assemblages on the south side of the San Jose Hills.

### 3.5.1.5 Biological Species of Concern

Ten species of special conservation status have been recorded within 0.5-mile of the I-10 corridor. These species are listed in Table 3.5-1.

Three of the 10 species appear in CNDDB occurrence records because each has become less abundant or displaced by urban development from its recent historic range. None of these three — coastal whiptail lizard, merlin, and rufous-crowned sparrow — has been elevated to formal special status. Five of the 10 species are known to occur only on the south side of the San Jose Hills. Many-stemmed dudleya is known to grow only northeast of the BSA in suitable native soils in Bonelli County Park. The remaining three species have vague collection locales somewhere in Covina. The engineered embankments along I-10 do not afford suitable habitat for any of these species.
### TABLE 3.5-1. ALL CNDDB OCCURRENCES WITHIN 0.5-MILE OF I-10 BETWEEN PUENTE AVENUE AND SR 57

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taxon</th>
<th>Status*</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American badger (<em>Taxidae taxus</em>)</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Unspecified location in Covina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plummer’s mariposa lily (<em>Calochortus plumerae</em>)</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td>Previously observed only on southern side of San Jose Hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coastal California gnatcatcher (<em>Polioptila californica californica</em>)</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td>Previously observed only on southern side of San Jose Hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coastal whiptail (<em>Aspidoscelis tigris stejnegeri</em>)</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Previously observed only on southern side of San Jose Hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intermediate mariposa lily (<em>Calochortus weedeii intermedius</em>)</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td>Previously observed only on southern side of San Jose Hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>many-stemmed dudleya (<em>Dudleya multicaulis</em>)</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td>Previously observed only near Puddingstone Reservoir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>merlin (<em>Falco columbarius</em>)</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Seen only over agricultural fields on Cal Poly Pomona campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pocketed free-tailed bat (<em>Nyctinomops femosaccus</em>)</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Known from single specimen, collected 1982 in Covina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rufous-crowned sparrow (<em>Aimophila ruficeps canescens</em>)</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Previously observed only on southern side of San Jose Hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>western mastiff bat (<em>Eumops perotis californicus</em>)</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Last collections from 1957 and 1958, unspecified locale other than Covina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California black walnut woodland</td>
<td>S2.1</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Threatened — listed per authority of federal Endangered Species Act; SC — California Department of Fish and Game species of special concern; 1B.2 — eligible for formal listing per authority of California Endangered Species Act and deemed rare, threatened, or endangered by California Native Plant Society; none — declining populations but not yet sufficiently to warrant inclusion on lists. Natural communities declining in size and ecological complexity have State ranking between S1 (worst prospects) and S3 (less bleak prospects).

### 3.5.1.6 Threatened and Endangered Species

Coastal California gnatcatchers were present in suitable habitat on the south side of the San Jose Hills during surveys completed between 2001 and 2003. As shown in Figure 3.5-1, most of the land designated as gnatcatcher critical habitat occurs on the south-facing slopes of the San Jose Hills. The open space on the west side of Kellogg Hill, the conservation preserve through which the small creek runs, lacks the proper assemblage of plant species; therefore, it was not included as critical habitat. Thus, Caltrans’ ROW does not extend to designated critical habitat on the west side of Kellogg Hill. Where the ROW abuts Cal Poly Pomona lands, on the east side of Kellogg Hill, designated critical habitat for gnatcatchers was drawn to extend to within 125 feet of the south edge of I-10. Where the proposed project and designated critical habitat are in close proximity, an unusually dense growth of laurel sumac forms a wide swath between the edge of I-10 and Cal Poly Pomona. This northern side of Cal Poly Pomona has large stands of nonnative pines among other plants never found in chaparral, with a weedy band between the pines and the laurel sumac thicket.
Figure 3.5-1
Known Location of Coastal California Gnatcatchers, Designated Critical Habitat, and a Significant Ecological Area in the Vicinity of Kellogg Hill
Figure 3.5-2
Unnamed Seasonal Stream Course and NWI Wetland
3.5.1.7 **Wetlands and a Stream Course**

An unnamed, seasonal stream shown in Figure 3.5-2 flows northwesterly from the western side of the San Jose Hills and approaches the south side of I-10 approximately 0.9-mile west of Via Verde Street, on the western side of Kellogg Hill. United States Geological Survey (USGS) maps the stream course as dotted blue-line. The creek bed carried water on May 18, 2011, probably because light rain fell the previous evening. The stream enters a 60-inch culvert at the south edge of I-10, and thereafter its course is undeterminable from above ground. It runs eventually to the San Gabriel River, most likely by confluence with Walnut Creek, which is a rectangular box-channel conveyance that crosses under I-10 between Grand and Barranca avenues. A cluster of California black walnut trees grows on the sloping shoulder of the roadbed around a structural depression built to accommodate concrete headwalls of this culvert. Caltrans ROW is less than 60 feet from the headwalls.

Upstream and beyond the Caltrans ROW fence, this stream course has all of the essential elements of a very narrow riparian corridor. Two tree species grow between I-10 and the ROW fence: California black walnut and Chinese elm (*Ulmus pavifolia*). Upstream from the ROW fence, other noteworthy trees and shrubs include western sycamores (*Platanus racemosa*), coast live oak (*Quercus agrifolia*), arroyo willow (*Salix lasiolepis*), and mulefat (*Baccharis salisifolia*). The stream course is mapped as wetlands in the National Wetlands Inventory. The map classifies the final length of the stream course, which is approximately 1,425 feet, as palustrine forested wetlands (Cowardin classification PFOA).

As this intermittent creek disappears beneath I-10 via a steep culvert, and because it is intermittent, no species of fish could inhabit its temporary waters.

Local wildlife species, such as bobcats (*Lynx rufous*), coyotes (*Canis latrans*), striped skunks (*Mephitis mephitis*), and raccoons (*Procyon lotor*), could use the stream course as a sheltered corridor to move between the south side of the San Jose Hills and the open space on the west side of Kellogg Hill. No tracks of any mammal were seen in mud along the creek’s bank during the reconnaissance survey.

### 3.5.2 Regulatory Requirements

The following summarizes environmental laws governing biological resources relevant to the proposed project.

- Federal Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended;
- Federal Water Pollution Prevention and Control Act of 1972, §404;
- Federal Water Pollution Prevention and Control Act of 1972, §401;
- Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918; and
- County of Los Angeles provisions to safeguard Significant Ecological Areas (SEA).
3.5.2.1 Federal Endangered Species Act

*Purpose:* Conserve species of fish, wildlife, and plants facing extinction.

*Applicability:* Any action that is likely to jeopardize continued existence of such endangered or threatened species or result in destruction or modification of critical habitat.

*General Procedures:* This Act and subsequent amendments provide for the conservation of endangered and threatened species and the ecosystems upon which they depend. Section 7 of the Act requires federal agencies, in consultation with and with the assistance of the Secretary of the Interior or of Commerce, as appropriate, to ensure that actions they authorize, fund, or carry out are not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of threatened or endangered species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat for these species. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)-Fisheries share responsibilities for administering the Act.

Section 10 of the Act requires nonfederal agencies, such as Caltrans, to consult in like manner with USFWS when a proposed project may adversely affect a threatened or endangered species.

Coordination and consultation would occur between USFWS and Caltrans should the proposed project require measures to conserve such listed species or their designated critical habitat.

3.5.2.2 Federal Water Pollution Prevention and Control Act of 1972, §404

Section 404 of the Clean Water Act establishes a permit program administered by USACE regulating the discharge of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States, including wetlands. The Section 404(b)(1) guidelines allow the discharge of dredged or fill material into the aquatic system only if there is no practicable alternative that would have less adverse impacts.

3.5.2.3 Federal Water Pollution Prevention and Control Act of 1972, §401

Section 401 requires an applicant for a federal license or permit to conduct any activity, which may result in a discharge to waters of the U.S. to obtain certification from the State that the discharge will comply with other provisions of the act. (Most frequently required in tandem with a Section 404 permit request.)

3.5.2.4 Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918

This law implements various treaties between the United States and Canada, Mexico, former Soviet Union, and Japan protecting migratory birds by making it unlawful at any time, by any means or in any manner, to pursue, hunt, take, capture, or kill said species. The law applies to the removal of nests, such as swallow nests on bridges, occupied by migratory birds during the breeding season. USFWS enforces this act.
3.5.2.5 County of Los Angeles Significant Ecological Areas

The County of Los Angeles maintains an inventory of undeveloped lands designated as SEAs. These are tracts of land it deems to “....play a critical role in identifying the County’s biotic diversity, and providing an opportunity to connect these areas with similar areas of biological importance in adjacent counties. For example, the Puente Hills SEA identifies a regionally significant open space that connects the Puente Hills in Los Angeles County with the Chino Hills in Orange County” (Los Angeles County, 2011).

SEAs are defined as ecologically important land and water systems that support valuable habitat for plants and animals, and are often integral to the preservation of rare, threatened, or endangered species and the conservation of biological diversity in the County. An Ecological Transition Area (ETA), a subset of an SEA, identifies areas where the natural ecological features or systems have been degraded as a result of past or ongoing land use activities, but are deemed functionally integral to the SEA. Conservation of the County’s biotic diversity is the main objective of the SEA Program, and connectivity between important natural habitats plays a vital role in maintaining biotic communities. The SEAs are not preserves, but areas where facilitating a balance between new, appropriately designed development and resource conservation are important in the County.

Project effects that could permanently degrade the ecological qualities of SEAs would constitute a significant project impact. Such degradation might include, but is not limited to, mechanized clearing and grubbing, which would remove natural topographic features, actions that would alter hydrological properties of SEA lands, and installation of streets lights where none now exist.

3.5.3 Significance Criteria

Criteria for determining the significance of impacts related to biological resources are based on the CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G – Environmental Checklist. Impacts from the proposed project would be considered significant if the proposed project would:

BIO-1: Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by CDFG or USFWS.

BIO-2: Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by CDFG or USFWS.

BIO-3: Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (e.g., marsh, vernal pool, coastal) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means.
BIO-4: Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.

BIO-5: Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.

BIO-6: Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

3.5.4 Impacts

3.5.4.1 No Project Alternative

Threatened and Endangered Species (California gnatcatchers). No change from existing conditions would occur. Slopes of hillside on the far side of the San Jose Hills away from the I-10 corridor would neither improve nor diminish in ecological qualities important to coastal California gnatcatchers. No impacts would be expected.

Other Species of Concern. No change from existing conditions would occur; therefore, no impacts would be expected.

Wetlands and Waters of the United States. California black walnut trees around the culvert and on the overbank of the unnamed stream would not be removed under this alternative. No impact to wetlands, riparian habitat, or waters of the United States would occur.

Significant Ecological Areas. No change in features or qualities of the SEA would occur; therefore, there would be no impact.

Animal Movement. No change in features or qualities of the intermittent creek bed and trees along it would occur; therefore, there would be no impact.

Nesting Birds. In the same manner, the numbers of migratory bird species finding suitable nesting sites given existing conditions cannot be estimated credibly; however, some nests should be expected. Year to year variability of nesting success by all bird species can arise from a great many influences other than merely the number of trees and bushes that happen to grow in a region the size of the project area. Retention of existing urban conditions would therefore not cause any foreseeable change in the measurable success, neither an increase nor a decrease, in the average numbers of chicks that survive to leave their nests of the migratory species that attempt to nest in this region.

Dedicated Open Space. There would be no impact to dedicated open space under the No Project Alternative.
3.5.4.2 Proposed Project Alternative

Impact BIO-1: The proposed project would not injure coastal California gnatcatchers, disrupt their nesting behavior, or change for the worse habitat conditions they require.

Gnatcatcher Individuals. The proposed construction of HOV lanes along I-10 would require construction of retaining walls in the general vicinity of Kellogg Hill. These would be built within a few feet of the existing toe of the freeway embankment. Site preparation for these retaining walls would not extend more than approximately 10 feet into those embankments.

Suitable gnatcatcher habitat does not occur where expansion of I-10 requires removal of plants from the extant freeway embankment, either on the west side of Kellogg Hill or at Cal Poly Pomona. Scattered walnuts, toyon, and holly-leaved cherry compose all of the perennials on the embankment west of Forest Lawn Memorial Park. Laurel sumac grows very densely between I-10 and Cal Poly Pomona. The open-space lands close to I-10 and within the BSA lack any of the perennial shrub species (e.g., buckwheat, California sagebrush) where gnatcatchers would forage or nest. No gnatcatchers were heard calling from anywhere adjacent to the Caltrans ROW fence.

The proposed project would cause no direct adverse effect to gnatcatchers known to occur in species-specific habitat on the south side of the San Jose Hills.

Designated Critical Habitat. Although mapped in close proximity to I-10, construction on the south side of I-10 to build a concrete retaining wall would not intrude into designated critical habitat. Nor could this aspect of the proposed project change the biotic quality of gnatcatcher habitat because the assemblage of native perennial shrubs do not grow in this part of the project corridor; therefore, the proposed project would comply with this second aspect of the federal endangered species statute.

Designated critical habitat for gnatcatchers does not extend to the ROW boundary Caltrans administers; therefore, the proposed project would have no effect of designated critical habitat.

Impacts would be considered less than significant as a result of the proposed project.

Impact BIO-2: The proposed project would not adversely cause death, injury, or removal by ground disturbance to individuals of the other nine species of concern.

The extant embankments on Kellogg Hill do not afford suitable conditions for any of the other plant or animal species. The proposed construction of HOV lanes along I-10 would cause no direct adverse effect to any of the 10 species known to occur in species-specific habitat on the south side of the San Jose Hills, which are within 0.5-mile of the freeway alignment. No impact is anticipated as a result of the proposed project.
Impact BIO-3: The proposed project would not decrease the size of lands mapped as wetlands.

Although there would be some tree removal work as described below, construction activity along the south side of I-10 would not affect the unnamed stream course itself on the west side of Kellogg Hill. The existing creek channel would remain undisturbed and would carry seasonal runoff between Caltrans’ fence and the opening to the culvert; therefore, the proposed project would not affect wetlands, streambed, or stream bank. The project would not result in any substantive effect upon this areas riparian character.

No impact to wetlands, riparian habitat, or waters of the United States would be expected with implementation of the proposed project.

Impact BIO-4: The proposed project could result in the failure of nests or death of unfledged chicks of migratory bird species.

Some horticultural landscape trees may be removed during reshaping of the ramp loop at Vincent Avenue. Elsewhere to the west of Citrus Street, construction of soundwalls could require removal of up to seven landscape trees. None are regionally important in any biological context. East of Grand Avenue, three to five walnut trees and two Chinese elms that surround the end of the stream course would be removed. Installation of retaining walls may require removal of approximately 10 individual trees: three toyon and seven walnuts.

Various bird species that nest in southern California and migrate south during fall in the northern hemisphere would possibly find suitable nesting places within tree canopies at many places along the freeway corridor. No credible estimate of their numbers can be presented. The proposed project could cause nest failures from the removal of trees at a few locations.

Impacts would be considered less than significant as a result of the proposed project.

Impact BIO-5: The proposed project would not degrade biological conditions that distinguish the County SEA.

Although the SEA wraps around the San Jose Hills on their south face and approaches the Caltrans ROW on the Cal Poly Pomona campus, it does not actually reach the proposed limits of construction of retaining walls.

No change in features or qualities of the SEA would occur from the proposed project; therefore, there would be no impact.

Impact BIO-6: The proposed project would not disrupt movement of wildlife between natural communities.

No signs of mammals using the small creek’s bed or banks as a dispersal corridor were evident. In view of the abrupt termination of the intermittent stream course as a natural
The riparian corridor where it enters the culvert at the edge of the freeway, the riparian band does not lead anywhere as a migratory destination.

Removal of walnut trees and Chinese elms from around the overbank of the culvert would not appreciably change the qualities that make the rest of the creek channel upstream from the ROW fence suitable, or not, for local movement within the dedicated open space.

No change in features or qualities of corridors that animals rely on for localized movement on the southern side of I-10 would occur from the proposed project; therefore, there would be no project impact.

**Impact BIO-7: The proposed project would not alter the ecological character of the open space on the west side of Kellogg Hill.**

The proposed project would require removal of three to five walnut trees and two Chinese elms that surround the end of the stream course. They are, in effect, too close to the edge of the freeway to be avoided. East of the culvert also the south side of I-10, installation of retaining walls may require removal of up to 10 individual trees: 3 toyon, and 7 walnuts. This tally is provisional pending more detailed project design.

Necessary removal of less than one-acre total of California black walnut woodland would occur at discontiguous assorted places in the eastern portion of the project; a change of minor and negligible consequence in local abundance of walnuts and habitat they afford. Removal of as many as seven horticultural trees from assorted places in ramp loops would similarly be of negligible consequence in view of similar conditions throughout the general region of the proposed project.

Because these trees are isolated, they do not provide any meaningful ecologically functional woodlands qualities. Hence, removal of approximately 15 native trees, mostly isolated from each other, would not substantially diminish the biological worth of the site. Absence of measurable ecological impact notwithstanding, Caltrans intends to offset any unavoidable loss of native trees not originally planted as landscaping.

Caltrans ROW does not reach as far south as the dedicated open space. Cut and fill to make retaining walls along this region of I-10 would not extend more than a few feet into the extant freeway embankment. Dedicated open space and I-10 embankments do not overlap anywhere in the project area. There would be no impact associated with the proposed project.

**3.5.5 Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation measures are required; however, the following minimization measures are proposed:

- Removal of all trees should occur between September 15 and January 15 to avoid the breeding season. If tree removal must occur during the breeding season, then a
qualified biologist shall be required to survey all trees for presence of active nests scheduled for removal. Discovery of nests with eggs or unfledged young birds will necessitate establishing an off-limits buffer around particular trees. The size of that buffer shall be determined in consultation with CDFG biologists. Disturbance potentially caused by various tools and equipment shall be considered in light of the nesting requirements of birds found in the zone of construction.

- Trees of both toyon and black walnut species will be planted from suitable nursery stock, three replacements for each natural tree removed. The stream course itself does not afford enough ground inside the ROW fence to accommodate more than two or three trees, thus the remainder would need to go into locations on Kellogg Hill where wider ROW exists.

The following minimization measures were identified in the MMRP (2003):

- Walnut and oak trees native to southern California that are removed or damaged during project construction will be replaced at a minimum ratio of 5:1. The actual planting ratios will depend on the tree species and their connectivity to native habitats, in compliance with regional and local walnut and oak tree regulations. Planting sites for walnut and oak trees will be within Caltrans' right-of-way to the maximum extent feasible and in adjacent open space areas if sites within Caltrans' right-of-way are not sufficient.

- Prior to the start of construction, the gnatcatcher habitat shall be delineated by the Caltrans Biologist. The delineated area shall be designated as an Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA). Temporary fencing shall be placed by the contractor at the direction of the Caltrans Biologist to surround the ESA during construction to prevent any debris, equipment or people from entering the ESA. Construction crews shall be educated and instructed to avoid entering into, or in any way disturbing, the ESA. Intrusion into the ESA shall not be allowed for any purposes (except for those identified by emergency services personnel). The ESA fencing will be maintained during construction by the contractor, from outside the ESA. The ESA will be designated as a sensitive noise receptor, and as such, all measures outlined in the Noise Section of this Final Environmental Document will apply to the ESA.

- Future maintenance activities, such as mowing and chemical weed control, have the potential to impact the already degraded RSS habitat. After project construction is complete, efforts will be instituted to study (in conjunction with appropriate parties) the establishment of another, permanent ESA. This post-construction ESA will serve to establish any areas of degraded habitat in the project area for further disruption, as allowed by law and Caltrans policy.
• Just prior to the start of construction in a particular area, including any clearing of vegetation, vector control shall be performed to prevent the invasion of homes and businesses by displaced pests.

• Phase site preparation, grading and construction so that these activities adjacent to the degraded California walnut woodland area are conducted outside the March 1 to September 1 bird nesting season.

• Conduct a survey prior to any site disturbance in the degraded California walnut woodland area if site preparation, grading and/or construction activities must occur in the bird nesting season adjacent to this area. If any nests are within 305 meters (1,000 feet) of the construction limits, temporary measures, such as the use of specialized mufflers on construction equipment, will be used to reduce noise. A biological monitor will be employed to provide suggestions in the field to reduce intrusions into sensitive areas.

3.5.6 Level of Significance after Mitigation

No mitigation measures are required for the proposed project.
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3.6 Cultural and Paleontological Resources

Cultural resources in the I-10 HOV Lane Project study area were identified based on literature reviews, records searches, and field surveys conducted by qualified architectural historians and archaeologists as described in detail in the *Historic Property Survey Report* (HPSR) (Caltrans, 2010a); *Negative Archaeological Survey Report* (ASR) (Caltrans, 2000a); and *Negative ASR* (Caltrans, 2002a).

3.6.1 Existing Conditions

The proposed project study area lies either within the paved traveled way or within the built environment. The study area, as defined in the 2010 HPSR, includes all areas affected by the current project plans. ROW acquisitions are included within the study area, as well as one property beyond the proposed acquisition. The additional property is evaluated to account for indirect effects such as noise, visual impacts, or vibration. All properties that would have TCEs are also included within the study area (Caltrans, 2010a).

The prehistoric environment would have been characterized by coastal sage scrub vegetation, with California sagebrush, walnut woodland, and riparian habitats. The project area ranges from 300 to 900 feet in elevation and is drained by the San Gabriel River, Big Dalton Wash, Walnut Creek, and Charter Oak Creek (Caltrans, 2010a).

3.6.1.1 Ethnography

**Prehistoric.** The project is located in the ethnographic and historic territory traditionally inhabited by the Gabrielino Indians, who subsisted on hunting and gathering, and lived in small, dispersed villages. The Gabrielino culture changed following the arrival of the Spanish missionaries to the San Fernando and San Gabriel missions in the 1770s. The Gabrielinos occupied a large area of southern California, including coastline from Topanga Canyon to Aliso Creek, the Southern Channel Islands, out to the San Bernardino Mountains, and most of the San Fernando Valley. They had a complex social, economic, and political structure, and they are known for their steatite, or soapstone industry, originating on Santa Catalina Island. At the time of historic contact, there were probably 50 to 100 mainland villages, each with a population of 50 to 100 inhabitants (Caltrans, 2000a).

**Historic.** Los Angeles was first discovered by the Spanish in 1769 while they were developing a trail between San Francisco and San Diego, known as El Camino Real. Led by Father Junipero Serra and Captain Gaspar de Portola, Father Juan Crespi wrote that the valley looked very hospitable for a large mission settlement, especially with a ready source of freshwater nearby from the Los Angeles River, which Crespi named El Rio de Nuestra Senora la Reina de los Angeles de Porciuncula. The river provided water to Los Angeles residents for 133 years, until 1913 when the Los Angeles Aqueduct was completed.

California's new governor, Felipe de Neve, recommended to the Viceroy in Mexico that the valley instead be developed into a pueblo, to be called El Pueblo de Nuestra Senora la Reina
de los Angeles de Porciuncula. It was founded after King Carlos III of Spain ordered the governor to establish the pueblo in September 1781. Los Angeles was the second of the three pueblos to be established in Alta California. The Mexican Period of Los Angeles history began in 1821 when Mexico achieved independence from Spain and extended to 1848 when the town of Los Angeles was taken by the United States in the Mexican-American War and the state eventually added to the Union. Los Angeles basin land use following this political shift went from large-scale agricultural to small-scale farms and ranches, and ultimately to the current pattern of dense suburban development (Caltrans, 2000a).

3.6.1.2 Historic Resources
A total of 368 improved properties, 74 unimproved properties, and 40 bridges are located within the Area of Potential Effects (APE)/study area surveyed in the Historic Architectural Survey Report that was prepared in 2002 (Caltrans, 2002b). Of these properties, 188 were constructed after 1956, 6 properties contain mobile homes or other temporary structures, and 14 properties were previously evaluated. A total of 161 properties were formally evaluated for eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). None of these newly evaluated properties were found to be eligible for the NRHP.

One property was previously determined eligible for inclusion in the NRHP. This property, partially within the APE/study area near the eastern end of the proposed project, was the main residence complex of the W. K. Kellogg Arabian Horse Ranch at Cal Poly Pomona. The eligible portion of this property includes the area bounded by the main residence, guest cottage and gardens, the residence gates, palm canyon, the small garage, and the Covina or northwestern gateposts. The main house is a Spanish Colonial Revival-style residence designed by Myron Hunt of Hunt and Chambers and constructed in 1926 for Mr. and Mrs. Will Keith Kellogg. Mr. Kellogg, of Battle Creek, Michigan, was the coinventor of cornflakes and the president of the Kellogg Cereal Company.

The main gate to the site is no longer used because construction of I-10 in the 1960s removed Holt-Garvey Avenue, which provided access to this part of the site. The ranch house and other buildings are fully enclosed within the college campus, and many of these buildings are currently used for college functions.

This property was determined to be eligible for the NRHP based on:

- Criterion B for its association with W.K. Kellogg, the coinventor of cornflakes and self-proclaimed protector of the Arabian horses bred in the United States.
- Criterion C for its extraordinary architecture and landscape design qualities.

The State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) concurred with the eligibility finding for the W.K. Kellogg Arabian Horse Ranch, as documented in the letter from the SHPO dated March 13, 1995. The SHPO further concurred that no additional structures identified in the
Supplemental HPSR were eligible for inclusion in the NRHP. Subsequent cultural resource studies have not identified historical resources within the APE/study area.

### 3.6.1.3 Archaeological Resources

No recorded prehistoric sites were identified within the study area. While the current environment in the I-10 project study area is predominantly paved, there are several small unpaved land areas adjacent to the ROW that would be affected by the proposed project. All unpaved areas were surveyed on foot, and no archaeological material was observed. A windshield survey was also conducted to observe most of the proposed project site with little potential to produce archaeological resources. Soil conditions observed during the pedestrian and windshield surveys were largely disturbed, and the APE was deemed to have a low level of sensitivity for archaeological resources.

No federally recognized "tribe" exists within the project study area; however, an effort was undertaken to ensure compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 amended in regards to consultation with "other parties likely to have knowledge of or concerns with historic properties in the area." A request for a search of the Sacred Land File (SLF) was sent to the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) on October 8, 2008. The NAHC replied on October 8, 2008, and indicated the results of the SLF search were negative for known Native American cultural resources within the project study area. Caltrans District 7 Native American Coordinator telephoned Dave Singleton of the NAHC to request an updated list of Native American individuals/organizations that may have knowledge of Native American cultural resources within the project study area. Letters and accompanying maps were sent via United States Postal Service (USPS) on February 15, 2012 to the nine Native American individuals/organizations provided by the NAHC. On March 6, 2012, Anthony Morales responded via telephone to discuss the proposed project, and Mr. Morales indicated that he did not know of any Native American-related cultural resources within the proposed project area. No response was received from any other contact, and information shows that no known cultural resources exist within the project study area (or immediately adjacent to the project study area). The work is anticipated to be located within an area that is highly urbanized and disturbed. Further, extensive cultural resource studies were conducted in the project area, and no cultural resources were identified during the research conducted for this project. Given the above considerations, it was further determined that no Native American Monitor would be required.

### 3.6.1.4 Paleontological Resources

The western and central portions of the project corridor are underlain by Quaternary deposits of the San Gabriel Valley. Locally, the existing I-10 is situated on Holocene alluvium materials consisting of unconsolidated gravel, sand, silt, and clay of various lithologies. At and very near the surface (e.g., less than 3 to 5 feet below ground surface [bgs]), the Younger Alluvium is probably too young to contain fossil remains. Correspondingly, there is probably only a low potential for scientifically important fossils to be encountered by very shallow ground-disturbing activities (PEAI, 2010).
The eastern end of the project corridor crosses the Puente Formation, where it unconformably overlies the Topanga Formation, and consists of a very thick sequence of marine sandstone, siltstone, shale, and pebble conglomerate. The middle upper Miocene-age Puente Formation has produced marine microfossils (i.e., benthic foraminifers); fossilized fish scales; fossilized remains of extinct species of marine algae, clams, crabs, fishes, sharks, and mammals (i.e., whales, desmostyliids); fossilized wood and leaves of land plants; fossilized coral remains; fragments of mollusk shells and marine vertebrate bones; and shark teeth. La Vida Shale Member of the Puente Formation has been noted by others at PM 38.5 and consists of thinly bedded olive gray to dark gray diatomaceous and tuffaceous shale and siltstone with interbedded feldspathic sandstone. For the above reasons, the Puente Formation is considered to have a high potential for producing scientifically important fossils (PEAI, 2010).

### 3.6.2 Regulatory Requirements

“Cultural resources,” as used in this document, refers to all historical and archaeological resources, regardless of significance. Laws and regulations dealing with cultural resources include:

- The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, (NHPA) sets forth national policy and procedures regarding historic properties, defined as districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects included in or eligible for the NRHP. Section 106 of the NHPA requires federal agencies to take into account the effects of their undertakings on such properties and to allow the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) the opportunity to comment on those undertakings, following regulations issued by the ACHP (36 CFR 800). On January 1, 2004, a Section 106 Programmatic Agreement (PA) between the ACHP, FHWA, SHPO, and Caltrans went into effect for Caltrans projects, both state and local, with FHWA involvement. The PA implements the ACHP’s regulations (36 CFR 800), streamlining the Section 106 process and delegating certain responsibilities to the Department. FHWA’s responsibilities under the PA have been assigned to Caltrans as part of the Surface Transportation Project Delivery Pilot Program (23 CFR 773) (July 1, 2007).

- Historical resources are considered under CEQA, as well as California Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 5024.1, which established the California Register of Historical Resources. PRC Section 5024 requires state agencies to identify and protect state-owned resources that meet NRHP listing criteria. It further specifically requires Caltrans to inventory state-owned structures in its ROWs.

### 3.6.3 Significance Criteria

Criteria for determining the significance of impacts related to archaeological, historic, and paleontological resources are based on the CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G – Environmental Checklist. Construction or operation impacts would be considered significant if they were to:

**CUL-1:** Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in the CEQA Guidelines §15064.5.
**CUL-2:** Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines §15064.5.

**CUL-3:** Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.

**CUL-4:** Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

According to the CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5(1), a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource means physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historical resource would be materially impaired.

Per Section 15064.5(2): The significance of an historical resource is materially impaired when a project:

(A) Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for inclusion in, the California Register of Historical Resources; or

(B) Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics that account for its inclusion in a local register of historical resources pursuant to Section 5020.1(k) of the PRC or its identification in an historical resources survey meeting the requirements of Section 5024.1(g) of the PRC, unless the public agency reviewing the effects of the project establishes by a preponderance of evidence that the resource is not historically or culturally significant; or

(C) Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of a historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its eligibility for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources as determined by a lead agency for purposes of CEQA; or

(D) Generally, a project that follows the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings or the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings (1995), Weeks and Grimmer, shall be considered as mitigated to a level of less than a significant impact on the historical resource.
3.6.4 Impacts

3.6.4.1 No Project Alternative
Implementation of the No Project Alternative would not result in any impacts to archaeological, historic, or paleontological resources because construction activities associated with the proposed project would not occur.

3.6.4.2 Proposed Project Alternative
Impact CUL-1: The proposed project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5.

No known historical resources are located within the study area. Neither would the proposed project affect any structures outside the public ROW; therefore, the proposed project would not result in a substantial adverse change to a historical resource. This would be considered a less than significant impact with mitigation as a result of the proposed project.

Impact CUL-2: The proposed project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource as defined in §15064.5.

No recorded prehistoric archaeological sites were identified within the study area; therefore, the proposed I-10 HOV Lane Project would not result in substantial adverse changes to known prehistoric sites. This would be considered a less than significant impact with mitigation as a result of the proposed project.

Impact CUL-3: The proposed project may directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.

Direct paleontological resource impacts primarily relate to the potential for destruction of nonrenewable fossils and the loss of information associated with these resources. If potentially fossiliferous bedrock or surficial sediments are disturbed, then the disturbance could result in the destruction of paleontological resources and subsequent loss of information.

In this regard, there are the following considerations with respect to potential impacts with the proposed project:

1. Past and ongoing development throughout the proposed project area has resulted in substantial alterations to the natural landscape.

2. Deep excavation activity is not necessary for the proposed project. There would be some grading work required along the slopes bordering the south side of I-10 at Kellogg Hill.
3. Most of the project corridor is considered to have a ‘low’ potential for encountering paleontological resources. The area considered to have a ‘high’ potential for exposing significant fossils is limited to the Kellogg Hill area of the project site.

Given these considerations, it is determined that the proposed project could potentially result in significant impacts to paleontological resources, confined to an area where work would be conducted within the Puente Formation along the eastern end of the project corridor. This would be considered a less than significant impact with mitigation as a result of the proposed project.

**Impact CUL-4: The proposed project would not disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.**

Because the proposed project site has been previously disturbed by urban development, construction would not be expected to affect human remains. No human remains are known to exist in the project location, nor is there past evidence of use as human burial grounds. This would be considered a less than significant impact with mitigation as a result of the proposed project.

### 3.6.5 Mitigation Measures

#### 3.6.5.1 Historical Resources

The following mitigation is recommended to offset potential impacts to historical resources:

**MM CUL-1:** In the unlikely event cultural materials are discovered during construction, all earth-moving activity within and around the immediate discovery area will be diverted until a qualified archaeologist can assess the nature and significance of the find.

#### 3.6.5.2 Archaeological Resources

See mitigation measures identified for Section 3.6.5.1 Historical Resources.

#### 3.6.5.3 Paleontological Resources

The following mitigation is recommended to offset potential impacts to paleontological resources:

**MM CUL-2:** A qualified principal paleontologist (MS or Ph.D. in paleontology or geology familiar with paleontological procedures and techniques) will be retained to be present to consult with grading and excavation contractors at pregrading meetings.

**MM CUL-3:** Paleontological monitor, under the direction of the qualified principal paleontologist, will be onsite to inspect cuts for fossils during original grading involving sensitive geologic formations.
MM CUL-4: When fossils are discovered, the paleontologist, or paleontological monitor, will recover them. Construction work in these areas will be halted or redirected to allow recovery of fossil remains in a timely manner.

MM CUL-5: Fossil remains collected during the monitoring and salvage portion of the mitigation program will be cleaned, repaired, sorted, and cataloged.

MM CUL-6: Prepared fossils, along with copies of all pertinent field notes, photos, and maps, will then be deposited in a scientific institution with paleontological collections.

MM CUL-7: A final report will be completed that outlines the results of the mitigation program.

3.6.5.4 Human Remains
The following mitigation is recommended to offset potential impacts to human remains:

MM CUL-8: In the unlikely event human remains are discovered, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that further disturbances and activities shall cease in any area or nearby area suspected to overlie remains, and the County Coroner contacted. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, if the remains are thought to be Native American, the coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) who will then notify the Most Likely Descendent (MLD). At this time, the person who discovered the remains will contact Gary Iverson, Environmental Chief, so that they may work with the MLD on the respectful treatment and disposition of the remains. Further provisions of PRC 5097.98 are to be followed as applicable.

3.6.6 Level of Significance after Mitigation
The proposed project would not result in any significant impacts to any archaeological or historic resources. Potentially significant impacts to paleontological resources would be offset with implementation of MM CUL-1 through MM CUL-8.
3.7 Geology, Soils, and Seismicity

This section discusses geology, soils, and seismic concerns as they relate to public safety and project design. Earthquakes are prime considerations in the design and retrofit of structures. Caltrans’ Office of Earthquake Engineering is responsible for assessing the seismic hazard for Caltrans projects. The current policy is to use the anticipated maximum credible earthquake (MCE) from young faults in and near California. The MCE is defined as the largest earthquake that can be expected to occur on a fault over a particular period.

3.7.1 Existing Conditions

Regionally, the proposed project is located within the upper portion of the San Gabriel River Basin. This basin is bounded on the west by the San Jose Hills, which form a natural topographic boundary to the north between the San Gabriel and San Bernardino mountains of the Central Traverse Ranges Geomorphic Province (Caltrans, 1993a and 2000b). The San Jose Hills are comprised of Tertiary sedimentary and volcanic rocks (DOC, 2001).

3.7.1.1 Topography

The topography of the west part of the I-10 HOV Lane Project study area is generally flat between Puente and Grand avenues. East of Grand Avenue, the elevation rises, with grades up to 5.5 percent, as the freeway traverses the west side of Kellogg Hill. Kellogg Hill is part of the San Jose Hills complex, which forms a natural physical boundary between the San Gabriel Valley to the west and the San Bernardino Valley to the east. The proposed project region drains westerly to the San Gabriel River via both Big Dalton Wash and Walnut Creek.

3.7.1.2 Geology and Soils

A series of flows, breccias, tuffs, and related intrusives known as the middle Miocene Glendora Volcanics are exposed in the northeastern end of the San Jose Hills. These volcanic rocks are overlain by and interbedded with the oldest sedimentary rocks in the area, the middle Miocene Topanga Formation, consisting of interbedded marine conglomerate, sandstone, and foraminiferal siltstone. A poorly sorted conglomerate and conglomeratic sandstone is exposed approximately 1-mile south of I-10 as the “Buzzard Peak conglomerate.” The middle upper Miocene Puente Formation unconformably overlies the Topanga Formation and consists of a very thick sequence of marine sandstone, siltstone, shale, and pebble conglomerate.

Quaternary deposits cover the floor of the San Gabriel Valley, including stream channels and alluvial fans and floodplains. They are composed of active channel wash, lacustrine deposits, younger alluvial fan deposits, and older alluvial fan deposits. (DOC, 2001) Locally, the existing I-10 is situated on Holocene alluvium materials consisting of unconsolidated gravel, sand, silt, and clay of various lithologies. Sand, gravel, and clay lenses continue as the depth increases to approximately 150 feet bgs. Just east of the Holt Avenue interchange, the proposed project site is situated on Tertiary-age rocks from the Puente Formation (i.e., La Vida Member), consisting of thinly bedded olive gray to dark gray diatomaceous and
tuffaceous shale and siltstone with interbedded feldspathic sandstone (Caltrans, 1993a and 2000b; PBQ&D, 1993).

### 3.7.1.3 Groundwater
The proposed project site overlies the San Gabriel Valley Groundwater Basin (RWQCB, 1995). Depth to groundwater varies widely throughout the project corridor, from 60 to 200 feet depending on the location of groundwater wells. In general, wells located to the west of the project corridor show deeper groundwater levels than wells to the east of the project corridor.

### 3.7.1.4 Regional Seismicity
Folds are the dominant structural features of the San Jose Hills: two anticlines and an intervening syncline that all trend generally eastward. The San Jose Fault transects the project limits in the vicinity of the interchange of I-10/SR51/SR71. The fault generally strikes to the north-northeast and probably has a vertical dip with the south block being dropped down (DOC, 2001).

The project corridor is in a seismically active area potentially influenced by several known active faults. The geologic processes that have caused earthquakes in the past can be expected to continue. The freeway does not traverse an Alquist-Priolo Zone (DOC, 2007) and is not located over a previously well-defined fault trace. Seismic events that are likely to produce the greatest bedrock accelerations could be a moderate event on the Cucamonga Fault Zone or a large event on a distant active fault such as the San Jacinto or the San Andreas (Caltrans, 1993a and 2000b). Additional local active faults in the Los Angeles region that could cause ground shaking in the project area are as follows. Figure 3.7-1 shows the location of major faults in the region.

- **San Jose Fault** – The San Jose Fault is considered to be a left-lateral strike-slip fault. The peak horizontal bedrock acceleration based on an MCE Richter scale\(^6\) Magnitude of 6.75 along the San Jose Fault is estimated to be approximately 0.6 g. Site parameters indicate that the San Jose Fault system has a largest maximum credible site acceleration of 0.48 g for an MCE-Magnitude of 6.7 and a largest maximum probable site acceleration of 0.17 g for an MCE-Magnitude of 5.0 (Caltrans, 2000b).\(^7\)

---

\(^6\) The Richter scale is a logarithmic scale used to express the magnitude (M) of a seismic disturbance (i.e., earthquake) as a range of numerical values that indicate the amount of energy dissipated during the event. Values generally range from 0 to 10. Each whole number in Richter M represents a tenfold increase in the wave amplitude generated by the earthquake, which is a representation of the size of an earthquake. For each full point increase in Richter magnitude, the corresponding amount of energy released increases 31.6 times. Thus, an M 6.3 earthquake is ten times larger in wave amplitude than an M 5.3 earthquake and releases 31.6 times more energy.

\(^7\) For comparison purposes, the greatest ground acceleration recorded during the 1994 Northridge Earthquake ($M_w = 6.7$) was 0.21 g at the Puddingstone Reservoir (center crest), located approximately 0.6-mile to the north of the SR 57/SR 71 interchange.
Figure 3.7-1
Los Angeles Region Fault Locations for the I-10 HOV Lane Project

Source: Caltrans, 2000b.
**Puente Hills Blind Thrust Fault** – The Puente Hills Blind Thrust Fault is located approximately 3 miles south of the project corridor. This fault is estimated to extend approximately 25 miles from the Puente Hills Region to south of Griffith Park. The Puente Hills Fault has been assigned a Maximum Magnitude of 6.8 on the Richter scale.

**East Montebello Fault** – The East Montebello Fault is located approximately 2.2 miles southwest of Baldwin Avenue.

**Cucamonga Fault** – The Cucamonga Fault is located approximately 4.1 miles to the northeast from the east end of the project corridor.

### 3.7.1.5 Earthquake-Related Effects

Earthquake-related effects include liquefaction and seismically induced settlement. Liquefaction occurs when loose soils lose their shear strength and behave as a liquid when subjected to strong, sustained ground shaking during an earthquake. When these conditions occur, soil strength dramatically decreases, resulting in a near liquid state. Liquefaction occurs most commonly where sand and silty sand deposits coincide with shallow groundwater conditions. Liquefaction can cause damage to foundations or other structures. Based on a regional study conducted by the U.S. Geological Survey (1985), the relative liquefaction susceptibility along the project corridor is considered to be from low to very low.

Seismically induced settlement consists of the compaction or consolidation of soils as a result of seismically induced ground shaking. Loose, sandy, and/or silty soils are typically most susceptible to seismic settlement. Differential compaction may occur during settlement, which can result in serious damage to structures.

### 3.7.1.6 Landslides

Landslides in the project area are assessed in a technical bulletin prepared by the State of California (DOC, 2001). Existing landslides typically consist of disrupted soils and rock materials that are generally weaker than adjacent undisturbed rock and soil materials. These landslides are shown in Figure 3.7-2. The Puente Formation at Kellogg Hill has historically experienced landslides caused by weakness along the contorted bedding planes. Several slides have occurred within this area of I-10. The most landslide-prone bedrock units are the Yorba (i.e., interbedded sandy and diatomaceous siltstone containing thin beds of limestone and thin-bedded to massive sandstone) and La Vida (i.e., laminated to platy siltstone with interbedded pebbly sandstone and local limestone and tuff beds) members of the aforementioned Puente Formation. Most of the landslides inventoried by the State Division of Mines and Geology are debris slides, block slides, and slumps.
3.7.2 Regulatory Requirements

The main purpose of the Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zones Act of 1972 is to prevent construction of buildings used for human occupancy on the surface trace of active faults. The Act only addresses the hazard of surface fault rupture and is not directed toward other earthquake hazards. The Act defines an "active fault" as a fault that has had surface displacement within Holocene time (i.e., approximately the last 11,000 years).

The Seismic Hazards Mapping Act of 1990 (PRC § 2690 and following as Division 2, Chapter 7.8) addresses nonsurface fault rupture earthquake hazards, including liquefaction and seismically induced landslides. Special Publication 117, Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California (DOC, 1997), constitutes the guidelines for evaluating seismic hazards other than surface fault rupture, and for recommending mitigation measures as required by PRC Section 2695(a).

The California Building Code (CBC) corresponds to the body of regulations known as California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 2, which is a portion of the California Building Standards Code. Title 24 is assigned to the California Building Standards Commission, which, by law, is responsible for coordinating all building standards. Under state law, all building standards must be centralized in Title 24 to be enforceable.

The Uniform Building Code (UBC), published by the International Conference of Building Officials, is a widely adopted model building code in the United States. The CBC incorporates the UBC by reference, along with necessary California amendments. Approximately one-third of the text within the CBC has been tailored for California earthquake conditions.
3.7.3 Significance Criteria
Criteria for determining the significance of impacts related to geology, groundwater, and soils are based on the CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G – Environmental Checklist. Impacts during project construction and operation would be considered significant under the following circumstances:

GEO-1: Expose people or structures to potentially substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault; strong seismic ground shaking; seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction; or landslides;

GEO-2: Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil;

GEO-3: Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the proposed project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse;

GEO-4: Be located on expansive soil, creating substantial risks to life or property; or

GEO-5: Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water.

3.7.4 Impacts
3.7.4.1 No Project Alternative
The No Project Alternative would not include construction of HOV lanes; however, forecasted increases in traffic volumes would still occur under this alternative. While no construction-related impacts would occur, the project corridor would continue to be subject to the risk of losses associated with future seismic ground shaking. These risks are minimized through adherence to design requirements contained within the aforementioned CBC. The No Project Alternative would result in less than significant impacts under CEQA.

3.7.4.2 Proposed Project Alternative
Impact GEO-1: The proposed project may expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects involving rupture of a known earthquake fault or strong seismic ground shaking.

Potential seismicity effects on the proposed I-10 HOV Lane Project include ground shaking, liquefaction, seismic settlement, and slope failure. Ground shaking during an earthquake is considered the primary risk of potential future structural damage to I-10 and the proposed project. The potential impacts associated with ground shaking would vary greatly, depending on the fault on which the earthquake occurs, distance from the earthquake epicenter, and magnitude and duration of the earthquake episode(s).
To minimize geologic and seismic hazards near the project, site-specific investigations, seismic hazard engineering analyses, and engineering recommendations for retaining walls, expansive soil treatment, cuts and fills, and bridge foundation elements would be conducted during final design using Caltrans Guidelines for Geotechnical Foundation Investigations and Reports. Specifications for construction would conform to the Caltrans Standard Specifications.

As noted above, the soils in the proposed project vicinity are not particularly susceptible to either liquefaction or seismic settlement. Standard Caltrans final design and construction techniques include measures to address soil stabilization and reduce the potential for associated seismicity effects to a less than significant level.

**Impact GEO-2: Construction and operation of the proposed project is not expected to result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.**

The Caltrans Highway Design Manual requires the design of modified highways to direct storm and landscaping runoff to storm drains and to avoid unnecessary flow of water over unpaved and nonlandscaped areas. During construction, best management practices (BMPs) would be employed to minimize erosion to the maximum extent practicable. A Caltrans Stormwater Management Plan (SWMP) would be prepared to address BMPs to reduce the discharge of pollutants associated with the stormwater drainage systems. The completed project plans would incorporate all necessary Maintenance BMPs (Category IA), Design Pollution BMPs (Category IB), and Treatment BMPs (Category III) to meet the maximum extent practicable requirements; therefore, the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts related to erosion.

**Impact GEO-3: The proposed project may be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that may become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse.**

Given the historic landslide activity in the Kellogg Hill area, as shown in Figure 3.7-2, there is the potential that the proposed project could be adversely affected by landslides. This area has been extensively studied by state geologists. The project design through this area would include retaining walls to support cut slopes. These retaining walls would be based on Caltrans design criteria, which generally follows American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) and FHWA design criteria. The proposed retaining walls would enhance the existing stability of the slopes. Given these considerations, it is not anticipated that, either during or after construction of the retaining walls, the project would compromise the existing stability conditions of the slopes above the walls.

One location for retaining walls is along the Forest Lawn property on the south side of the eastbound lanes. The existing slopes along the ROW line between Forest Lawn and Caltrans properties were graded in the early 1980s with a slope ratio of approximately 2H (Horizontal): 1V (Vertical). These slopes are currently covered with vegetation, thus limiting the information that could be gathered during field observations. Given this situation, plus access limitations,
existing conditions of the slopes above the proposed retaining walls could not be ascertained. Additional information would need to be obtained during the detailed project design stage.

Several factors outside of Caltrans’ control may affect the conditions of the slopes. These factors, which must be prevented to ensure long-term stability of the slopes, include:

- Saturation of the slopes due to irrigation water or accumulation of water outside of Caltrans’ ROW;
- Additional surcharge placed above the slopes outside of Caltrans’ ROW; and
- Erosion of the slopes by surface water runoff from outside of Caltrans’ ROW.

**Impact GEO-4:** The proposed project is not located on expansive soils.

Soils containing high clay content often exhibit a relatively high potential to expand when saturated and contract when dried out. This shrink/swell movement can adversely affect building and structure foundations, often causing them to crack or shift, with resulting damage to the buildings they support. Proposed project structures would be built to current State of California design standards and in accordance with project-specific geotechnical report recommendations for handling of expansive soils. The soils at the proposed project site do not have a high clay content that would cause adverse effects to building foundations; therefore, the proposed project would have no impacts related to expansive soils.

**Impact GEO-5:** The proposed project does not have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water.

Project implementation would not require the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems; therefore, no impacts associated with the use of a septic system would occur.

### 3.7.5 Mitigation Measures

**Impacts GEO-1, GEO-2, GEO-3, GEO-4, and GEO-5:** No mitigation measures are required; however, the following measures will be included to avoid or minimize impacts associated with slope failure:

- Retaining walls will be included in the project design for the Kellogg Hill area where ROW constraints do not allow slopes to be cut parallel to the existing slope ratios. The proposed project may include other design features where determined necessary to minimize the potential for losses due to possible future slope failure activity. Retaining walls will be designed and constructed in a manner that satisfies both State and Federal standards and requirements.
Minimization measures were also identified in the MMRP (2003):

- The grading plans for Segment 3 will include provisions to ensure that graded areas will be compatible with, and reflect, the landform character of the existing surroundings, consistent with the need for retaining walls along parts of Segment 3.

- Slopes along Segment 3 affected by construction of the proposed I-10 HOV Lane project will be recontoured to a 1:2 slope, or as determined appropriate through geotechnical investigation, to provide a smooth and gradual transition between the modified topography and existing grade, and to minimize the appearance of manufactured grading. Use of crib-type retaining walls in place of slopes will be minimized, except where necessary to provide greater slope stability. The top and toe of slope edges will be rounded to reduce the angular effects of manufactured grading. These design features will be incorporated in Segment 3, as feasible, to stay within the I-10 right-of-way limits.

- The proposed project would be designed and constructed consistent with Caltrans' guidelines, specifications, applicable building codes and design criteria, which provide state of the art seismic construction for Seismic Zone A structures. These measures may include the use of hinge retainers to hold superstructure elements together during extreme motion; the use of heavy keys to limit movement between the superstructure and abutment; and/or the use of increased reinforcement in column sections to assure effective confinement of concrete allowing large movements without collapse.

3.7.6 Level of Significance after Mitigation

No mitigation measures are required for the proposed project.
3.8 Hazardous Waste/Materials

Hazardous materials are generally substances that, by their nature or reactivity, have the capacity for causing harm or health hazards during normal exposure or an accidental release or mishap. They are characterized as being toxic, corrosive, flammable, reactive, an irritant, or a strong sensitizer. The term “hazardous substances” encompasses chemicals regulated by both U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) “hazardous materials” regulations and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA) “hazardous waste” regulations, including emergency response. Hazardous wastes require special handling and disposal because of their potential to damage public health and the environment.

This subsection discusses potential human health hazards due to exposure to existing and possible future sources of hazardous materials and wastes because of the proposed project’s construction and operation.

3.8.1 Existing Conditions

Several Initial Site Assessments (ISAs) and parcel hazardous waste assessments have been conducted along the project corridor. These are summarized in Table 3.8-1. These documents can be found on file at the District 7 offices.

These ISAs and parcel hazardous waste assessments were prepared in general accordance with the applicable American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) guidelines in effect at the time of the reports (ASTM E1927-00 for 2002 and ASTM E1527-05 after 2006). The scopes of the ISAs included site reconnaissance; historical research related to use, storage, disposal, or release of hazardous materials or petroleum hydrocarbons; review of environmental databases; and report of findings. The purpose of the ISAs was to identify recognized environmental conditions⁸ (RECs).

There are several bridges/overcrossings located along the project corridor. Depending on their ages, these bridges/overcrossings may contain asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) and/or lead-based paint (LBP).

---

⁸ Defined as “the presence or likely presence of any hazardous substances or petroleum products on a property under conditions that indicate an existing release, a past release, or the material threat of a release of any hazardous substances or petroleum products into structures on the property or into the ground, groundwater, or surface water of the property (ASTM, 2005).”
### TABLE 3.8-1. SUMMARY OF INITIAL SITE ASSESSMENTS AND HAZARDOUS WASTE ASSESSMENTS FOR PARCELS SUBJECT TO ACQUISITION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>REC Present?</th>
<th>Summary of RECs</th>
<th>Other Hazardous Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parcel 79812 3250 Big Dalton Avenue APN# 8460-006-043</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>This parcel is included in the San Gabriel Valley Area 2 National Priorities List (NPL) site (SGVA2). During the 1940s through the 1980s, carbon tetrachloride, tetrachloroethene, trichloroethene, and other chlorinated solvents were released by a combination of intentional disposal, careless handling during loading and unloading, leaking tanks and pipes, and other means. Volatile organic compounds (VOCs) have been detected in groundwater.</td>
<td>No other hazardous conditions identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 South California Avenue APN #8474-007-030</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None Identified.</td>
<td>Aerially deposited lead (ADL) – It is possible that upper shallow soils beneath the parcel have been contaminated with ADL from past vehicle emissions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Fashion Plaza APN # 8474-003-081</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None Identified.</td>
<td>None Identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195 South Glendora Avenue APN# 8474-011-046</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None Identified.</td>
<td>ADL – It is possible that upper shallow soils beneath the parcel have been contaminated with ADL from past vehicle emissions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>950 Lakes Drive APN# 8474-011-028</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None Identified.</td>
<td>ADL – It is possible that upper shallow soils beneath the parcel have been contaminated with ADL from past vehicle emissions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110 South California Avenue APN #8474-007-031</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None Identified.</td>
<td>ADL – It is possible that upper shallow soils beneath the parcel have been contaminated with ADL from past vehicle emissions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel 79744 APN# 8848-029-063 Parcel 79745 APN# 8848-029-064</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None Identified.</td>
<td>ADL – It is possible that upper shallow soils beneath the parcel have been contaminated with ADL from past vehicle emissions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 3.8-1. SUMMARY OF INITIAL SITE ASSESSMENTS AND HAZARDOUS WASTE ASSESSMENTS FOR PARCELS SUBJECT TO ACQUISITION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>RECs Present?</th>
<th>Summary of RECs</th>
<th>Other Hazardous Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parcel 79746 APN# 8848-029-065 Paras 79747 APN# 8848-029-066 Parcel 79748 APN# 8848-029-062 Parcel 79749 APN# 8848-029-061</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None Identified.</td>
<td>ADL – It is possible that upper shallow soils beneath the parcel have been contaminated with ADL from past vehicle emissions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel 79751 APN# 8848-010-011 Parcel 79752 APN# 8848-010-021</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None Identified.</td>
<td>ADL – It is possible that upper shallow soils beneath the parcel have been contaminated with ADL from past vehicle emissions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel 79766 APN# 8277-008-034</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None Identified.</td>
<td>ADL – It is possible that upper shallow soils beneath the parcel have been contaminated with ADL from past vehicle emissions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel 79824 APN# 8448-019-049</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None Identified.</td>
<td>ADL – It is possible that upper shallow soils beneath the parcel have been contaminated with ADL from past vehicle emissions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel 80234 APN# 8451-012-040 Parcel 80235 APN# 8451-012-047</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None Identified.</td>
<td>ADL – It is possible that upper shallow soils beneath the parcel have been contaminated with ADL from past vehicle emissions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel 80246 APN# 8448-010-900</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None Identified.</td>
<td>ADL – It is possible that upper shallow soils beneath the parcel have been contaminated with ADL from past vehicle emissions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel 79813 APN# 8474-001-012 (Doctors Hospital)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>This parcel is included in the SGVA2 NPL site. During the 1940s through the 1980s, carbon tetrachloride, tetrachloroethylene, trichloroethylene, and other chlorinated solvents were released by a combination of intentional disposal, careless handling during loading and unloading, leaking tanks and pipes, and other means. VOCs have been detected in groundwater.</td>
<td>ADL – It is possible that upper shallow soils beneath the parcel have been contaminated with ADL from past vehicle emissions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.8.2 Regulatory Requirements

Hazardous materials and hazardous wastes are regulated by many state and federal laws. These include not only specific statutes governing hazardous waste, but also a variety of laws regulating air and water quality, human health, and land use.

The primary federal laws regulating hazardous wastes/materials are the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976 (RCRA) and the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA). The purpose of CERCLA, often referred to as Superfund, is to clean up contaminated sites so that public health and welfare are not compromised. RCRA provides “cradle to grave” regulation of hazardous wastes. Other federal laws include:

- Community Environmental Response Facilitation Act (CERFA) of 1992
- Clean Water Act (CWA)
- Clean Air Act (CAA)
- Safe Drinking Water Act
- Occupational Safety and Health Act (OSHA)
- Atomic Energy Act
- Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA)
- Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA)

In addition to the acts listed above, Executive Order (EO) 12088, Federal Compliance with Pollution Control, mandates that necessary actions be taken to prevent and control environmental pollution when federal activities or federal facilities are involved.

Hazardous waste in California is regulated primarily under the authority of the federal RCRA and the California Health and Safety Code. Other California laws that affect hazardous waste are specific to handling, storage, transportation, disposal, treatment, reduction, cleanup, and emergency planning.

Worker health and safety and public safety are key issues when dealing with hazardous materials that may affect human health and the environment. Proper disposal of hazardous material is vital if it is disturbed during construction of the proposed project.

3.8.3 Significance Criteria

Criteria for determining the significance of impacts related to hazardous waste and materials are based on the CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G – Environmental Checklist. Impacts during proposed project construction and operation would be considered significant if they would:

**HAZ-1:** Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.
HAZ-2: Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.

HAZ-3: Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25-mile of an existing or proposed school.

HAZ-4: Be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

3.8.4 Impacts

3.8.4.1 No Project Alternative

I-10 is currently used by vehicles carrying hazardous waste and materials. Spills of these types of materials are handled according to the existing Caltrans Highway Maintenance Department Hazardous Spills Procedures Manual, which outlines procedures for protecting the safety of travelers, Caltrans, and other emergency services personnel. The manual also identifies procedures for the protection of the environment and the immediate removal and proper disposal of hazardous or toxic substances from the road.

No change in the volume of vehicles carrying hazardous waste or materials is expected to occur under the No Project Alternative. Ground disturbance associated with the proposed project would not occur; therefore, aerially deposited lead (ADL) would not be a concern. No excavation would occur; therefore, no contact with potentially contaminated groundwater would occur. No demolition of structures would occur; therefore, no LBP or ACMs would be disturbed. There would be no impacts associated with hazardous waste or materials under the No Project Alternative.

3.8.4.2 Proposed Project Alternative

Impact HAZ-1: The proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.

Under the Proposed Project Alternative, no change in the volume of vehicles carrying hazardous and toxic materials is expected during project operation. As a result, there would be no impacts associated with hazardous waste or materials as a result of implementation of the Proposed Project Alternative.

During construction, hazardous waste or materials may be removed. These materials would need to be transported off-site to an appropriate disposal facility. The United States Department of Transportation specifies procedures for safely transporting hazardous materials and procedures to follow in case of accidental spills during transport. The United
States Environmental Protection Agency specifies the requirements for proper labeling and placarding of hazardous substances. Other local, state and federal regulations address the identification, removal, handling and disposal of hazardous wastes. These procedures would be followed in the event hazardous materials are found during construction. As a result, the impacts associated with the transport of hazardous waste or materials as a result of implementation of the Proposed Project Alternative would be less than significant.

Impact HAZ-2: The proposed project could create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.

There is a slight potential that previously unknown hazardous materials or underground storage tanks (USTs) would be uncovered during construction. Implementation of Caltrans’ Construction Manual (Caltrans, 2003) would substantially reduce potential impacts on construction workers and the public due to discovery or disturbance of hazardous materials and/or USTs during construction.

The proposed I-10 HOV Lane Project would require the acquisition of ROW that may have been contaminated with hazardous materials based on existing and/or past uses, and that could be disturbed during construction. Required remediation of existing hazardous materials contamination would be addressed during the property acquisition phase and would be conducted consistent with existing federal, state, and local laws and regulations.

Soil contaminated with ADL would be removed and disposed of in accordance with the lead variance issued to Caltrans by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) (effective date July 2009). Per the variance, this material may be reused for embankment fill, retaining wall backfill, and/or excavation of clean soils and backfilling, and capped with an appropriate amount of clean fill material.

There is potential for the generation of ACM waste associated with the demolition and removal of existing bridges and structures on I-10 and of older structures on ROW acquired for the proposed project. Predemolition asbestos sampling and notification are included as part of the proposed project, consistent with the requirements of the SCAQMD. Compliance with existing regulations would reduce the potential for release of asbestos during construction to a level below significant.

The existing yellow thermoplastic and yellow-painted traffic stripes on I-10 may also contain lead and/or chromium. Removed thermoplastic and yellow paint would be disposed of at an appropriate site, in accordance with local, state, and federal laws. This would reduce the potential for adverse impacts associated with any potential lead- and chromium-containing stripes to a level below significant.
HAZ-3: The proposed project is not expected to emit hazardous emissions or require handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25-mile of an existing or proposed school.

While there are several schools located within 0.25-mile of the project corridor, impacts associated with mobile-source air toxics (MSAT) are not expected to be significant given the following considerations: (1) there is already an existing freeway in the study area; (2) highway improvements would not move the freeway appreciably closer to these schools; and (3) based on other similar HOV projects, studies have shown that, depending on the constituent, only slight percentage increases/decreases in MSAT emissions are projected to occur with the HOV lanes in operation.

HAZ-4: The proposed project is located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5; however, it would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

Sites 1a, 1b, 5, and 15 are located immediately above the plume identified for the San Gabriel Valley Area 2 National Priorities List (NPL) site. Groundwater within this vicinity may be contaminated; however, based on preliminary construction plans, excavation activity would not likely reach the existing groundwater table located 60 feet or more bgs elevation. Should encroachment into SGVA2 occur, appropriate procedures would be followed to provide adequate protection to works and the public.

3.8.5 Mitigation Measures

MM HAZ-1: Groundwater is not expected to be disturbed and/or disposed during construction activities. If groundwater needs to be disturbed and/or extracted during construction, then appropriate disposal and treatment (if required) options will be determined through coordination with the regulatory agencies in order to prevent possible cross contamination. If contamination is found, then a work plan shall be prepared by a registered geotechnical engineer to protect the health of construction workers.

MM HAZ-2: ADL soil management will be evaluated for the applicability of the lead variance issued to Caltrans by DTSC.

MM HAZ-3: Bridges and structures shall be surveyed to screen for ACMs and LBP prior to construction activities. If ACMs are found, then the contractor will comply with the SCAQMD Rule 1403 notification and removal processes. In addition, disposal of ACMs will be handled in compliance with local, state, and federal requirements. If LBP and/or heavy metals are found, then the contractor shall comply with local, state, and federal rules and regulations for notification, removal process, and disposal activities.

MM HAZ-4: Any hazardous materials or wastes encountered before or during the demolition stage of the proposed project shall be disposed according to current regulatory guidelines.
MM HAZ-5: A worker Health and Safety Plan (HSP) that meets the provisions of California Code of Regulations (Title 22, Section 5192) shall be developed by the proposed project contractor. HSP procedures will address the identification, excavation, handling, and disposal of hazardous wastes and materials that may be found in construction areas.

MM HAZ-6: Removed thermoplastic and yellow paint will be disposed at an appropriate landfill in accordance with local, state, and federal laws.

In addition to the above-mentioned measures, the following mitigation measures were identified in the MMRP (2003):

MM HAZ-7: If unknown wastes or underground storage tanks are discovered during construction which the construction contractor believes may involve hazardous materials, he/she will (1) immediately stop work in the vicinity of the suspected contamination, remove workers and the public from the area; (2) notify Caltrans' Resident Engineer; and (3) secure the area as directed by Caltrans' Resident Engineer. Caltrans' Plans and Procedures for Hazardous Wastes and Materials, the Construction Hazardous Materials Response Plan and the Construction Underground Tank Contingency Plan, as appropriate, will be implemented by Caltrans and the construction contractors.

MM HAZ-8: Prior to the start of construction, Caltrans will conduct a Site Investigation (SI) for all sites in the proposed right-of-way identified as having the potential for hazardous waste. The SI will consist of drilling and testing. Based on the findings of the drilling and testing, specific remediation measures will be identified in the SI to address documented hazardous wastes contamination at the affected sites in accordance with applicable federal and state laws. For sites documented through the SI process to contain hazardous waste, Caltrans will include the mitigation defined in the SI in the construction contract and specifications.

MM HAZ-9: Hazardous substances are strictly regulated by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the California and Federal Occupational Health and Safety Administration (OSHA), the United States Department of Transportation (DOT) and a number of other federal, state and local agencies. DOT specifies procedures for safely transporting hazardous material and procedures to follow in case of accidental spills during transport. EPA specifies the requirements for proper labeling and placarding of hazardous substances. The American National Standards Institute (ANSI) recommends safety procedures for handling and storing hazardous materials. OSHA specifies the procedures required for using and storing hazardous materials. Other local, state and federal regulations address the identification, removal, handling and disposal of hazardous wastes. Project contractors will be required to follow these procedures and to maintain the required documentation during all site preparation, grading and construction of the proposed project.
3.8.6 Level of Significance after Mitigation

With the incorporation of the recommended mitigation measures MM HAZ-1 through MM HAZ-6, the proposed project’s hazardous waste/materials impacts would be less than significant.
3.9 Hydrology and Water Quality

This section includes an analysis of the potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed project on hydrology, floodplain, and water quality concerns. The proposed project has been extensively analyzed by Caltrans over the past several years, and these studies have been used in part to develop this section. Where appropriate, however, the analyses have been updated to keep pace with the comprehensive evolution of water quality control requirements that have occurred since the proposed project was first assessed in the early 1990s.

3.9.1 Existing Conditions

Regionally, the proposed project is located within the lower portion of the San Gabriel River Basin. This basin is bounded on the east by the San Jose Hills, which form a natural topographic boundary to the north between the San Gabriel and San Bernardino mountains of the Central Transverse Ranges Geomorphic Province.

3.9.1.1 Watershed Characteristics

The project site is predominantly located within the San Gabriel River Watershed, shown in Figure 3.9-1. The San Gabriel River, which flows for approximately 58 miles, drains a large coastal stream system in southern California (LACDPW, 2011) from headwaters in the San Gabriel Mountains to the ocean at Seal Beach. The total watershed area is approximately 689 square miles in eastern Los Angeles County and northwestern Orange County. In its upper reaches, the watershed consists of mostly undisturbed woodland and riparian habitats, but it also contains a series of flood control dams. The urbanizing middle portion of the watershed has been extensively modified to control flood and debris flows, and it includes expansive spreading grounds used for water recharge. The lower part of the watershed, which the San Bernardino Freeway traverses, is substantially urbanized. The river channel is concrete lined across the San Gabriel Valley.

The project corridor traverses two hydrologic subareas (HSAs) within the San Gabriel River Watershed: Main San Gabriel – HSA 405.41 and San Jose – HSA 405.51. At the far eastern end of the corridor in the vicinity of Cal Poly Pomona, the freeway enters a portion of the Chino HSA 481.20, which drains to the Santa Ana River Watershed. (LARWQCB, 1995) Annual precipitation in the watershed ranges between 15 and 31 inches, with an average of approximately 19 inches in the proposed project area.

Land use in the watershed is diverse and ranges from open space and agriculture to heavy industry. Although agriculture was historically the predominant land use, it now accounts for only a small percentage of the land use area. Pollutants from dense clusters of residential and commercial activities have impaired water quality in the middle and lower watersheds. Tertiary-treated effluent from several sewage treatment plants enters the river in its middle reaches (LARWQCB, 2000).
3.9.2 Surface Water
Walnut Creek is the primary water course within the proposed project vicinity. It is an intermittent stream with flows occurring mostly between October and March. Discharging from Puddingstone Reservoir in San Dimas, the creek flows southwesterly in an earthen channel through Walnut Creek Wilderness Park before crossing I-10 in a reinforced concrete box structure approximately 0.2-mile west of Grand Avenue. After crossing I-10, Walnut Creek flows westerly in a concrete channel as it meanders between a few hundred feet and almost 0.5-mile to the south of I-10. Walnut Creek discharges to the San Gabriel River just southwest of the I-605/I-10 interchange. The channelized portion of the creek is
approximately 35 feet wide and 15 to 20 feet deep. This channel was designed to convey flows of up to 9,000 cubic feet per second (cfs) (Caltrans, 1993b).

Additional surface waters within the proposed project vicinity include Charter Oak Creek and Big Dalton Wash. Big Dalton Wash is a concrete-lined, rectangular drainage channel that collects stormwater from the region north of I-10 and crosses I-10 just west of the project corridor at Francisquito Avenue before discharging to Walnut Creek. This channel is capable of containing a 100-year flow of approximately 28,500 cfs. Charter Oak Creek, also a tributary of Walnut Creek, crosses I-10 just east of Citrus Street. There is also a minor unnamed drainage channel that crosses I-10 in an earthen channel to the west of Forest Lawn Memorial Park Cemetery.

There are many storm drains along this stretch of I-10 that flow from north to south and discharge to Walnut Creek south of the freeway. These storm drains run parallel to major streets crossing the freeway, and they all flow in closed conduits or box culverts. None of these storm drains are visible from the street level. All storm drains have been designed to carry the maximum flood flows as per County of Los Angeles design criteria (Caltrans, 1993b). Within the project corridor storm drain inlets are located on the freeway facility and local streets.

Existing beneficial uses for Walnut Creek, as designated in the Basin Plan, are for Wildlife Habitat and Wetlands. Surface water quality within the proposed project area is currently compromised from stormwater running off paved highway and roadway surfaces, medians, shoulders, and side slopes. Discharged water enters surface water systems either via outfall structures or localized runoff into scheduled detention structures and receiving waters. Walnut Creek is on the State’s ‘2006 CWA Section 303(d) List of Water Quality Limited Segments Requiring TMDLs’ for pH and toxicity (SWRCB, 2006); therefore, it is subject to total maximum daily load (TMDL) discharge restrictions for these constituents.

3.9.1.3 Groundwater

The proposed project site overlies the San Gabriel Valley Groundwater Basin (LARWQCB, 1995). The basin covers a surface area of approximately 255 square miles. The storage capacity of the basin has been estimated at approximately 10.7 million acre feet. This basin is bounded on the north by the Raymond Fault and the contact between Quaternary sediments and consolidated basement rocks of the San Gabriel Mountains. Exposed consolidated rocks of the Repetto, Merced, and Puente hills bound the basin on the south and west, with the Chino and San Jose faults forming the eastern boundary (DWR, 2004).

Depth to groundwater varies widely throughout the project corridor, from 60 to 500 feet below ground surface (bgs) elevation. The general quality of groundwater in the region has been substantially degraded by past disposal/discharge activities within specific areas of the basin. Volatile organic compounds (VOCs) from industry, as well as nitrates from subsurface sewage disposal and agriculture, are the primary groundwater contaminants. In the mid-
1990s, it was estimated that approximately 20 percent of groundwater production capacity for municipal purposes was shut down due to this pollution (LARWQCB, 1995).

### 3.9.1.4 Floodplains

One-hundred year flood flows within the proposed project area are contained within the major water courses described above and maintained by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (LACDPW). A review of 2008 flood insurance rate maps prepared by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) indicates the entire project area is within Zone X. These are areas protected from the 100-year flood event by levees that prevent overtopping of adjacent flood channels. This designation is consistent with conclusions reached in other project-specific floodplain studies prepared in 1993-94.

### 3.9.2 Regulatory Requirements

#### 3.9.2.1 Federal Laws and Regulations

**Clean Water Act.** In 1972, Congress amended the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, making the addition of pollutants to the waters of the United States from any point source unlawful unless the discharge is in compliance with a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. Known today as the Clean Water Act (CWA), Congress has amended it several times. In the 1987 amendments, Congress directed discharges of storm water from municipal and industrial/construction point sources to comply with the NPDES permit scheme. Important CWA sections are:

- Sections 303 and 304 require states to promulgate water quality standards, criteria, and guidelines.
- Section 401 requires an applicant for a federal license or permit to conduct any activity which may result in a discharge to waters of the U.S. to obtain certification from the State that the discharge will comply with other provisions of the Act. (Most frequently required in tandem with a Section 404 permit request. See below.)
- Section 402 establishes the NPDES, a permitting system for the discharges (except for dredge or fill material) of any pollutant into waters of the U.S. Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCB) administer this permitting program in California. Section 402(p) requires permits for discharges of storm water from industrial/construction and municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4s).
- Section 404 establishes a permit program for the discharge of dredge or fill material into waters of the U.S. This permit program is administered by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE).

The objective of the CWA is “to restore and maintain the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the Nation’s waters.”
USACE issues two types of 404 permits: Standard and General permits. There are two types of General permits, Regional permits and Nationwide permits. Regional permits are issued for a general category of activities when they are similar in nature and cause minimal environmental effect. Nationwide permits are issued to authorize a variety of minor project activities with no more than minimal effects.

There are two types of Standard permits: Individual permits and Letters of Permission. Ordinarily, projects that do not meet the criteria for a Nationwide Permit may be permitted under one of USACE’s Standard permits. For Standard permits, the USACE decision to approve is based on compliance with U.S. EPA’s Section 404 (b)(1) Guidelines (U.S. EPA CFR 40 Part 230), and whether permit approval is in the public interest. The Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines were developed by the U.S. EPA in conjunction with USACE, and allow the discharge of dredged or fill material into the aquatic system (waters of the U.S.) only if there is no practicable alternative which would have less adverse effects. The Guidelines state that USACE may not issue a permit if there is a least environmentally damaging practicable alternative (LEDPA), to the proposed discharge that would have lesser effects on waters of the U.S., and not have any other significant adverse environmental consequences. Per Guidelines, documentation is needed that a sequence of avoidance, minimization, and compensation measures has been followed, in that order. The Guidelines also restrict permitting activities that violate water quality or toxic effluent standards, jeopardize the continued existence of listed species, violate marine sanctuary protections, or cause “significant degradation” to waters of the U.S. In addition every permit from the USACE, even if not subject to the Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines, must meet general requirements. See 33 CFR 320.4. A discussion of the LEDPA determination, if any, for the document is included in the Wetlands and Other Waters section.

**Executive Order (EO) 11988.** EO 11988 (Floodplain Management) directs all federal agencies to refrain from conducting, supporting, or allowing actions in floodplains unless it is the only practicable alternative. The FHWA requirements for compliance are outlined in 23 CFR 650 Subpart A.

In order to comply, the following must be analyzed:

- The practicability of alternatives to any longitudinal encroachments
- Risks of the action
- Impacts on natural and beneficial floodplain values
- Support of incompatible floodplain development
- Measures to minimize floodplain impacts and to preserve/restore any beneficial floodplain values impacted by the project
The base floodplain is defined as “the area subject to flooding by the flood or tide having a 1 percent chance of being exceeded in any given year.” An encroachment is defined as “an action within the limits of the base floodplain.”

3.9.2.2 State Water Quality Laws and Regulations

Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act (California Water Code). California’s Porter-Cologne Act, enacted in 1969, provides the legal basis for water quality regulation within California. This Act requires a “Report of Waste Discharge” for any discharge of waste (i.e., liquid, solid, or gaseous) to land or surface waters that may impair beneficial uses for surface and/or groundwater of the state. It predates the CWA and regulates discharges to waters of the State. Waters of the State include more than just Waters of the U.S., like groundwater and surface waters not considered Waters of the U.S. Additionally, it prohibits discharges of “waste” as defined and this definition is broader than the CWA definition of “pollutant”. Discharges under the Porter-Cologne Act are permitted by Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) and may be required even when the discharge is already permitted or exempt under the CWA.

The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) and RWQCBs are responsible for establishing the water quality standards (i.e., objectives and beneficial uses) required by the CWA and regulating discharges to ensure compliance with the water quality standards. Details regarding water quality standards in a project area are contained in the applicable RWQCB Basin Plan. States designate beneficial uses for all water body segments, and then set criteria necessary to protect these uses. Consequently, the water quality standards developed for particular water segments are based on the designated use and vary depending on such use. In addition, each state identifies waters failing to meet standards for specific pollutants, which are state listed in accordance with CWA Section 303(d). If a state determines that waters are impaired for one or more constituents and the standards cannot be met through point source controls, the CWA requires the establishment of TMDLs. TMDLs specify allowable pollutant loads from all sources (i.e., point, nonpoint, and natural) for a given watershed.

State Water Resources Control Board and Regional Water Quality Control Boards. The SWRCB administers water rights, water pollution control, and water quality functions throughout the state. RWQCBs are responsible for protecting beneficial uses of water resources within their regional jurisdiction using planning, permitting, and enforcement authorities to meet this responsibility.

- NPDES Program
  Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems

Section 402(p) of the CWA requires the issuance of NPDES permits for five categories of storm water dischargers, including Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4s). The U.S. EPA defines an MS4 as any conveyance or system of
conveyances (roads with drainage systems, municipal streets, catch basins, curbs, gutters, ditches, human-made channels, and storm drains) owned or operated by a state, city, town, county, or other public body having jurisdiction over storm water, that are designed or used for collecting or conveying storm water. The SWRCB has identified the Caltrans as an owner/operator of an MS4 by the SWRCB. This permit covers all Caltrans rights-of-way, properties, facilities, and activities in the state. The SWRCB or the RWQCB issues NPDES permits for five years, and permit requirements remain active until a new permit has been adopted.

The Caltrans’s MS4 Permit, under revision at the time of this update, contains three basic requirements:

1. The Caltrans must comply with the requirements of the Construction General Permit (see below);

2. Caltrans must implement a year-round program in all parts of the State to effectively control storm water and non-storm water discharges; and

3. Caltrans storm water discharges must meet water quality standards through implementation of permanent and temporary (construction) Best Management Practices (BMPs) and other measures.

To comply with the permit, Caltrans developed the Statewide Storm Water Management Plan (SWMP) to address storm water pollution controls related to highway planning, design, construction, and maintenance activities throughout California. The SWMP assigns responsibilities within Caltrans for implementing storm water management procedures and practices as well as training, public education and participation, monitoring and research, program evaluation, and reporting activities. The SWMP describes the minimum procedures and practices Caltrans uses to reduce pollutants in storm water and non-storm water discharges. It outlines procedures and responsibilities for protecting water quality, including the selection and implementation of BMPs. The proposed Project will be programmed to follow the guidelines and procedures outlined in the latest SWMP to address storm water runoff.

Part of and appended to the SWMP is the Storm Water Data Report (SWDR) and its associated checklists. The SWDR documents the relevant storm water design decisions made regarding project compliance with the MS4 NPDES permit. The preliminary information in the SWDR prepared during the Project Initiation Document (PID) phase will be reviewed, updated, confirmed, and if required, revised in the SWDR prepared for the later phases of the project. The information contained in the SWDR may be used to make more informed decisions regarding the selection of BMPs and/or recommended avoidance, minimization, or mitigation measures to address water quality impacts.
Construction General Permit

Construction General Permit (Order No. 2009-009-DWQ), adopted on September 2, 2009, became effective on July 1, 2010. The permit regulates storm water discharges from construction sites which result in a Disturbed Soil Area (DSA) of one acre or greater, and/or are smaller sites that are part of a larger common plan of development. By law, all storm water discharges associated with construction activity where clearing, grading, and excavation results in soil disturbance of at least one acre must comply with the provisions of the General Construction Permit. Construction activity that results in soil disturbances of less than one acre is subject to this Construction General Permit if there is potential for significant water quality impairment resulting from the activity as determined by the RWQCB. Operators of regulated construction sites are required to develop storm water pollution prevention plans; to implement sediment, erosion, and pollution prevention control measures; and to obtain coverage under the Construction General Permit.

The 2009 Construction General Permit separates projects into Risk Levels 1, 2, or 3. Risk levels are determined during the planning and design phases, and are based on potential erosion and transport to receiving waters. Requirements apply according to the Risk Level determined. For example, a Risk Level 3 (highest risk) project would require compulsory storm water runoff pH and turbidity monitoring, and before construction and after construction aquatic biological assessments during specified seasonal windows. For all projects subject to the permit, applicants are required to develop and implement an effective Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). In accordance with Caltrans’ Standard Specifications, a Water Pollution Control Plan (WPCP) is necessary for projects with DSA less than one acre.

Section 401 Permitting

Under Section 401 of the Clean Water Act (CWA), any project requiring a federal license or permit that may result in a discharge to a water body must obtain a 401 Certification, which certifies that the project will be in compliance with State water quality standards. The most common federal permits triggering 401 Certification are CWA Section 404 permits issued by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). The 401 permit certifications are obtained from the appropriate Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), dependent on the project location, and are required before USACE issues a 404 permit.

In some cases the RWQCB may have specific concerns with discharges associated with a project. As a result, the RWQCB may issue a set of requirements known as Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) under the State Water Code that define activities, such as the inclusion of specific features, effluent limitations, monitoring, and plan submittals that are to be implemented for protecting or benefiting water quality. WDRs can be issued to address both permanent and temporary discharges of a project.
3.9.3 **Significance Criteria**

Criteria for determining the significance of impacts related to hydrology, floodplains, and water quality are based on the CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G – Environmental Checklist. Construction or operation impacts would be considered significant if they were to:

**WTR-1:** Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements;

**WTR-2:** Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level;

**WTR-3:** Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;

**WTR-4:** Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site;

**WTR-5:** Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff;

**WTR-6:** Otherwise substantially degrade water quality;

**WTR-7:** Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a FEMA map or other flood hazard delineation map;

**WTR-8:** Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows;

**WTR-9:** Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam; or

**WTR-10:** Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

3.9.4 **Impacts**

3.9.4.1 **No Project Alternative**

The No Project Alternative would not include construction and operation of HOV lanes within the subject corridor. While no construction-related water quality impacts would occur, the U.S. District Court, Central District of California has mandated via Stipulation and Order (Case No. 93-6073-ER [JRX]) that Corridor Storm Water Management Studies be prepared on the District 7 drainage system for freeway corridors situated in Los Angeles and Ventura counties. A separate study of I-10, to be completed either with or without the proposed project, will be prepared to identify appropriate sites for infiltration devices, media filters, detention devices,
biofiltration strips, biofiltration swales, and other Treatment BMPs. These BMPs would be incrementally constructed over time in coordination with future freeway improvements.

3.9.4.2 Proposed Project Alternative

Impact WTR-1: The proposed project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.

Temporary. The greatest potential for impacts to water quality would be during project construction when slope erosion and siltation would increase in the drainage area. With BMP controls, runoff from the site is not expected to channelize and cause gullying and scour; however, new slopes would be created and existing slopes would be modified, which might require concentrated flow conveyance systems. Siltation discharges from construction activities could result in increased nutrient loading and total suspended solids concentration. Without appropriate controls, these construction impacts would affect all drainages downstream of the project area and pose a potentially adverse impact to water quality.

Working details and standard specification provisions for vegetated and hard surface protection systems would be reviewed and provided during the Plans, Specifications, and Estimates (PS&E) phase of project development. With implementation of a project-specific SWPPP that identifies construction site BMPs, sediment discharges would be minimized, and no water quality standards or waste discharge requirements would be violated.

Construction activities would result in additional polluted runoff because of construction-related pollution and waste discharge. Pollutants associated with construction activities, including gasoline, oil, rubber particles, herbicides, pesticide, paint, adhesives, tar, and other chemicals, and the generation of construction-related waste materials, have the potential to affect surface water quality downstream of the project construction site. The chemical contamination of site runoff during construction activities would pose a potentially adverse impact to water quality. The SWPPP would include controls to be implemented for nonstormwater discharges/good housekeeping practices to minimize the potential effect of these discharges during construction.

During the construction stage, all disturbed slopes would be vegetated, and surface water from the project site would be diverted to designed collection and permanent treatment facilities along the roadway. This work would minimize the effects of erosion and downstream siltation on any of the receiving waters once the HOV lanes are operational.

Permanent. As discussed, the existing freeway is paved in the median under current conditions; therefore, the proposed project would not entail addition of extensive new impervious surface area. It is anticipated that the hydraulic efficiency of the stormwater control and drainage system would be improved under the proposed project, resulting in a system capable of treatment to the standard for water quality flows as required in Caltrans’ Project Planning and Design Guide.
With implementation of biofiltration strips/swales, detention devices, infiltration devices, media filters, or any combination thereof, the design of the proposed project aims to treat all of the onsite runoff water quality volume (WQV). In addition, where possible, the runoff from all bridges would be conveyed to Treatment BMPs. No bridge runoff would be discharged directly into waterways; therefore, the proposed project would not substantially degrade water quality. This would be an overall benefit to the environment compared to the existing system.

The project would not increase activities commensurate with dry weather flows; therefore, there should be no increase of dry weather flows (Caltrans, 2002b).

According to the Caltrans Project Planning and Design Guide (Caltrans 2007), pollutants that are identified as targeted design constituents (TDCs) are treatable by currently available Caltrans-approved Treatment BMPs. A project must consider treatment to control a TDC when an affected water body within the project limits or within the subwatershed is on the Section 303(d) list for one or more of these constituents. When it is determined that no TDCs are identified for the receiving waters, the Project Planning and Design Guide recommends considering all Caltrans-approved Treatment BMPs for general purpose pollutant removal. The applicability of all nine Caltrans-approved Treatment BMPs would be analyzed as part of this project. Walnut Creek within the proposed project vicinity is on the Section 303(d) list for pH and toxicity; however, it is noted that pH and toxicity are not pollutants that are generated from roadway surfaces.

With the combination of Treatment BMPs and various design pollution prevention BMPs (e.g., providing benches or terraces on high cut and fill slopes, rounding slopes, flaring the ends of outlets, and incorporating headwalls, transition structures, and splash walls where necessary), water quality would not be substantially degraded.

**Impact WTR-2: The proposed project would not affect groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level.**

The proposed project site overlies the San Gabriel Valley Groundwater Basin (LARWQCB, 1995). Storm flows during both project construction and operation would be controlled before discharge to existing storm drain infrastructure. Construction activities would not impact groundwater quantity or quality (Caltrans, 2002b). Reasons for this conclusion include: (1) existing site is already predominantly covered with impervious surfaces; (2) groundwater in proposed project area is at considerable depth (i.e., greater than 50 feet bgs); and (3) the proposed project would not use groundwater for any purposes. Given these considerations, the proposed project would not be expected to interfere substantially with groundwater recharge and would not create a net deficit in aquifer volume or lower the local groundwater table level; therefore, groundwater resources would not be adversely affected by implementing the proposed project.
Impact WTR-3: The proposed project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site.

The proposed project would result in only minor changes to the existing drainage pattern within the subject I-10 corridor, and with the aforementioned BMP controls would not result in related erosion or downstream siltation either on- or off-site. In addition, the Caltrans Highway Design Manual requires the design of modified highways to direct storm and landscaping runoff to storm drains and to avoid unnecessary flow of water over unpaved and nonlandscaped areas; therefore, the proposed project would not result in substantial impacts related to erosion.

Impact WTR-4: The proposed project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site.

As mentioned above, the proposed project would result in only minor changes to the existing drainage pattern within the subject I-10 corridor. Walnut Creek crosses the project corridor in a reinforced concrete box culvert to the west of Grand Avenue. An unnamed drainage also crosses the project corridor west of Forest Lawn Memorial Park Cemetery in an earth-lined channel. Because no permanent structures would be placed within these watercourses, the proposed project would not result in adverse impacts related to changes in water courses. It would be determined during detailed design stage whether temporary encroachment at Walnut Creek or the aforementioned unnamed drainage would be required during construction.

In general, a floodplain cannot be altered in any way until it has been shown that such alteration would pass the base flood without significant damage to either the floodplain or surrounding property. Bridge abutments or embankment cannot encroach on a regulatory floodway. This project would discharge to both lined and unlined channels. Avoidance and minimization measures to address these considerations are described below.

Impact WTR-5: The proposed project would not create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional source of polluted runoff.

Most of the locations where new construction is expected to occur are currently paved. The Design Manual requires that 100 percent of potential runoff from new impervious surface areas associated with the proposed project be treated before off-site discharge. In addition, current drainage facilities within the project area have been determined to have adequate capacity for the incremental increase in runoff associated with the proposed project; however, drainage facility upgrades would be made, where required, to provide improved
treatment of runoff. Drainage facilities would be designed to be consistent with established drainage plans for the area.

**WTR-6: The project would not substantially degrade water quality.**

See response to WTR-1. Walnut Creek, which drains Puddingstone Reservoir before crossing I-10 west of Grand Avenue and traversing parallel to and south of the freeway, is listed as a Section 303(d) water body for pH and toxicity. BMP controls for pH and toxics would be implemented during construction. Considering traffic volume is expected to grow substantially in the future, the amount of motor vehicle-related pollutants discharged into the watershed and drainage channels from impervious surfaces would increase either with or without implementation of the proposed project. Because so much of the existing proposed project site is impervious, the increased area of impervious surfaces would be small. The project design would include permanent BMPs to control and minimize discharge of pollutants to the watershed. Given these considerations, the proposed project would not have a significant impact on local water resources and quality.

The groundwater table in this area is at depths from approximately 50 to 500 feet bgs elevation. Because there are only limited areas of pervious surfaces in the existing I-10 ROW, this area is not a major source of groundwater recharge; therefore, the proposed project would not result in any substantial change in the rate or amount of groundwater recharge. Given the depth to groundwater and the existing impervious nature of the site, it is concluded that the proposed project would not impact groundwater quality in this area.

**WTR-7: The project would not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a FEMA map or other flood hazard delineation map.**

The proposed project would not involve construction of housing within the 100-year flood hazard area.

**WTR-8: The project would not place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows.**

See response to WTR-4. A review of 2008 flood insurance rate maps prepared by FEMA indicates the entire project area is within Zone X. These are areas protected from the 100-year flood event by levees that prevent overtopping of adjacent flood channels. This designation is consistent with conclusions reached in other project-specific floodplain studies prepared in 1993-94. The design of the proposed project at drainage crossings and stormwater facilities would be coordinated with LACDPW and the Public Works Departments of the local jurisdictions.

The project would involve new HOV lanes, auxiliary lanes, and other improvements mostly located within the existing freeway ROW. The project does not involve new highways or new freeway access locations that would foster incompatible developments within
floodplains. To minimize impacts on existing flooding levels, hydraulic modeling would be required to evaluate the effect of proposed improvements in these areas, along with flood mitigation where necessary.

Runoff volumes would not increase substantially because there would be only a minor increase in impervious surface area on I-10 as a result of the proposed project. Runoff from I-10, including the HOV lanes, would be accommodated by the existing storm drain system; therefore, the proposed project would not result in substantial changes in the amount of water in surface water bodies.

**WTR-9: The project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.**

I-10 within the project area is located within the inundation areas of three upstream reservoirs: Santa Fe, San Dimas, and Puddingstone dams. Santa Fe Dam, located in the City of Irwindale approximately 2.5 miles north of I-10, is a ‘dry dam’ operated by USACE. This facility is used for groundwater recharge, control of heavy runoff, and as a backup for upstream reservoirs. San Dimas Dam, located in the Angeles National Forest north of the City of San Dimas, has a rated capacity of 1,496 acre-feet. Puddingstone Dam, located at Frank G. Bonelli County Regional Park approximately 1-mile north of I-10, has a limited capacity by agreement of 6,083 acre-feet. Flows released from this reservoir discharge to Walnut Creek. The latter two facilities are managed by LACDPW. The dam owners/operators have developed Emergency Action Plans for each of these facilities, as required by FEMA (City of West Covina, 2004). The proposed project would not increase exposure of the existing freeway to the flood water effects in the very unlikely event of failure on one of these dams. The very small risk associated with failure of one of these dams could affect a wide swath of the project area, not just the existing I-10 with future improvements; therefore, the proposed project would not likely result in an increase in exposure of people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding.

**WTR-10: The project would not be constructed in an area that is subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.**

The project site is not located on a lake and is approximately 30 miles inland from the nearest coastal area, so there is no potential for inundation by seiche or tsunami. See response to Section 3.7.4.2 regarding the potential impact associated with a mudflow.

Project implementation would not require the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems; therefore, no impacts associated with use of a septic system would occur.
3.9.5 Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required for hydrology or water quality; however, the following measures will be included to avoid or minimize impacts associated with hydrology and water quality issues:

- As part of the I-10 HOV Lane Project final design, Caltrans will conduct a detailed hydrologic analysis to determine if any flood control devices will require modification to protect the project site and facility from design flood levels. The final design of these flood control devices will be coordinated with all affected cities and the LACDPW.

- Caltrans will coordinate with FEMA prior to completion of the final project design to confirm any necessary revisions to the FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Maps or FEMA Special Flood Hazard Areas maps.

- For impacts WTR-1 and WTR-6, no mitigation measures are required during construction, assuming Contractor conformance to current federal, state, and local regulatory requirements to minimize impacts to water resources and water quality.

- The Caltrans SWMP describes BMPs and practices to reduce the discharge of pollutants associated with the stormwater drainage systems of state highways, facilities, and activities. The completed project plans would incorporate all necessary Maintenance BMPs (Category IA), Design Pollution BMPs (Category IB), and Treatment BMPs (Category III) to meet the maximum extent practicable requirements. As part of the project design development, a Storm Water Data Report (SWDR) will be prepared to document the decision-making process relating to the selection and implementation of BMPs. The SWDR will be updated as the project progresses towards final design.

- BMPs to be incorporated into the project during construction will be required for soil stabilization (erosion control), sediment control, temporary tracking control, wind erosion control, and non-stormwater runoff management. Primary BMPs anticipated for the proposed action shown in Table 3.9-1.

- A written site-specific Construction Site Monitoring Plan (CSMP) will be developed prior to commencement of construction activities, and it shall be revised as necessary to reflect project revisions. The CSMP will be developed to meet the specific requirements and objectives identified in the General Permit for the proposed project’s risk level to be identified in the SWPPP. The CSMP shall include monitoring procedures and instructions, location maps, forms, and checklists, and a description of the project site’s watershed, including drainage patterns and all site discharge locations. The CSMP will include specific details about sample collection frequency; sample constituents; sample collection methodologies, including clean
sample collection techniques; and use of pH and turbidity field meters and field quality assurance/quality control.

In addition to the above-mentioned minimization measures, the following measures were identified in the MMRP (2003):

- A small concrete lined drainage parallel to eastbound I-10 west of Kellogg Drive will be realigned. Permits will be required from the Army Corps of Engineers (Clean Water Act Section 404 permit), Regional Water Quality Control Board, (Clean Water Act Section 401 permit) and California Department of Fish and Game (Section 1601 Streambed Alteration Agreement). This drainage will be replaced in kind using Best Management Practices for water quality and in conjunction with the desires of the applicable permitting agencies.

- During final design, detailed hydrologic analysis will be conducted to determine if any flood control devices would require modification to protect the site and facility from design flood levels. The final design of the flood control devices will be coordinated with the Cities of Baldwin Park, West Covina, Covina, San Dimas and Pomona and the LAs Angeles County Department of Public Works (LACDPW).

- The final design of the proposed project will be coordinated with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) to confirm any needed revisions to the FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Maps or FEMA Special Flood Hazard Areas Maps.

- The proposed project would be subject to the requirements of Caltrans' existing National Pollutant Discharge Elimination Systems (NPDES) permit regarding water pollution control. Caltrans would coordinate construction and operation of the proposed project under the existing NPDES permit with the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), consistent with the requirements of the existing permit, for any discharges of wastes to surface waters. Issues related to water quality would be mitigated to a level less than significant based on implementation of existing Caltrans plans and programs which address water pollution control and stormwater management. These are the Department Storm Water Management Plan (SWMP) and the Storm Water Quality Handbooks (three manuals: Project Planning Design Guidelines, Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and Water Pollution Control Program (WPCP) Preparation Manual). In addition, District Directive DD20 also applies to storm water management. These plans and programs would apply to the proposed project.

- Appropriate erosion control measures will be incorporated in a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) approved by Caltrans Resident Engineer. The SWPPP will be implemented during site preparation, grading and construction. The SWPPP will include, but not be limited to, measures to protect exposed slope areas, control of surface flows over exposed soils, use of wetting or sealing agents and/or sedimentation ponds.
### Table 3.9-1
Best Management Practices Applicable to the Proposed Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BMP Purpose</th>
<th>Best Management Practice</th>
<th>ID Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Erosion Control</td>
<td>Scheduling</td>
<td>SS-1</td>
<td>Sequence construction activities minimize soil exposed at any one time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preservation of Existing Vegetation</td>
<td>SS-2</td>
<td>Preserve existing vegetation where required and feasible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geotextiles, Plastic Covers, and Erosion Control Blankets/Mats</td>
<td>SS-7</td>
<td>Plastic sheeting will be used to cover soil stockpiles; geotextile blankets will be used to provide soil stabilization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wind Erosion Control</td>
<td>WE-1</td>
<td>Potable water will be applied to disturbed soil areas to control dust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sediment Control</td>
<td>Temporary Silt Fence</td>
<td>SC-1</td>
<td>Silt fences will be deployed along toe of exterior cut and fill slopes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Temporary Check Dam</td>
<td>SC-4</td>
<td>Check dams will be installed along temporary earthen channels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Temporary Gravel Bag Berm</td>
<td>SC-6</td>
<td>Gravel bag berms will be installed along temporary earthen swales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Street Sweeping</td>
<td>SC-7</td>
<td>Sweeping will be conducted during export/import of dirt and at end of shift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Temporary Drain Inlet Protection</td>
<td>SC-10</td>
<td>Storm drain inlet protection will be used at all internal inlets to the system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracking Control</td>
<td>Temporary Construction Entrance</td>
<td>TC-1</td>
<td>Stabilize all entrances/exits to construction site staging areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-stormwater Control</td>
<td>Water Control and Conservation</td>
<td>NS-1</td>
<td>Water application rates will be minimized to prevent runoff &amp; ponding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paving, Sealing, Sawcutting and Grinding Operations</td>
<td>NS-3</td>
<td>During these operations, all inlets will be covered with plastic; vacuum will be used to collect sawcutting residue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vehicle and Equipment Washing</td>
<td>NS-8</td>
<td>Vehicles and equipment will be washed at an appropriate disposal facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vehicle and Equipment Fueling</td>
<td>NS-9</td>
<td>Drip pans will be used during mobile fueling; spill kits will be kept on fuel truck during fueling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vehicle and Equipment Maintenance</td>
<td>NS-10</td>
<td>Drip pans will be used during all vehicle equipment and maintenance activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concrete Curing and Finishing</td>
<td>NS-12, NS-14</td>
<td>Excess water from curing will be contained within the excavation area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Caltrans, 2011.*
For impacts WTR-8 and WTR-9, existing regulations require that the project be designed to avoid or minimize impacts to floodplains. See also above MMs WTR-1 and WTR-2. Given this consideration, no mitigation is required.

No mitigation measures are required for impacts WTR-2, WTR-3, WTR-5, WTR-7, and WTR-10.

3.9.6 Level of Significance after Mitigation

Considering the extensive laws and regulations in place to protect the environment from water pollution and floodplain damage, it is concluded that hydrology and water quality impacts due to the proposed project would be less than significant.
3.10 Land Use

This section assesses potential land use impacts associated with the proposed project. The analysis includes a discussion of existing land uses by local jurisdiction within 0.25-mile of the project corridor (defined for analysis purposes as the ‘study area’). In addition, potential property acquisitions along the ROW are addressed. Information for this section was obtained from the Interstate 10 High Occupancy Vehicle Lanes Community Impact Assessment (Caltrans, 2008b).

3.10.1 Existing Conditions

3.10.1.1 Existing Land Uses

City of Baldwin Park. From Puente Avenue to approximately Ardilla Avenue, commercial (i.e., Baldwin Park Town Center) uses dominate this part of the study area north of I-10. Single- and multi-family residential, commercial (i.e., motel, auto dealership), institutional (i.e., Golden State Care Center), and light industrial uses are located in the study area south of I-10.

City of West Covina. North of I-10 between Ardilla and Pacific avenues, there are single- and multi-family residential, institutional (i.e., preschool and vocational training) and commercial (i.e., offices) uses. Commercial (i.e., office, motel, and retail) uses dominate from Pacific Avenue to Sunset Avenue. Institutional (i.e., Vincent Children’s Center and Options Head Start School), single- and multi-family residential, and commercial (i.e., Channel Communications and Piano City) uses extend from Sunset to Vincent avenues. From Vincent to Azusa avenues, there are commercial and residential (i.e., single- and multi-family) uses. A mix of uses, including commercial (i.e., Hollenbeck Office Center, restaurant), single- and multi-family residential, and vacant land extend from Azusa to Hollenbeck avenues. From Hollenbeck to Citrus avenues, commercial, institutional, and mult-family residential uses are the principle land uses. The Westfield Eastland Shopping Center, which includes retail and commercial uses, extends from Citrus Street to Barranca Avenue. From Barranca Avenue to Fairway Lane, commercial (i.e., restaurant, hotel, Grand Creek Plaza) and office uses (i.e., Foothill Transit) are the dominant uses. There are existing single-family residential uses from Fairway Lane to approximately Forest Hills Drive.

South of I-10 between approximately Ardilla Avenue east to Orange Avenue, there are a mix of single- and multi-family residential, vacant land, institutional (i.e., Beverly Manor Convalescent Hospital and Pierce Brothers Mortuary), and commercial (i.e., City Gate Business Park) uses. From Orange to Sunset avenues, commercial (i.e., Kmart and Jo-Ann Fabric & Crafts) and institutional (i.e., Doctor’s Hospital of West Covina) uses exist. Commercial (i.e., retail and office) uses from Sunset to Glendora avenues include Westfield West Covina, The Lakes at West Covina, and Edwards Cinema West Covina 18. There are commercial (i.e., Sammelman Mortgage and Carrows Restaurant) and single-family residential uses between Glendora and Azusa avenues. From Azusa to Hollenbeck avenues, there are
commercial (i.e., auto dealerships) and residential uses. Residential and commercial (i.e., restaurant) uses are located between Hollenbeck and Citrus avenues. Commercial (i.e., office and retail shops) uses are located from Citrus to Grand avenues. A mix of residential, institutional (i.e., Temple Ami Shalom and West Covina Hills Seventh-Day Adventist Church and School), and vacant land are located between Grand Avenue and Horseshoe Circle.

**City of Covina.** North of I-10, from approximately Forest Hills Drive to Park View Drive, commercial uses dominate the area, including business parks and the Radisson Suites Hotel. Jalapa Park is located immediately north of the Holt Avenue off-ramp. Land uses south of I-10 are located within unincorporated Los Angeles County.

**City of San Dimas.** Single-family residences constitute the dominant land use north of I-10 from Via Verde Street to the SR 57/SR 71 interchange. Frank G. Bonelli Regional Park is located to the northeast of the SR 57/SR 71 interchange within the project study area. There are no land uses south of I-10 under the jurisdiction of the City of San Dimas.

**City of Walnut.** South of I-10, between Forest Lawn Memorial Park and Cal Poly, Pomona, the northern city limits of Walnut extend to the vicinity of I-10 where the hilly land is used as open space.

**City of Pomona.** Public facilities and business park space dominate within the proposed project area. Cal Poly, Pomona, is located on the south side of I-10, and office park space occupies the space southeast of the SR 57/SR 71 interchange.

**Los Angeles County.** Extending from Holt Avenue to Via Verde Street, unincorporated land on both sides of I-10 are predominantly developed with large-lot single-family residential uses. There is also an existing park-and-ride facility on the north side of I-10 at Via Verde Street. South of I-10, land under Los Angeles County jurisdiction consists of institutional (i.e., Forest Lawn Memorial Park) and single-family residential uses.

Table 3.10-1 provides a summary of land uses in the immediate vicinity of the proposed project. Figure 3.10-1 indicates current land use in the study area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Land Use Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From Puente Avenue to Citrus Avenue (north of I-10)</td>
<td>Consists mostly of single-family residential with dense pockets of commercial at the west and east end of this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Puente Avenue to Citrus Avenue (south of I-10)</td>
<td>Consists mostly of single-family residential with one dense pocket of public facilities surrounded by an even larger pocket of commercial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Citrus Avenue to SR 57/ SR 71 (north of I-10)</td>
<td>Less dense than the western portion of the project area, this area consists mostly of single-family residential, the other half of the commercial pocket on the west side, and the only two parks in the project study area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Citrus Avenue to SR 57/ SR 71 (south of I-10)</td>
<td>Less dense than the western portion of the project area, much of this area consists of Forest Lawn Memorial Park, with single-family residential on the west side and commercial on the east side.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Parsons, 2008.*
Figure 3.10-1  Land Use Map
3.10.2 Regulatory Requirements

3.10.2.1 Adopted Plans

Adopted plans that guide development within the study area include the General Plans of the cities of Baldwin Park, West Covina, Covina, San Dimas, Walnut, and Pomona, as well as Los Angeles County.

The General Plan is the basic planning document for a city or county that provides the blueprint for development of the community. It must address the following seven State-prescribed elements: land use, circulation, housing, conservation, open space, noise, and safety. The Land Use Element (LUE) of a General Plan identifies the proposed distribution and intensity of housing, business, industry, open space, natural resources, public facilities, waste disposal, and other categories of public and private land uses.

City of Baldwin Park General Plan

The City’s General Plan, adopted in 2002, consists of nine specific elements and an Implementation Program. The nine specific elements are land use, urban design, economic development, circulation, housing, open space and conservation, public safety, noise, and air quality (City of Baldwin Park, 2002).

Established policies and implementation measures relevant to the proposed project include provisions for development or redevelopment of mixed-use commercial centers near the freeway, and encouraging development of low-scale, low-intensity commercial and industrial uses that are oriented primarily toward serving the local resident and business populations. The Plan also includes circulation provisions encouraging direct coordination with Caltrans to improve I-10.

Redevelopment Project Areas. Three redevelopment project areas lie within the project study area: Delta Redevelopment Project, Sierra Vista Redevelopment Project, and Puente/Merced Amended Redevelopment Project. Baldwin Park does not have any city-initiated redevelopment projects. Currently, these redevelopment areas do not have any pending projects within the project study area.

City of West Covina General Plan

Last updated in 1985, the City’s General Plan includes goals, policies, implementation measures, and maps for land use decisions made in the city. The General Plan characterizes the city as largely residential and focuses nonresidential uses in two major commercial cores: the CBD and Eastland.

The principle General Plan land use designations in the vicinity of I-10 are residential and commercial uses. Areas along and immediately north of I-10 in the east part of the study area are principally service and neighborhood commercial uses. Proceeding east from the city’s boundary with Baldwin Park along West Garvey Avenue North and south to North Sunset
Avenue, the General Plan land use designations include medium-high residential, public facilities, service and neighborhood commercial, and regional commercial. Continuing east from North Sunset Avenue along West Garvey Avenue North to Azusa Avenue, the designated land uses are regional commercial, service, and neighborhood commercial, and low-medium, medium, and medium-high residential. From Azusa Avenue east to Citrus Avenue, the land use designations are service and neighborhood commercial and low-medium, medium, and medium-high residential. Continuing east to the city’s boundary, land use designations include regional commercial; service and neighborhood commercial; planned development; and very-low, low-medium, and suburban residential (City of West Covina, 1985).

General Plan policies and implementation measures relevant to the proposed project emphasize preservation of the city’s existing residential character, provision of a range of nonresidential uses to ensure a strong economic base, providing a safe and efficient means of circulation, and maintaining an aesthetically pleasant environment for those who live, work, play, and visit West Covina. The Circulation Element of the General Plan is unavailable for online review for West Covina.

Redevelopment Project Areas. West Covina has two redevelopment project areas that are spread throughout the city: West Covina Redevelopment Project Area and City Wide Redevelopment Project Area. Much of the redevelopment project area boundaries run along the I-10 corridor, with the West Covina Redevelopment Project Area boundary encompassing most of the redevelopment volume in the city. Currently, one redevelopment project is underway within the project study area: Westfield West Covina Mall expansion, 112 Plaza Drive (Phase III).

City of Covina General Plan
The City’s General Plan LUE, last updated in 1989, indicates that land uses adjacent to I-10 include general commercial and low-density residential. According to the LUE map, general commercial uses are designated for areas north of I-10 from approximately Forest Hills Drive east along East Garvey Avenue North to Holt Avenue. In the city’s sphere of influence, low-density residential is designated for areas immediately adjacent to the city boundary, north of I-10 and generally east of Holt Avenue, in unincorporated Los Angeles County (City of Covina, 1989).

General Plan policies and implementation measures relevant to the proposed project emphasize accommodation of moderate residential, commercial, and industrial development, and an attractive community that maintains a good image and small-town atmosphere, economic and social vitality, and provision of sufficient public facilities and services. The Circulation Element of the General Plan is unavailable for online review for Covina.

Redevelopment Project Areas. Covina has one redevelopment project area that lies within the proposed project area: Project Area One. A portion of Project Area One abuts the northern
edge of I-10 near Holt Avenue. There are no major redevelopment projects located within the project study area in the city.

**City of San Dimas General Plan**
The City’s General Plan LUE, last updated in 1991, designates land in the I-10 project study area as single-family, very low density, and public/semi-public. The LUE identifies Via Verde Street/I-10 as a City Entryway or Gateway and recommends that this area be developed with unique landscaping and a city entry sign in medians or public property to create a sense of identity (City of San Dimas, 1991).

General Plan policies and implementation measures relevant to the proposed project emphasize maintenance of a rural, small town, low-density atmosphere; provision of adequate and essential services, utilities, and recreational and open space facilities; planning an urban form that efficiently utilizes urban infrastructure and services; well-planned commercial centers and nodes; and a unified and high-quality visual image for the city. The Plan also includes a circulation provision with the objective to increase vehicle occupancy rates.

**Redevelopment Project Areas.** The two redevelopment project areas in San Dimas are located outside the project study area.

**City of Walnut General Plan**
The City’s General Plan, adopted in 1978, consists of seven specific elements. The seven specific elements are land use, circulation, housing, environmental resources management (i.e., conservation, open space, recreation, and scenic highways), public safety, noise, and sewer. Walnut is primarily a residential community. The fundamental goal of the General Plan is to preserve its rural character (City of Walnut, 1978).

Established General Plan policy and implementation measures relevant to the proposed project include minimizing alteration of the natural terrain and encouraging maintenance of all land and improvements in a safe, healthful, and attractive condition. There are no circulation policies relevant to the proposed project.

**Redevelopment Project Areas.** The only area of the city located near I-10 is within the Walnut Improvement Agency. The City of Walnut has no plans for development in this area.

**California State Polytechnic University, Pomona Campus Master Plan**
The Campus Master Plan, issued in July 2000, aims to create a physical environment that fosters the university’s educational mission of advancing learning and knowledge for students. The Master Plan acknowledges the presence of I-10 in its discussion of campus boundaries, vehicular systems, viewsheds, and access points. A new parking structure is planned in the Campus Master Plan at the entrance to the University near I-10. Strategic policy goals of the Cal Poly, Pomona Campus Master Plan that are relevant to the proposed
project include enhancing effective acquisition, planning and management of resources, and increasing community involvement.

**City of Pomona General Plan**

The City’s General Plan was adopted in 1976; a 2007 Draft update is available on the City of Pomona Web site. Although minor amendments have been made to the General Plan since its adoption, the 1976 version continues to serve as the fundamental land use planning document for the City. The City of Pomona General Plan consists of six specific elements and the Plan for Land Use. The six specific elements are environmental resources, community design, residential, economic development, circulation-transportation, and human resources. The LUE of the City’s General Plan focuses primarily on the amount and location of new development.

There are two plan areas in Pomona particularly relevant to this project: California State Polytechnic, Pomona to the south of I-10 and the Kellogg/University Corporate Center Specific Plan that abuts the SR 57/SR 71 interchange. Land use designations in that area are primarily public facilities, with a small portion near the interchange that permits nonresidential development (City of Pomona, 2007).

The following established policy and implementation measure in the City’s General Plan is relevant to the proposed project: protect the livability of neighborhoods to prevent the intrusion of incompatible land hazards such as noise, noxious fumes, and through traffic into residential areas. The Plan also includes circulation provisions to reduce single-occupancy vehicle travel and manage congestion on nearby freeways.

**Kellogg/University Corporate Center Specific Plan.** The Kellogg/University Corporate Center Specific Plan is a 52-acre business park located adjacent to the SR 57/SR 71 interchange. The specific plan area is partially developed with 1.5 million allowable square feet of research and development, office, hotel, retail, and other supporting uses. DeVry University and other office uses are currently located on the site.

**Redevelopment Project Areas.** The area immediately adjacent to the SR 57/SR 71 interchange is located within the West Holt Redevelopment Project Area. There are no planned or recently completed redevelopment projects located within the project study area in Pomona.

**County of Los Angeles General Plan**

The County of Los Angeles General Plan, adopted in 1980, serves as a long-range planning document to provide the framework for future development and resource conservation. The Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning has made a copy of the County’s Draft 2035 General Plan (April 2011) available online; however, the 1980 version is the only adopted plan. The General Plan contains the following seven elements: land use, circulation, conservation and open space, noise, safety, public services and facilities, and economic
development. Each element includes broad policies and goals to guide development and local decision making. The elements also include implementation strategies for achieving stated policies and goals.

The following policy in the County’s Draft 2035 General Plan is relevant to the proposed project: promote and encourage transit-oriented development (TOD) along major transportation and transit corridors (Los Angeles County, 2011); however, because that Plan is not yet adopted, policies from the 1980 General Plan are relevant at this time. The 1980 General Plan includes a land use provision relevant to the proposed project that encourages clustering of highway-oriented commercial facilities. The Plan also includes circulation provisions to improve traffic flow (Los Angeles County, 1980).

Redevelopment Project Areas. There are no designated redevelopment project areas in unincorporated Los Angeles County within the I-10 project study area.

3.10.2.2 Relocation Assistance

As required by existing federal and state laws, Caltrans will comply with the provisions of the Uniform Relocation and Assistance Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended (California Government Code, Chapter 16, Section 7260, et. seq.). If there is any displacement or relocation required, displaced persons would be entitled to reimbursement of certain actual, reasonable moving expenses pursuant to 25 California Code of Regulations (CCR) §6090 and compensation for replacement housing payments as provided by 25 CCR §§6102 and 6104. All benefits and services would be provided equitably to all affected parties without regard to race, color, religion, age, national origins, and disability as specified under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

3.10.3 Significance Criteria

Criteria for determining the significance of land use impacts are based on the CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G – Environmental Checklist. Land use impacts would be considered significant if they were to:

LU-1: Physically divide an established community.

LU-2: Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project, adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

LU-3: Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

LU-4: Displace substantial numbers of existing housing and residents, necessitating construction of replacement housing elsewhere.
LU-5: Displace substantial numbers of nonresidential properties, necessitating replacement of nonresidential properties.

3.10.4 Impacts

3.10.4.1 No Project Alternative
The No Project Alternative would not include construction or operation of HOV lanes within the subject corridor; land use would continue to be directed by existing comprehensive planning guidelines. The No Project Alternative would not impact land use within the study area.

3.10.4.2 Proposed Project Alternative
Impact LU-1: The proposed project would not physically divide an established community.

I-10 has been in operation since the 1950s. The communities have grown around the existing freeway. The proposed project would result in mostly minor property acquisitions at several locations; however, these acquisitions should have no effect with regard to dividing an established community. Neither would the proposed project create a barrier to interaction between parts of the community because the HOV improvements would be made along an existing corridor.

Once in operation, the proposed project is anticipated to improve traffic flow and ease congestion along I-10, which would in turn eliminate the need for those traveling along the freeway to use short cuts through the neighboring communities. As a result, the proposed project would create beneficial effects, including easing traffic flow on surface streets adjacent to the freeway.

Impact LU-2: The proposed project would not conflict with applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations of an agency with jurisdiction over the project, adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

The proposed project is consistent with all state, regional, and local plans and programs; it is not anticipated to require any zoning changes. The proposed project would be consistent with the goals and policies outlined in the General Plans for the cities of Baldwin Park, West Covina, Covina, San Dimas, Walnut, and Pomona, as well as for the County of Los Angeles.

No temporary impacts on land use would occur because no change in land use or zoning along the project corridor would be required, nor would there be unacceptable intrusive impacts on adjacent land uses during the construction period.
Impact LU-3: The proposed project would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

Based on review of the aforementioned General Plans, as well as USFWS and CDFG maps and plans, there are no existing habitat conservation plans (HCPs), natural community conservation plans, or other approved local, regional or state habitat plans (i.e., HCPs) applicable to this area.

Impact LU-4: The proposed project would neither displace existing residents nor necessitate construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

No full residential acquisitions are anticipated for the proposed project. In this regard, relocation of owner- and rental-occupied residential properties is not anticipated.

Temporary impacts would include temporary construction easements (TCEs) on nonresidential and residential properties along the nine-mile-long project ROW. Construction activities may briefly impede access to residential properties due to the implementation of street or driveway closures or detours. Access to the neighborhoods and businesses may be detoured for short periods of time during construction; however, access would continue to be available for residents, businesses, and emergency response at all times. Construction would be conducted in phases to allow maximum room for traffic movement and detours. In addition, a TMP would be developed for all work performed within the public ROWs. The purpose of the TMP would be to provide safe and efficient movement of motorists, pedestrians, bicyclists, construction equipment, workers, and emergency and law enforcement personnel and equipment. The TMP would be consistent with the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) (September 2006) and local agency guidelines. A separate TMP component would be prepared for each different construction phase or operation. For a complete list of acquisitions, see Appendix I, Project Acquisitions.

Impact LU-5: The proposed project would displace nonresidential properties, necessitating replacement nonresidential properties

Figure 3.10-2 and Table 3.10-2 identify the full nonresidential property acquisitions that may be required for the proposed project. Three business displacements, all located within West Covina near the Vincent Avenue on-/off-ramp, are currently proposed to be required. The first two businesses listed in Table 3.10-2, a retail phone store and a restaurant, are located on the same parcel; however, one of the businesses is currently vacant. The third displacement is located adjacent to the first two. These acquisitions are anticipated due to reconfiguration of the on-/off-ramp. According to the Relocation Impact Statement (2010) prepared for the proposed project, sufficient replacement properties are available. For a complete list of acquisitions, see Appendix I, Project Acquisitions.
Figure 3.10-2 Potential Full Acquisitions
Construction activities may also temporarily impair access to businesses due to implementation of road closures or detours, thus negatively affecting businesses. Displacement of and difficulty accessing businesses during construction could affect employment and economic activity within the project vicinity; however, these impacts would be temporary in nature and the affected businesses would be fairly compensated for relocation assistance and associated payments.

### TABLE 3.10-2. POTENTIAL PROPERTY ACQUISITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Business Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>APN</th>
<th>Square Feet</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Current Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Covina</td>
<td>AT&amp;T Retail Store</td>
<td>100 S. California Avenue #A</td>
<td>8474-007-030</td>
<td>8,962</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>Retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bob's Big Boy (closed)</td>
<td>100 S. California Avenue #B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>Restaurant (vacant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>California Pizza Kitchen</td>
<td>110 S. California Avenue</td>
<td>8474-007-031</td>
<td>6,006</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>Restaurant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Caltrans, 2011.*

#### 3.10.5 Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required for impacts LU-1 through LU-5. The following measures would minimize impacts associated with relocations:

- A Real Estate Acquisition Management Plan (RAMP) shall be developed adhering to the requirements pertaining to land acquisition for projects funded by FTA as prescribed in Volume 49 CFR Part 24, Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act for Federal and Federally Assisted Programs, and the California Relocation Assistance Act, 1970. All acquisitions shall follow state and local guidelines for compliance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act.

In addition to the above-mentioned minimization measure, the following minimization measures were identified in the MMRP (2003):

- As required by existing federal and state laws, Caltrans will comply with the provisions of the Uniform Relocation and Assistance Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended (California Government Code, Chapter 16, Section 7260, et. seq.).

- More efficient redesign and rearrangement of existing parking.

- Fair market value compensation for the loss of parking spaces to the space owners including development and coordination of parking mitigation options.
3.10.6  Level of Significance after Mitigation

The proposed project’s land use impact would be less than significant.
3.11 Agriculture

This section assesses potential agricultural resources impacts associated with the proposed project. The analysis includes a discussion of existing agricultural land uses within 0.25-mile of the project corridor (defined for analysis purposes as the ‘study area’). Information for this section was obtained from the following reports prepared for the I-10 HOV Lane Project: Socioeconomics, Land Use, Utilities and Public Services Technical Report (Caltrans, 2002c) and Community Impact Assessment (Caltrans, 2008b).

3.11.1 Existing Conditions

The only agricultural land within the vicinity of the study area is adjacent to I-10 within the Cal Poly Pomona campus. There are large fields within the study area, located generally southwest of the eastbound I-10 transition ramps to southbound SR 57. The field closest to the interchange and south of East Campus Drive is proposed for future development in the most recent (2011) campus master plan revision. The campus was not surveyed for the most recent 2008 California Department of Conservation Important Farmlands Map for Los Angeles County. Hence, agricultural properties on campus are not designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (DOC, 2010). As a public entity, the campus does not include any land under a Williamson Act contract. Lands for academic, instructional, and research agricultural programs remain on campus and include land dedicated to crop production, animal husbandry, and horse pastures. The campus does not include forestlands. (Cal Poly Pomona, 2011)

3.11.2 Regulatory Requirements

CEQA requires the review of projects that would convert Williamson Act contract land to nonagricultural uses. The main purposes of the Williamson Act are to preserve agricultural land and to encourage open space preservation and efficient urban growth. The Williamson Act provides incentives to landowners through reduced property taxes to deter the early conversion of agricultural and open space lands to other uses.

3.11.3 Significance Criteria

Criteria for determining the significance of impacts related to agriculture are based on the CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G – Environmental Checklist. Impacts from the proposed project would be considered significant under the following circumstances:

AGR-1: Convert prime farmland, unique farmland, farmland of statewide importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to nonagricultural use.

AGR-2: Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract.

AGR-3: Involve other changes in the existing environment that, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland to nonagricultural use.
3.11.4  Impacts

3.11.4.1  No Project Alternative
The No Project Alternative would not include construction of HOV lanes. Like the Proposed Project Alternative, the No Project Alternative would not impact agricultural resources within the study area.

3.11.4.2  Proposed Project Alternative
Impact AGR-1: The proposed project would not result in conversion of prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance to nonagricultural use.

The agricultural lands on the Cal Poly Pomona campus are set back from the freeway and would not be directly affected by the proposed project. No farmland or farms would be acquired for the proposed project. As mentioned above, there are no farmlands within the study area that are designated as prime, unique, or of statewide importance. Given these considerations, the proposed project would not result in any impacts related to acquisition of prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance.

Impact AGR-2: The proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract.

Unincorporated land south of I-10 from approximately the intersection of East Garvey Avenue South and Palomino Drive (the western boundary of Forest Lawn Memorial Park Cemetery) to the SR 57/SR 71 interchange is zoned for agricultural use. An approximately 0.6-mile stretch of unincorporated land on the north side of I-10 east of the city of Covina boundary is also zoned for agricultural use (A-1-40000), but it is being used for large-lot residential purposes. Williamson Act contracts are not attached to these land parcels. Soundwalls are recommended along some of these areas. Most of the soundwalls would be within Caltrans ROW; however, some land may be acquired to accommodate the soundwalls. Because the land in question is not in active agricultural production, but is zoned for such use, a less than significant impact is judged to exist.

Impact AGR-3: The proposed project would not involve other changes in the existing environment that, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland to nonagricultural use.

No land used for farming or forestry purposes would be affected by the proposed project.

3.11.5  Mitigation Measures
Impacts AGR-1, AGR-2, and AGR-3: There would be no impacts to agriculture with proposed project construction and operation; therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

3.11.6  Level of Significance after Mitigation
No mitigation measures are required for the proposed action.
3.12 Public Services and Utilities

This section assesses potential public services and utilities impacts associated with the proposed project. The below analysis includes a discussion of existing public services and utilities in the proposed project study area. The study area is defined as 0.25-mile from the project corridor. Public services include police and fire protection/emergency services, schools, and solid waste management. Utilities include domestic/potable water, sewer service, electricity, natural gas, and cable television. Health-care facilities are also discussed in this section. Information for this section was obtained from the *Interstate 10 High Occupancy Vehicle Lane from Puente Avenue to the State Route 57/State Route 71/Interstate 210 Interchange Community Impact Assessment* (Caltrans, 2008b).

3.12.1 Existing Conditions

3.12.1.1 Police and Fire Protection

**City of Baldwin Park.** Law enforcement in Baldwin Park is provided by the City of Baldwin Park Police Department. The Department Headquarters is located at 14403 Pacific Avenue. The CHP, Baldwin Park Station at 14039 Francisquito Avenue, is responsible for law enforcement on I-10.

Fire protection in Baldwin Park is provided by the Los Angeles County Fire Department. Station 29, located at 14334 Los Angeles Street, is responsible for responding to calls north of I-10 and on I-10. The area south of I-10 in Baldwin Park is within the service area of Station 87, located at 140 South Second Avenue in the City of Industry.

Emergency services (i.e., ambulance and paramedics) within the study area are provided by the Los Angeles County Fire Department and private transport providers.

**City of West Covina.** Law enforcement in West Covina is provided by the City of West Covina Police Department. The Department Headquarters is located at 1444 West Garvey Avenue South. The CHP Baldwin Park Station is responsible for law enforcement on I-10 in West Covina.

Fire protection is provided by the West Covina Fire Department. The following stations respond to incidents on I-10 and in the freeway vicinity: Station 1 (819 South Sunset Avenue), Station 2 (2441 East Cortez Avenue), and Station 3 (1433 West Puente Avenue).

Emergency services (i.e., ambulance and paramedics) in the study area along I-10 are provided by the West Covina Fire Department.

**City of Covina.** Law enforcement in Covina is provided by the City of Covina Police Department. The police department facility nearest to the project study area is located at 444 North Citrus Avenue. The CHP Baldwin Park Station is responsible for law enforcement on I-10 in Covina.
Fire protection in Covina is provided by the County of Los Angeles Fire Department. Stations 152 (807 West Cypress Street), 153 (1577 East Cypress Street), and 154 (401 North Second Avenue) serve the I-10 project study area.

Emergency services (i.e., ambulance and paramedics) within the study area are provided by the Los Angeles County Fire Department and private transport providers.

**City of San Dimas.** Law enforcement in San Dimas is provided by the Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department at 270 South Walnut Avenue. The CHP Baldwin Park Station is responsible for law enforcement on I-10 in San Dimas.

Fire protection in San Dimas is provided by the Los Angeles County Fire Department. Stations 64 (164 South Walnut Avenue) and 141 (1124 West Puente Street) are responsible for responding to calls in the city, including the area in the vicinity of and along I-10.

Emergency services (i.e., ambulance and paramedics) within the study area are provided by the Los Angeles County Fire Department and private transport providers.

**City of Walnut.** Law enforcement in Walnut is provided by the Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department at 21695 East Valley Boulevard.

Fire protection in Walnut is provided by the Los Angeles County Fire Department. Stations 61 (20011 La Puente Road) and 146 (20604 Loyalton Drive) are responsible for responding to calls in the city.

Emergency services (i.e., ambulance and paramedics) within the study area are provided by the Los Angeles County Fire Department and private transport providers.

**City of Pomona.** Law enforcement in Pomona is provided by the City of Pomona Police Department, located at 490 West Mission Boulevard.

Fire protection in Pomona is provided by the Los Angeles County Fire Department. The closest stations to the project area are Stations 184 (1980 West Orange Grove) and 187 (3325 Temple Avenue).

**Los Angeles County.** Law enforcement in unincorporated Los Angeles County in the vicinity of I-10 is provided by the Walnut Station of the Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department, located at 21695 East Valley Boulevard. The CHP Baldwin Park Station is responsible for law enforcement on I-10.

Fire protection in unincorporated Los Angeles County in the vicinity of I-10 is provided by the Los Angeles County Fire Department, Fire Station 146 (20604 E. Loyalton Drive). Emergency services (i.e., ambulance and paramedics) within the study area are provided by the Los Angeles County Fire Department and private transport providers.
Emergency services (i.e., ambulance and paramedics) within the study area are provided by the Los Angeles County Fire Department and private transport providers.

### 3.12.1.2 Schools

**City of Baldwin Park.** The Baldwin Park Unified School District (BPUSD) operates three elementary schools, one junior high school, and one senior high school; however, the proposed project study area is not a part of the BPUSD attendance area.

**City of West Covina.** The Covina-Valley Unified School District (CVUSD) provides school facilities in West Covina in the project study area. The CVUSD schools located in the project study area are Workman Avenue Elementary (1941 East Workman Avenue) and Vincent Children’s Center (1024 West Workman Avenue). Vincent Children’s Center provides educational services for children with special needs up until 4 years of age. The center also provides after-school care for those with special needs in the 5th through 8th grades.

The following daycare, preschool, and private school facilities are located in the project study area:

- Discovery Montessori Preschool – 2451 East Garvey Avenue North (preschool)
- Learning Garden School – 2141 West Garvey Avenue North (preschool)
- Sacred Heart School – 360 West Workman Avenue (Kindergarten-8th Grade)
- Atid Hebrew Academy – 3508 East Temple Way (Kindergarten-6th Grade)
- Christ Lutheran School – 311 South Citrus Street (Preschool-8th Grade)
- West Covina Education Center – 2009 West Garvey Avenue North (daycare)
- Vincent Children’s Center – 1024 West Workman Avenue (preschool)

In addition, North-West College and ITT Technical Institute offer post-secondary education within the project study area. North-West College (2121 West Garvey Avenue North) provides training in the healthcare and business fields, and ITT Technical Institute (1530 West Cameron Avenue) provides technical career training.

**Cities of Covina, San Dimas, and Walnut.** There are no school facilities located in the project study area of these jurisdictions.

**City of Pomona.** DeVry University (901 Corporate Center Drive) and Cal Poly Pomona (3801 West Temple Avenue), the latter a part of California’s State University system, are university facilities located in the project study area.

**Los Angeles County.** CVUSD provides public education services in the unincorporated parts of the project study area. Please refer to the above discussion for a description of the CVUSD school facilities in the project study area.
3.12.1.3 Libraries
The West Covina Library, located at 1601 West Covina Parkway, is the East Regional County Library for Los Angeles County. This library has adult and juvenile materials in multiple languages and is a selective government depository for federal and state environmental documents.

3.12.1.4 Courthouses
The West Covina Courthouse is located at 1427 West Covina Parkway and is part of the Los Angeles County Superior Court system.

3.12.1.5 Hospitals and Health-Care Facilities
Doctor’s Hospital of West Covina, located at 725 South Orange Avenue in West Covina, is an acute-care facility that provides inpatient and outpatient services, including pharmacy and laboratory. The Kaiser Permanente West Covina Mental Health Clinic, located at 1511 North Garvey Avenue in West Covina, provides outpatient mental health services.

3.12.1.6 Cemeteries
City of Covina. Forest Lawn Memorial Park located in the Covina Hills at 21300 Via Verde Drive provides memorial and burial services.

Cities of Baldwin Park, West Covina, San Dimas, Walnut, and Pomona; Los Angeles County. There are no cemeteries in the project study area within unincorporated Los Angeles County or the cities of Baldwin Park, West Covina, San Dimas, Walnut, or Pomona.

3.12.1.7 Places of Worship
City of West Covina. Two religious centers are located in the project study area: Temple Ami Shalom, located at 3508 East Temple Way; and West Covina Hills Adventist Church, 3536 East Temple Way.

Cities of Baldwin Park, Covina, San Dimas, Walnut, and Pomona; Los Angeles County. There are no places of worship in the project study area within the jurisdiction of unincorporated Los Angeles County or the cities of Baldwin Park, Covina, San Dimas, Walnut, or Pomona.

The public and private services in the I-10 project study area are shown in Table 3.12-1 and in Figure 3.12-1.
### TABLE 3.12-1. PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SERVICES IN THE I-10 PROJECT STUDY AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Police Departments</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Covina Police Department</td>
<td>1444 West Garvey Avenue, West Covina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fire Departments</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None in project area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Schools</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discovery Montessori Preschool</td>
<td>2451 East Garvey Avenue North, West Covina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest College</td>
<td>2121 West Garvey Avenue North, West Covina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Garden School</td>
<td>2141 West Garvey North, West Covina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workman Avenue Elementary School</td>
<td>1941 East Workman Avenue, West Covina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITT Technical Institute</td>
<td>1530 West Cameron Avenue, West Covina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent Children's Center</td>
<td>1024 West Workman Avenue, West Covina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacred Heart School</td>
<td>360 West Workman Avenue, West Covina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atid Hebrew Academy</td>
<td>3508 East Temple Way, West Covina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ Lutheran School</td>
<td>311 South Citrus Street, West Covina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Covina Education Center</td>
<td>2009 W Garvey Avenue North, West Covina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State Polytechnic, Pomona</td>
<td>3801 West Temple Avenue, Pomona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeVry University</td>
<td>901 Corporate Center Drive, Pomona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Libraries</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Covina Public Library</td>
<td>1601 West Covina Parkway, West Covina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Courthouses</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Covina Courthouse</td>
<td>1427 West Covina Parkway, West Covina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medical Facilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor's Hospital West Covina</td>
<td>725 South Orange Avenue, West Covina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Building</td>
<td>126 S. Glendora Avenue, West Covina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiser Permanente</td>
<td>1511 N. Garvey Avenue West, West Covina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cemeteries/Religious Facilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Lawn Memorial Park</td>
<td>21300 Via Verde Drive, Covina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple Ami Shalom</td>
<td>3508 East Temple Way, West Covina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Covina Hills Adventist Church</td>
<td>3536 East Temple Way, West Covina</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Parsons, 2008.*
Figure 3.12-1 Public Services
3.12.1.8 Solid Waste Management

Many landfills currently serve solid waste disposal needs for cities in the project study area. Based on data for 2006 from the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB), Baldwin Park disposed of 67,988 tons, West Covina disposed of 91,832 tons, Covina disposed of 54,062 tons, San Dimas disposed of 42,775 tons, Walnut disposed of 25,012 tons, and Pomona disposed of 4,735,245 tons of municipal solid waste (MSW). In 2006, 1,362,793 tons of MSW were disposed in unincorporated Los Angeles County; only a small percent of that total was generated in the unincorporated County areas within the project study area.

Landfills serving jurisdictions in the project study area are located in both Orange and Los Angeles counties and include, but are not limited to:

- **Azusa Land Reclamation Company Landfill**, located in Azusa, has a throughput capacity of 6,500 tons per day (tpd) and an estimated 66.7 million cubic yards (cy) of capacity. This landfill is scheduled to close in 2025.

- **Frank R. Bowerman Sanitary Landfill**, located in Irvine in central Orange County, has a throughput capacity of 8,500 tpd and an estimated 127 million cy of capacity. It is scheduled to close in 2022.

- **Olinda Alpha Sanitary Landfill**, located in Brea in north Orange County, has a throughput capacity of 8,000 tpd and an estimated 74.9 million cy of capacity. This landfill is scheduled to close in 2013.

- **Puente Hills Landfill #6**, located in Industry, has a throughput capacity of 13,200 tpd and an estimated 106.4 million cy of capacity. This landfill is scheduled to close in 2013.

Solid waste collection and disposal services in the project study area are provided by:

- **Waste Management**: unincorporated Los Angeles County and cities of Baldwin Park, San Dimas, and Pomona,

- **Athens Services Company**: West Covina, Covina, and Pomona

- **Apex Waste System**: Pomona

- **Burrtec Waste Industries**: Pomona

- **Valley Vista Services**: Pomona and Walnut

- **Covina Disposal Company**: Covina

3.12.1.9 Utilities

Public utilities located in the project study area include electricity, gas, domestic water, wastewater, and cable television. These utilities are listed in Table 3.12-2.
### TABLE 3.12-2. UTILITIES IN THE I-10 PROJECT STUDY AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Provider</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Baldwin Park</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer</td>
<td>Los Angeles County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Water</td>
<td>Valley County Water District, San Gabriel Valley Company, and Valley View Mutual Water Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Gas</td>
<td>The Gas Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>Southern California Edison (SCE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cable Television</td>
<td>Time Warner Cable Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of West Covina</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer</td>
<td>City and Los Angeles County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Water</td>
<td>Five principle companies serve the city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Gas</td>
<td>The Gas Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>SCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cable Television</td>
<td>Charter Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Covina</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer</td>
<td>City of West Covina (contract)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Water</td>
<td>Five principle companies serve the city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Gas</td>
<td>The Gas Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>SCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cable Television</td>
<td>Time Warner Cable Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of San Dimas</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer</td>
<td>Southern California Water Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Water</td>
<td>Southern California Water Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Gas</td>
<td>The Gas Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>SCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cable Television</td>
<td>Time Warner Cable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Walnut</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer</td>
<td>City and Los Angeles County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Water</td>
<td>Walnut Valley Water District, Southern California Water Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Gas</td>
<td>Southern California Gas Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>SCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cable Television</td>
<td>Charter Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Pomona</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer</td>
<td>City of Pomona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Water</td>
<td>City of Pomona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Gas</td>
<td>The Gas Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>SCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cable Television</td>
<td>Time Warner Cable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unincorporated Los Angeles County</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer</td>
<td>Los Angeles County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Water</td>
<td>Southern California Water Company and Suburban Water Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Gas</td>
<td>The Gas Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>SCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cable Television</td>
<td>Time Warner Cable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Parsons, 2008.*
3.12.2 Regulatory Requirements
There are no regulatory requirements for the analysis of public services and utilities.

3.12.3 Significance Criteria
Criteria for determining the significance of impacts related to public services and utilities are based on the CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G – Environmental Checklist. Impacts from the proposed project would be considered significant under the following circumstances:

**PS-1:** Require the provision of new, or physically alter, governmental facilities to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives.

**PS-2:** Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

**PS-3:** Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

**PS-4:** Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

**PS-5:** Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

**PS-6:** Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?

**PS-7:** Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?

**PS-8:** Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

3.12.4 Impacts

3.12.4.1 No Project Alternative
The No Project Alternative would not result in temporary impacts to utility facilities and emergency service providers associated with the I-10 HOV Lane Project. There would be no interruptions to utility service, street excavations, or utility relocations associated with the proposed project. Potential traffic effects to emergency service providers due to detours or closures would not occur; however, due to a projected increase in future traffic volumes without the project, and associated increased traffic congestion, traffic delays are expected to increase emergency response times under the No Project Alternative.
3.12.4.2 Proposed Project Alternative

Impact PS-1: The proposed project would not require the provision of new, or physically alter, governmental facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives.

Fire, Law Enforcement, and Emergency Services. The proposed project would involve construction that could contribute to short-term impacts to fire protection and emergency services due to delayed response times. This potential impact would be minimized through standard implementation of a TMP, which would contain access routes and detour plans to be implemented during construction, as required by the Department. The TMP should be reviewed and approved by the Los Angeles County Fire Department and any potentially affected fire or law enforcement agency; therefore, construction-related traffic impacts would create a less than significant impact to public and emergency services.

Schools and Other Public Facilities. The proposed project would not generate demand for schools or libraries; therefore, there would be no impact to schools. A TMP would be prepared to ensure that access to schools and other public facilities would be maintained during construction.

Hospitals and Other Health-Care Facilities. The proposed project would not increase demand for hospitals or other health-care facilities. See above discussion regarding emergency access issues and TMP implementation.

Cemeteries and Places of Worship. A TMP would be prepared to ensure that safe access to Forest Lawn Memorial Park would be maintained during construction of the proposed project. There would be no impact to cemeteries or places of worship.

Solid Waste Disposal Services. The proposed project would require demolition to accommodate the proposed improvements; therefore, considerable demolition and construction debris would be created. Recycling of material either onsite or offsite is required for Caltrans projects to minimize the solid waste disposal impacts; therefore, the proposed project would create less than significant impacts for solid waste disposal services.

Utilities. Utilities can be affected in three ways: (1) relocation, (2) removal, and (3) protection in place. During relocation and removal, as well as other construction activities, utility services could be damaged. Typical construction activities requiring relocation include widening of roadways and or replacement of existing structures. Areas requiring pavement widening would not require a utility location. Low-height retaining walls that would be constructed beneath overhead utilities would also not require utility relocation.

Construction of the I-10 HOV Lane Project would require the relocation of several public and private utilities within the project area. Most utility lines within the project area are located below ground and would not be in conflict with the improvements included in the proposed project. Nonetheless, several other utility lines would require relocation. In some
cases, parallel facilities would be constructed around the project improvements, requiring short-term interruptions to service when service is switched to the new parallel facilities. Construction of structures directly above or near these utilities would likely affect these locations and require relocation.

Design, construction, and inspection of utilities requiring relocation to accommodate the project would be completed in accordance with Caltrans’ requirements. Timely coordination with affected utilities would be undertaken to minimize disruption of service and to ensure construction takes place during periods of low demand and in accordance with applicable requirements.

Details about the handling of the various utility lines with anticipated conflicts would be solidified during final design stage. The aforementioned TMP would be devised and implemented to also minimize traffic impacts associated with utility relocations or replacements-in-kind within the project study area.

No permanent impacts related to public and private utilities and emergency services would result from the Proposed Project Alternative. All impacts to utilities and emergency services would be temporary and would be rectified once project construction is complete. After the HOV lanes are operational, the proposed project would result in improved access for emergency response services and would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with any adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The proposed project would result in less than significant impacts to utilities.

**Impact PS-2:** The proposed project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board.

No Impact. In comparison to overall system capacity, minimal wastewater would be generated by the proposed project during construction. Due to the nature of the proposed project, there would be no wastewater produced during facility operation.

**Impact PS-3:** The proposed project would not require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.

No Impact. The proposed project consists of adding HOV lanes to an existing freeway. New wastewater or water treatment facilities are not a component of the proposed project. Limited water used at the site, such as for dust control during construction, would be metered from local fire hydrants.

**Impact PS-4:** The proposed project would not require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.
Less Than Significant Impact. As stated above, construction of the proposed project could result in minor modifications to the storm water drainage system; however, the effects of these changes on the environment are expected to be less than significant because the major flow regime within the study area (discharge to Walnut Creek) would be retained intact. As the study area is mostly developed urban land, the increase in pavement and structures due to the proposed project would not be expected to substantially increase the amount of stormwater runoff (Caltrans, 2002b).

Impact PS-5: The proposed project will have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, and no new or expanded entitlements would be needed.

No Impact. While irrigation water would be required for landscaping, the volume of water needed for this purpose would be small and would not trigger the need for new water sources or affect expansion of an existing facility to meet the additional water needs.

Impact PS-6: The proposed project would result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments.

No Impact. As a proposed transportation project, neither its construction nor operation would substantially increase the amount of wastewater generated at the site over current rates; therefore, the capacity of current providers to treat the wastewater volumes within the study area would basically be unaffected by the proposed project.

Impact PS-7: The proposed project would be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs.

Less Than Significant Impact. The nearest operating landfill is Puente Hills Landfill, located more than 4 miles southwest from the Puente Avenue interchange. In 2009, the landfill had an estimated remaining capacity of 35.2 million cubic yards, approximately 47 percent of its total capacity. The Puente Hills Landfill is capable of accommodating waste from the proposed project that needs to be disposed; accordingly, it would have a less than significant impact on the landfill’s available capacity.

Impact PS-8: The proposed project would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project would be in compliance with all federal, state, and local codes and regulations pertaining to the disposal of solid waste. These codes include Part 13 Title 42 – Public Health and Welfare of the California Health and Safety Code, and Chapter 39 Solid Waste Disposal – of the United States Code. The proposed project would also be compliant with AB 939, the California Solid Waste Management Act,
which requires each city in the state to divert at least 50 percent of its solid waste from landfill disposal through source reduction, recycling, and composting. Most concrete demolition debris would be crushed and reused for this project. Given these considerations, there would be no significant impacts associated with consistency related to laws pertaining to solid waste disposal.

### 3.12.5 Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required; however, the following minimization measures are proposed:

- Emergency service providers will be alerted in advance of any temporary road closures and delays so they have adequate time to make appropriate accommodations to ensure prompt emergency response times that fulfill their responsibilities and defined service objectives.

- Utility providers will be made aware of project developments and be involved in planning of utility rerouting, identification of potential conflicts, and formulation of strategies to deal with unanticipated problems that may arise once construction has begun.

The following minimization measures were also identified in the MMRP (2003):

- Final design will include coordination with all the affected public services and utilities providers to ensure that existing facilities are protected in place, removed and/or relocated to the satisfaction of the provider to minimize the potential disruption of existing utilities in the I-10 right-of-way.

- Caltrans will require construction contractors to:
  - Reuse excess soil materials for fill to the maximum extent feasible.
  - Reuse or recycle material taking into consideration the feasibility, safety and reasonableness of such actions.
  - Dispose of waste material removed as part of project construction in accordance with the Standard Specification for solid waste removal, listed in the California Administration Code.

- Caltrans will require construction contractors to conduct all utility protection, removal and replacement consistent with Caltrans’ construction procedures and the procedures of the affected utilities.

- Caltrans will require construction contractors to ensure that proposed haul routes, detours and temporary lane closures will not adversely impact utility and service...
providers; and that necessary public services and utilities can be provided adequately in the project study area during construction.

- Final design will include coordination with the area school districts regarding the construction schedule, phasing and any proposed detours and/or other traffic delays, so the school districts can prepare and plan for any possible disruptions in student transportation services.

### 3.12.6 Level of Significance after Mitigation

No mitigation measures are required for the proposed project.
3.13 Parks and Recreational Facilities

This section describes existing parks and recreational facilities in the study area of the proposed project. The study area is defined as 0.25-mile from the project alignment, as shown in Figure 3.13-1. Information for this section was obtained from the Community Impact Assessment (Caltrans, 2008b).

3.13.1 Existing Conditions

There are two parks in the study area, and these are located in the cities of Covina and San Dimas.

3.13.1.1 City of Covina

Jalapa Park, located approximately 50 feet from the existing I-10 ROW between East Garvey Street, Village Oaks Drive, and Holt Avenue, is a public park owned and operated by the City of Covina Parks and Recreation Department. This 2-acre park is an active recreational facility. Amenities provided at the park include a barbecue pit, picnic tables, and play equipment.

3.13.1.2 City of San Dimas

Frank G. Bonelli Regional Park is a 1,980-acre recreational park located northeast of the SR 57/SR 71 interchange, with most of the park located outside the project study area. It is a regional park, owned and operated by the County of Los Angeles, and provides fishing and boating, biking, hiking, and horse trails, among other amenities. It is also home to the ‘Raging Waters’ water park.

3.13.1.3 Cities of Baldwin Park, West Covina, Pomona, and Los Angeles County

There are no parks or recreational facilities in the project study area owned or operated by the cities of Baldwin Park, West Covina, Walnut, or Pomona, or by Los Angeles County.

3.13.2 Regulatory Requirements

Open Space elements of the general plans for each jurisdiction were reviewed for regulatory requirements within the project area.

3.13.2.1 City of Baldwin Park

Relevant policy from the City’s Open Space Element includes:

- **Policy 1.1**: Preserve all existing park space, and provide improvements to enhance utilization.
Figure 3.13-1 Parks and Recreational Facilities within the I-10 Study Area
3.13.2.2 City of San Dimas
Relevant goals from the City’s Open Space Element include:

- **Goals Statement OS-2**: Maintain open space for the protection of public health and safety.
- **Goals Statement OS-6**: Provide access to public open space.

3.13.2.3 City of Walnut
Relevant policy from the City’s Open Space Element includes:

- **Policy 1**: Promote the conservation and prudent utilization of natural resources, the reuse of resources, and the protection of environmental amenities.

3.13.2.4 City of Pomona
There are no open space policies relevant to the proposed project.

3.13.2.5 Los Angeles County
Relevant policies from the County’s Open Space Element include:

- **Policy 13**: Encourage open-space easements and dedications as a means of meeting scenic, recreational, and conservation needs.
- **Policy 34**: Encourage the maintenance of landscaped areas and pollution-tolerant plants in urban areas. Integrate landscaping and open space into housing, commercial, and industrial developments, especially in urban revitalization areas. Use drought-resistant vegetation.
- **Policy 35**: Support preservation of heritage trees. Encourage tree planting programs to enhance the beauty of urban landscaping.

Open space elements were unavailable for online review for the cities of West Covina and Covina.

3.13.3 Significance Criteria
Criteria for determining the significance of impacts related to parks and recreation facilities are based on the CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G – Environmental Checklist. Impacts from the proposed project would be considered significant under the following circumstances:

**PAR-1**: Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated.

**PAR-2**: Require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.
3.13.4 Impacts

3.13.4.1 No Project Alternative
The No Project Alternative would not include construction of HOV lanes. Like the Proposed Project Alternative, the No Project Alternative would not impact parks and recreation facilities within the study area.

3.13.4.2 Proposed Project Alternative
Impact PAR-1: The proposed project would not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated.

Both parks are located outside of construction staging areas; therefore, no direct construction or permanent impacts would occur. At Jalapa Park in Covina, indirect temporary air quality and noise impacts are likely to occur during construction. Air quality and noise impacts during construction, and associated reduction measures, are discussed in Sections 3.3 and 3.4, respectively. Frank G. Bonelli Regional Park is separated from the construction site by a major interchange; therefore, it is unlikely to be adversely affected by temporary construction impacts. Given the above considerations, no impact is anticipated as a result of the proposed project.

Impact PAR-2: The proposed project would not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

The proposed project would involve adding HOV lanes to an existing freeway, among other improvements. No parks or recreational facilities are part of the proposed project. Neither would the proposed project increase the demand, or create new demand, for park services. No impact is anticipated as a result of the proposed project.

In addition, of the general plans available for review online, no policies or goals are in conflict with the proposed project.

3.13.5 Mitigation Measures
Impacts PAR-1 and PAR-2: No mitigation is required.

3.13.6 Level of Significance after Mitigation
No mitigation measures are required for the proposed project.
CHAPTER 4
OTHER TOPICAL CEQA ISSUES
4.0 Other Topical CEQA Issues

4.1 Growth Inducement

A project is considered growth inducing when it directly or indirectly fosters economic or population growth, or the construction of housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment (CEQA Guidelines §15126.2[d]). Projects that could remove obstacles to population growth, such as expansion of a wastewater treatment plant’s capacity, are also considered in the context of growth inducement. Increases in population may also tax existing community service facilities, potentially requiring construction of new facilities that could cause significant environmental effects. In addition, growth inducement can be defined as growth that makes it feasible to increase the density of development in surrounding areas.

The area surrounding I-10 within the project corridor is urbanized and largely built out. Geographic and planning constraints limit the potential for growth to occur within this area. Limited available open space remaining along the east end of the project corridor is either unavailable or too steep for new development. Hence, with the exception of the Cal Poly Pomona campus, most future growth in the area next to I-10 is expected to be associated with urban infill projects.

As stated in Chapter 1, the San Gabriel Valley and surrounding metropolitan region have been subject to continuing and ongoing growth for the past several decades. Eastern Los Angeles County and western San Bernardino County are continuing to grow at a rapid rate, including development of residential and employment land uses. This unabated growth has resulted in considerable congestion on area freeways, including I-10. Peak-period traffic demand on I-10 currently exceeds capacity and, as a result of forecasted growth, is expected to continue to exceed capacity. The I-10 HOV Lane Project would assist in addressing commuter needs while focusing limited transportation capital on improvements that support HOV modes.

The proposed project would be beneficial to the local economy because numerous direct and indirect jobs would be created during construction. In addition to direct construction employment, jobs would be created or sustained in the manufacturing, retail, and service sectors. The economic growth associated with the proposed project would result in an unquantifiable effect on the physical environment; however, these impacts would be distributed regionally, nationally, and even globally. Any local growth associated with construction activities would end after the project is operational. Given these considerations, growth-inducing impacts associated with the proposed project are determined to not be significant.
4.2 Cumulative Impacts

“Cumulative impacts” refers to two or more individual effects that may be significant when considered together, or that compound or increase other environmental impacts. The individual effects may be changes resulting from a single project or many separate projects. The cumulative impact of several projects is the change in the environment that results from the incremental impact of the project when added to other closely related, past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant projects taking place over a period of time (CEQA Guidelines §15355). The impacts evaluated in this EIR are cumulative in nature due to the size of the project area and the assessment of impacts on a regional scale.

4.2.1 Planned and Current Projects in the Vicinity of the I-10 Corridor

A list of projects that could potentially contribute to the cumulative condition is provided in Table 4.2-1 and shown in Figure 4.2-1.

4.2.2 Cumulative Impacts Analysis

4.2.2.1 Environmental Resources for Which No Potential Cumulative Effects would Result

Taking into consideration the above-noted projects that may contribute to cumulative impacts, in the context of the I-10 HOV Lane Project, there are several environmental resources that would not contribute to the cumulative condition. These are listed below:

**Biological Resources.** Given the following considerations, the proposed project as mitigated would not cause cumulative biological impacts. The proposed project would not (1) affect any federal or state listed species; (2) affect wetlands, waters of the United States, or lands set aside as ecologically significant by Los Angeles County; or (3) disturb species protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918, or nesting raptor species. Other proposed projects in the region likely would require removal of landscape trees; therefore, the proposed I-10 HOV Lane Project could conceivably add to the numbers of trees removed. This potential cumulative effect should be offset assuming similar species are planted out as landscaping once each project has been completed.

**Cultural and Paleontological Resources.** The proposed project would not result in any effects to archaeological, historic, or paleontological resources. While it is possible that previously unidentified cultural and paleontological resources may be discovered during construction, the proposed project and all cumulative project activities within the APE are required by law to be in compliance with established procedures for notification, identification, and recovery of resources uncovered during construction. Once the project is operational, no adverse cumulative effects on cultural or paleontological resources, either individually or in conjunction with other nearby projects, are expected.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. on Map</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Baldwin Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sierra Expansion Project</td>
<td>North side of Baldwin Park Boulevard, between Francisquito Avenue and Tracy Street</td>
<td>The site comprises approximately 4 acres and is developed with roughly 50,000 square feet of new retail. Tenants include Smart &amp; Final, CVS Drugs, IHOP, and Starbucks.</td>
<td>Planning stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of West Covina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Westfield Expansion Phase III</td>
<td>Westfield West Covina Mall (112 Plaza Drive)</td>
<td>Phase III includes the addition of approximately 32,000 square feet and the reconfiguration of existing mall space. This phase will feature a second mini-anchor space of 45,000 square feet for Nordstrom Rack and Gold’s Gym.</td>
<td>Construction stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>McIntyre Square</td>
<td>220 S. Citrus Street</td>
<td>McIntyre Square consists of 60,470 square feet of retail and restaurant space on 6.37 acres.</td>
<td>Construction stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fairfield Inn &amp; Suites by Marriott</td>
<td>3211 E. Garvey Avenue North</td>
<td>Fairfield Inn &amp; Suites by Marriott is a 5-story, 110-bedroom hotel covering 57,028 square feet.</td>
<td>Construction stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>West Covina Senior Villas II</td>
<td>1838 E. Workman Avenue</td>
<td>The Community Development Commission and West Covina Senior Villas II, LLC are collaborating in the development of an affordable housing complex on the 1.07-acre lot.</td>
<td>Construction stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Former Wickes Furniture Site</td>
<td>301 S. Glendora Avenue</td>
<td>Redevelopment plans are being discussed with the new property owner for the 114,000-square-foot Wickes Furniture site.</td>
<td>Planning stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Covina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Olson Citrus Walk Project</td>
<td>Citrus Avenue, School Street, and Italia Street</td>
<td>Mixed-use development will consist of 49 residential units, 8 of which will be low-moderate income units. 8,300 square feet of retail space will be constructed with 12 residential units above. A portion of School Street will be vacated and a cul-de-sac built.</td>
<td>Planning stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Pomona</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Pomona Valley Transfer Station Project</td>
<td>1371 East 9th Street</td>
<td>The Pomona Valley Transfer Station Project proposes construction and operation of a Municipal Solid Waste (MSW) transfer station on a 10.5-acre site.</td>
<td>Planning stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I-10 HOV (Carpool) Lane Project</td>
<td>Between I-605 and Puente Avenue in the City of Baldwin Park</td>
<td>Construction of one HOV lane along I-10 in each direction (Phase I of the Proposed Project discussed in this EIR).</td>
<td>Construction stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. on Map</td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I-10/I-605 Interchange Improvement Project</td>
<td>I-10/I-605 Interchange in the City of Baldwin Park</td>
<td>The project involves construction of a direct connector from southbound I-605 to eastbound I-10.</td>
<td>Planning stage (construction scheduled for summer 2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Alameda Corridor East Grade Separations (Phase II)</td>
<td>San Gabriel Valley: City of San Gabriel (2.2-mile trench); Nogales Street grade separation; Puente Avenue and Fairway Drive grade separations; Montebello Boulevard, Rose Hills, and Turnbull Canyon Road grade separations</td>
<td>Constructs bridges or underpasses and improves the operation of other railroad intersections along a 35-mile-long stretch of railroad main line in the San Gabriel Valley.</td>
<td>In various stages of design and planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Metro Express Lanes</td>
<td>El Monte Busway (I-605 to Alameda Street)</td>
<td>Conversion of the I-10 El Monte Busway HOV lanes (I-605 to Alameda Street) to HOT lanes.</td>
<td>Construction anticipated to begin 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>College of Business Admin (Phase I)</td>
<td>Cal Poly, Pomona</td>
<td>This project will add approximately 74,500 gross square feet and will include the installation of state-of-the-art Learning Centered Technology Initiative equipment in all instructional and lecture classrooms.</td>
<td>Construction stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>ASI Recreation Center</td>
<td>Cal Poly, Pomona</td>
<td>The new Recreation Center will be 120,000 gross square feet, which includes replacement of the two existing state pools with a new pool.</td>
<td>Construction anticipated to begin June 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I-Poly High School</td>
<td>Cal Poly, Pomona</td>
<td>This project is the construction of approximately 52,000 square feet of permanent facilities for I-Poly, including associated site work. The building program includes classrooms, administrative offices, multipurpose room, small resource center, amphitheater, and outdoor learning spaces, as well as a small food service facility. Site improvements, in addition to landscaping, include telecommunications, utilities, roadways, and 186 parking spaces.</td>
<td>Construction stage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4.2-1 Location of Cumulative Projects

Source: Parsons 2011.
Geology, Soils, and Seismicity. The proposed project would be designed to satisfy the most current seismic design standards and accommodate the potential for liquefaction. With major improvements to several bridges listed in Chapter 1, the proposed project would improve public safety. In addition, none of the related projects would be expected to produce adverse geotechnical effects.

Hazardous Waste. Potential hazardous waste impacts could occur during construction due to (1) use of hazardous material products and (2) possibly encountering hazardous waste during excavation work. Cumulative issues associated with hazardous waste/materials are unlikely given the assumption that the proposed project and all of the above-listed project construction activities are required to handle, remove, transport, and dispose of hazardous materials and waste in compliance with existing federal, state, and local laws and regulations.

A section of the project corridor traverses land that is San Gabriel Valley Area 2 (SGVA2) National Priorities List, where contaminated groundwater may exist approximately 60 feet or more bgs. Based on preliminary construction plans, excavation activity would not likely reach the existing groundwater table located 60 feet or more bgs elevation. Should encroachment into SGVA2 occur, appropriate procedures would be followed to provide adequate protection to works and the public. Given these considerations, the proposed project would not contribute to the cumulative condition at the SGVA2 site.

Once construction is complete, no cumulative impacts would be associated with hazardous materials and wastes because, other than routine transport of hazardous materials and waste, the project would not produce hazardous materials and wastes.

Hydrology. The proposed project would not cause an increase in flood elevation within the water courses affected by freeway construction activities; therefore, the I-10 HOV Lane Project would not contribute to the cumulative condition.

Land Use and Planning. The proposed project would not contribute to the cumulative condition because it would not (1) require a revision to any of the adopted plans and policies at local and regional levels; (2) encourage land use changes that could be in conflict with long-term plans and policies; or (3) result in any new land use compatibility issues, either individually or in association with other projects in the vicinity of the corridor.

Agriculture. No land used for farming or forestry purposes would be affected by the proposed project, and proposed project impacts to agriculture would be insignificant; therefore, the project would not contribute to the cumulative condition.

Parks and Recreation. No direct impacts are expected to result from the proposed project during construction or operation of the proposed project. While temporary indirect air quality and noise impacts could occur at Jalapa Park in Covina, these potential impacts would not be cumulative because none of the above-listed projects are located in the immediate vicinity of Jalapa Park.
4.2.2.2 Environmental Resources Having Potential Cumulative Effects

The following discussion pertains to issue areas that could be affected by cumulative impacts.

Aesthetics and Visual Resources. Cumulatively, in conjunction with other I-10 projects (Nos. 9, 10, and 12) listed in Table 4.2-1, the I-10 corridor between the I-605 and SR 57/SR 71 interchanges is anticipated to undergo a substantial change from its existing design; however, none of the projects listed in Table 4.2-1 overlap with the footprint of the proposed project. These ongoing and future projects, including the proposed action, would cumulatively alter the existing aesthetic setting of the corridor. Primary cumulative visual impacts include removal of existing mature vegetation and construction of additional highway and building structures.

Removal of vegetation would be addressed on an individual project basis with incorporation of replacement landscaping. Each project includes planting of replacement vegetation, including trees, wherever feasible and safe. Caltrans will coordinate with each city in regards to landscaping activities.

The new projects should not be out of character with the surrounding environment, which is urbanized and includes major state and local transportation corridors. To maintain consistency within the subject I-10 corridor, Caltrans is proposing identical treatment of median walls for the design of HOV lanes between I-605 and Puente Avenue (see Figure 3.1-3). Bridge structure, retaining wall, and soundwall improvements are also planned to be designed with aesthetically pleasing designs. Vine plantings may also be used to cover soundwalls. Given that most of the existing corridor has a low visual quality, these architectural and landscape treatments should slightly improve the overall appearance of I-10 within and to the west of the project site to the I-605 interchange.

As a result of the above considerations, it is judged that the proposed project would not have an adverse cumulative effect on the visual environment, taking into account past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects.

Traffic. During construction, it is possible that construction activities for other projects (i.e., both transportation and nontransportation types) could spatially overlap. This could possibly result in extended and unnecessary traffic delays on local streets in the vicinity of I-10 bridges and ramps where construction activities would occur. To avoid such a scenario, Caltrans will coordinate with internal and external agency staff to appropriately schedule project activities. Coordination with construction managers overseeing other projects may be necessary to coordinate schedules, especially where multiple traffic disruptions are planned within the same general vicinity. In addition to preparation of a TMP, mitigation measures for public outreach and transit agency coordination (see Section 3.2) will be implemented to further alleviate cumulative traffic conditions.
As stated in Section 1.2.1 above, the proposed action, as well as other current and planned improvement projects along the I-10 corridor, as listed in the SCAG 2008 RTP, is intended to meet the following regional goals:

1. Maximize mobility and accessibility for people and goods in the region
2. Ensure travel safety and reliability for all people and goods in the region
3. Protect the environment, improve air quality, and promote energy efficiency
4. Maximize the productivity of the transportation system

In this regard, operation of the project would result in cumulatively beneficial traffic and transportation impacts.

**Air Quality.** Construction activities would generate air pollutants, including emissions of dust, fumes, equipment exhaust, and other air contaminants. During construction, short-term degradation of air quality may occur. These cumulative impacts would not be adverse with application of mitigation as recommended in Section 3.3.4.

In terms of operational effects, the air quality analysis is based on the traffic data provided in the Traffic Impact Analysis for the proposed project. The Traffic Impact Analysis considered all of the reasonably foreseeable future projects in the project vicinity through 2040; therefore, the project effects described in Section 3.3.4 include cumulative projects through 2035 and/or the worst-case traffic condition (i.e., maximum traffic capacity) on I-10. Operational air quality benefits would be beneficial; therefore, they would not adversely cumulatively affect air quality.

**Noise and Vibration.** The noise analysis is based on the traffic data provided in the Traffic Impact Analysis. The Traffic Impact Analysis considered all of the reasonably foreseeable future projects in the project vicinity through 2035; therefore, the project effects described in Section 3.4.4 include cumulative projects through 2035 and/or the worst-case traffic condition (i.e., maximum traffic capacity) on I-10. The project would not have an adverse cumulative effect on noise or vibration.

**Water Quality and Stormwater Runoff.** During construction, the project could affect water quality through the discharge of pollutants into local surface water courses. These impacts are discussed in Section 3.9.4.

The current trend of urbanization in the eastern San Gabriel Valley is projected to continue. As shown in Figure 4.2-1, most of the ongoing and future development activity involves urban infill projects. These projects are expected to cumulatively result in increased loading of pollutants into surface waters. Stormwater discharges from highway and nonhighway projects in the vicinity of the project corridor, if not properly controlled, could cumulatively degrade water quality. In this regard, each project within the study area is required to comply with federal NPDES stormwater permit regulations governing discharges to surface waters.
In particular, all projects over 1-acre in size must prepare a project-specific SWPPP that identifies construction site BMPs. For Caltrans projects smaller than 1-acre, contractors must incorporate requirements of a Water Pollution Control Plan into daily construction activities. Given these considerations, cumulative water quality impacts due to construction activities would be minimized. Local projects must comply with urban runoff ordinances.

For state highway projects, an SWMP is prepared to include design pollution prevention BMPs. With implementation of biofiltration strips/swales, detention devices, infiltration devices, media filters, or any combination thereof, the design of the proposed action aims to treat 100 percent of the onsite runoff water quality volume. In addition, where possible, the runoff from all bridges would be conveyed to Treatment BMPs; therefore, it can be concluded that the project would not substantially contribute to the cumulative condition.

**Public Services and Utilities.** Utilities, emergency services, and public services that could potentially be subject to cumulative construction effects would be generally confined to the immediate vicinity of the active work areas during individual project activities. Various water, sewer, power, and other utility lines currently cross the study area and may require relocation or special handling during construction activities. Proposed project construction activities requiring relocation of an underground sewer main, for example, could be scheduled to coincide with a telephone company project to underground telephone lines. In this way, a situation may be avoided where constant construction and accompanying traffic delays occur on a busy street due to poorly coordinated schedules. Assuming implementation of Caltrans’ typical procedures for working with public and private utility companies during the design and construction processes, cumulative effects, if they occur, would be minor and temporary. For operational effects, no adverse cumulative effects on public services would be expected.

### 4.3 Climate Change

Climate change refers to long-term changes in temperature, precipitation, wind patterns, and other elements of the earth's climate system. An ever-increasing body of scientific research attributes these climatological changes to greenhouse gases (GHGs), particularly those generated from the production and use of fossil fuels.

While climate change has been a concern for several decades, the establishment of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) by the United Nations and World Meteorological Organization’s in 1988, has led to increased efforts devoted to greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduction and climate change research and policy. These efforts are primarily concerned with the emissions of GHGs related to human activity that include carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane, nitrous oxide, tetrafluoromethane, hexafluoroethane, sulfur hexafluoride, HFC-23 (fluoroform), HFC-134a (s, s, 2 –tetrafluoroethane), and HFC-152a (difluoroethane).

There are typically two terms used when discussing the impacts of climate change. "Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Mitigation" is a term for reducing GHG emissions in order to
reduce or "mitigate" the impacts of climate change. “Adaptation," refers to the effort of planning for and adapting to impacts due to climate change (such as adjusting transportation design standards to withstand more intense storms and higher sea levels).\(^9\)

Transportation sources (passenger cars, light duty trucks, other trucks, buses and motorcycles) in the state of California make up the largest source (second to electricity generation) of greenhouse gas emitting sources. Conversely, the main source of GHG emissions in the United States (U.S.) is electricity generation followed by transportation. The dominant GHG emitted is CO\(_2\), mostly from fossil fuel combustion.

There are four primary strategies for reducing GHG emissions from transportation sources: 1) improve system and operation efficiencies, 2) reduce growth of vehicle miles traveled (VMT) 3) transition to lower GHG fuels and 4) improve vehicle technologies. To be most effective all four should be pursued collectively. The following regulatory setting section outlines state and federal efforts to comprehensively reduce GHG emissions from transportation sources.

### 4.3.1 Regulatory Requirements

#### State

With the passage of several pieces of legislation including State Senate and Assembly Bills and Executive Orders, California launched an innovative and pro-active approach to dealing with greenhouse gas emissions and climate change at the state level.

Assembly Bill 1493 (AB 1493), Pavley. Vehicular Emissions: Greenhouse Gases (AB 1493), 2002: requires the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to develop and implement regulations to reduce automobile and light truck greenhouse gas emissions. These stricter emissions standards were designed to apply to automobiles and light trucks beginning with the 2009-model year. In June 2009, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) Administrator granted a Clean Air Act waiver of preemption to California. This waiver allowed California to implement its own GHG emission standards for motor vehicles beginning with model year 2009. California agencies will be working with Federal agencies to conduct joint rulemaking to reduce GHG emissions for passenger cars model years 2017-2025.

Executive Order S-3-05: (signed on June 1, 2005, by Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger) the goal of this Executive Order is to reduce California’s GHG emissions to: 1) 2000 levels by 2010, 2) 1990 levels by the 2020 and 3) 80 percent below the 1990 levels by the year 2050. In 2006, this goal was further reinforced with the passage of Assembly Bill 32.

AB32 (AB 32), the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006: AB 32 sets the same overall GHG emissions reduction goals as outlined in Executive Order S-3-05, while further

---

9 [http://climatechange.transportation.org/ghg_mitigation/](http://climatechange.transportation.org/ghg_mitigation/)
mandating that CARB create a plan, which includes market mechanisms, and implement rules to achieve “real, quantifiable, cost-effective reductions of greenhouse gases.” Executive Order S-20-06 further directs state agencies to begin implementing AB 32, including the recommendations made by the State’s Climate Action Team.

**Executive Order S-01-07:** Governor Schwarzenegger set forth the low carbon fuel standard for California. Under this Executive Order, the carbon intensity of California’s transportation fuels is to be reduced by at least ten percent by 2020.

**Senate Bill 97 (Chapter 185, 2007):** required the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to develop recommended amendments to the State California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines for addressing greenhouse gas emissions. The Amendments became effective on March 18, 2010.

**Federal**

Although climate change and GHG reduction is a concern at the federal level; currently there are no regulations or legislation that have been enacted specifically addressing GHG emissions reductions and climate change at the project level. Climate change and its associated effects are being addressed through various efforts at the federal level to improve fuel economy and energy efficiency, such as the “National Clean Car Program” and Executive Order 13514- Federal Leadership in Environmental, Energy and Economic Performance.

Executive Order 13514 is focused on reducing greenhouse gases internally in federal agency missions, programs and operations, but also direct federal agencies to participate in the interagency Climate Change Adaptation Task Force, which is engaged in developing a U.S. strategy for adaptation to climate change.

On April 2, 2007, in *Massachusetts v. EPA*, 549 U.S. 497 (2007), the Supreme Court found that greenhouse gases are air pollutants covered by the Clean Air Act and that the U.S. EPA has the authority to regulate GHG. The Court held that the U.S. EPA Administrator must determine whether or not emissions of greenhouse gases from new motor vehicles cause or contribute to air pollution which may reasonably be anticipated to endanger public health or welfare, or whether the science is too uncertain to make a reasoned decision.

On December 7, 2009, the U.S. EPA Administrator signed two distinct findings regarding greenhouse gases under section 202(a) of the Clean Air Act:

- **Endangerment Finding:** The Administrator found that the current and projected concentrations of the six key well-mixed greenhouse gases--carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), nitrous oxide (N₂O), hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), perfluorocarbons (PFCs), and sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆)--in the atmosphere threaten the public health and welfare of current and future generations.
• **Cause or Contribute Finding:** The Administrator found that the combined emissions of these well-mixed greenhouse gases from new motor vehicles and new motor vehicle engines contribute to the greenhouse gas pollution which threatens public health and welfare.

Although these findings did not themselves impose any requirements on industry or other entities, this action was a prerequisite to finalizing the U.S. EPA’s *Proposed Greenhouse Gas Emission Standards for Light-Duty Vehicles*, which was published on September 15, 2009\(^\text{10}\). On May 7, 2010 the final *Light-Duty Vehicle Greenhouse Gas Emissions Standards and Corporate Average Fuel Economy Standards* was published in the Federal Register.

U.S. EPA and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) are taking coordinated steps to enable the production of a new generation of clean vehicles with reduced GHG emissions and improved fuel efficiency from on-road vehicles and engines. These next steps include developing the first-ever GHG regulations for heavy-duty engines and vehicles, as well as additional light-duty vehicle GHG regulations. These steps were outlined by President Obama in a memorandum on May 21, 2010\(^\text{11}\).

The final combined U.S. EPA and NHTSA standards that make up the first phase of this national program apply to passenger cars, light-duty trucks, and medium-duty passenger vehicles, covering model years 2012 through 2016. The standards require these vehicles to meet an estimated combined average emissions level of 250 grams of carbon dioxide per mile, equivalent to 35.5 miles per gallon (MPG) if the automobile industry were to meet this carbon dioxide level solely through fuel economy improvements. Together, these standards will cut GHG emissions by an estimated 960 million metric tons and 1.8 billion barrels of oil over the lifetime of the vehicles sold under the program (model years 2012-2016).

On January 24, 2011, the U.S. EPA along with the U.S. Department of Transportation and the State of California announced a single timeframe for proposing fuel economy and greenhouse gas standards for model years 2017-2025 cars and light-trucks. Proposing the new standards in the same timeframe (September 1, 2011) signals continued collaboration that could lead to an extension of the current National Clean Car Program.

### 4.3.2 Project Analysis

An individual project does not generate enough GHG emissions to significantly influence global climate change. Rather, global climate change is a cumulative impact. This means that a project may participate in a potential impact through its incremental contribution combined with the contributions of all other sources of GHG.\(^\text{12}\) In assessing cumulative impacts, it must

---

\(^{10}\) [http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/endangerment.html](http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/endangerment.html)

\(^{11}\) [http://epa.gov/otaq/climate/regulations.htm](http://epa.gov/otaq/climate/regulations.htm)

\(^{12}\) This approach is supported by the AEP: Recommendations by the Association of Environmental Professionals on How to Analyze GHG Emissions and Global Climate Change in CEQA Documents (March 5, 2007), as well as the SCAQMD (Chapter 6: The CEQA Guide, April 2011) and the U.S. Forest Service (Climate Change Considerations in Project Level NEPA Analysis, July 13, 2009).
be determined if a project’s incremental effect is “cumulatively considerable.” See CEQA Guidelines sections 15064(h)(1) and 15130. To make this determination the incremental impacts of the project must be compared with the effects of past, current, and probable future projects. To gather sufficient information on a global scale of all past, current, and future projects in order to make this determination is a difficult if not impossible task.

The AB 32 Scoping Plan contains the main strategies California will use to reduce GHG. As part of its supporting documentation for the Draft Scoping Plan, CARB released the GHG inventory for California (Forecast last updated: 28 October 2010). The forecast is an estimate of the emissions expected to occur in the year 2020 if none of the foreseeable measures included in the Scoping Plan were implemented. The base year used for forecasting emissions is the average of statewide emissions in the GHG inventory for 2006, 2007, and 2008 (see Figure 4.3-1).

![California Greenhouse Gas Emissions Forecast](http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/inventory/data/forecast.htm)

**Figure 4.3-1**

California Greenhouse Gas Forecast

Caltrans and its parent agency, the Business, Transportation, and Housing Agency, have taken an active role in addressing GHG emission reduction and climate change. Recognizing that 98 percent of California’s GHG emissions are from the burning of fossil fuels and 40 percent of all human made GHG emissions are from transportation, Caltrans has created and is implementing the Climate Action Program that was published in December 2006 (see Climate Action Program at Caltrans (December 2006).13

One of the main strategies in the Caltrans’ Climate Action Program to reduce GHG emissions is to make California’s transportation system more efficient. The highest levels of

---

13 [Caltrans Climate Action Program](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/ogm/key_reports_files/State_Wide_Strategy/Caltrans_Climat Action_Program.pdf)
carbon dioxide from mobile sources, such as automobiles, occur at stop-and-go speeds (0 to 25 miles per hour) and speeds over 55 mph; the most severe emissions occur from 0 to 25 miles per hour (see Figure 4.3-2 below). To the extent that a project relieves congestion by enhancing operations and improving travel times in high congestion travel corridors GHG emissions, particularly CO₂, may be reduced.

![Figure 4.3-2 Possible Effect of Traffic Operation Strategies in Reducing On-Road CO₂ Emission](http://onlinepubs.trb.org/onlinepubs/trnews/trnews268.pdf)

**4.3.2.1 Project GHG Emissions Analysis**

**Construction Emissions**

Greenhouse gas emissions for transportation projects can be divided into those produced during construction and those produced during operations. Construction GHG emissions are temporary in nature and include emissions produced as a result of material processing, emissions produced by onsite construction equipment, and emissions arising from traffic delays due to construction. These emissions will be produced at different levels throughout the construction phase; their frequency and occurrence can be reduced through innovations in plans and specifications and by implementing better traffic management during construction phases. In addition, with innovations such as longer pavement lives, improved traffic management plans, and changes in materials, the GHG emissions produced during construction can be mitigated to some degree by longer intervals between maintenance and rehabilitation events. Based on the preliminary information on construction duration and engineering, the construction CO₂ emissions have been estimated and are provided in Tables 3.3-4 and 3.3-5 under the Air Quality section.

---

Operational Emissions

Sources of operational GHG emissions are the same as those analyzed for criteria pollutant emissions and include GHG emissions from vehicles traveling along the project corridor. Project-related GHG emissions (No Project and Proposed Project Alternatives) were estimated using the emission factors for on-road mobile sources and VMTs along the project corridor. Climate change, as it relates to man-made GHG emissions, is by nature a global and cumulative impact. According to the Association of Environmental Professionals (AEP), in its paper titled *Alternative Approaches to Analyzing Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Global Climate Change in CEQA Documents*, “an individual project does not generate enough greenhouse gas emissions to significantly influence global climate change. Global climate change is a cumulative impact; a project participates in this potential impact through its incremental contribution combined with the cumulative increase of all other sources of greenhouse gases.” The following GHG emissions estimate is presented for the purpose of disclosing project-related emissions.

The project GHG emissions are evaluated for the following:

- The changes in the future GHG emissions along the project corridor compared to the CEQA baseline (i.e., emissions in 2010).

- The changes in GHG emissions for the Proposed Project Alternative along the project corridor compared with the No Project scenario.

These comparisons provide disclosure of estimated changes in project emissions of GHG based on forecast traffic data. Note that GHG emissions are only useful for a comparison between Alternatives or between years. The numbers are not necessarily an accurate reflection of what the true GHG emissions will be because GHG emissions are dependent on other factors that are not part of the model such as the fuel mix and consumption, rate of acceleration, and the aerodynamics and efficiency of the vehicles. ARB’s EMFAC model emission rates are only for direct engine-out CO₂ emissions and do not account for a full fuel cycle. Fuel cycle emission rates can vary dramatically depending on the amount of additives like ethanol and the source of the fuel components.

Table 4.3-1 below summarizes daily operational GHG emissions that would occur from vehicular traffic within the project limits in 2010, 2015, and 2035. Since CO₂ and CH₄ are the primary GHGs of concern, the estimate was limited to emissions of those. Emissions of the CO₂ and CH₄ were then converted to CO₂-equivalent or CO₂e.

---

### TABLE 4.3-1. EXISTING AND FUTURE ESTIMATED GHG EMISSIONS BY PROJECT ALTERNATIVES*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>CO₂ (MT/day)</th>
<th>CH₄ (kg/day)</th>
<th>CO₂e (MT/day)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Year 2010 Emissions</td>
<td>943.9</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>945.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2015</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Project Emissions</td>
<td>993.8</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>994.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Project Emissions</td>
<td>1,110.1</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>1,111.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ from Existing Emissions</td>
<td>166.2</td>
<td>-12.5</td>
<td>165.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ from No Project Emissions</td>
<td>116.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>116.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2035</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Project Emissions</td>
<td>1,289.3</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>1,289.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Project Emissions</td>
<td>1,361.7</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>1,362.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ from Existing Emissions</td>
<td>417.8</td>
<td>-32.1</td>
<td>417.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ from No Project Emissions</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>72.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Global Warming Potential (GWP) of 21 was applied for CH₄ based on the IPCC Second Assessment Report (1996).

Note: Minus (-) sign denotes a decrease from existing or No Project.

MT = Metric tons

**Comparison with CEQA Baseline (Year 2010 Emissions)**

The data in Table 4.3-1 indicate that the future daily operational CO₂ emissions for the Proposed Project and No Project Alternatives are anticipated to increase when compared to the existing level. The future daily operational emissions of CH₄, however, are anticipated to decrease. When converted to the equivalent of CO₂ or CO₂e, emissions are anticipated to increase in the future years (17.5 percent in 2015 and 44.1 percent in 2035 for the Proposed Project Alternative) when compared to the existing. The level of increase is expected to be more in 2035 than in 2015.

**Comparison with the No Project Alternative (NEPA Baseline)**

The data in Table 4.3-1 indicate that the Proposed Project Alternative is anticipated to result in increase in CO₂ emissions (11.7 percent in 2015 and 5.6 percent in 2035) and in CH₄ emissions (8.4 percent in 2015 and 2.6 percent in 2035) when compared to the No Project Alternative. The percentage of increase in CO₂e is similar to that in CO₂ emissions for both years.

**Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategies**

**AB 32 Compliance**

Caltrans continues to be actively involved on the Governor’s Climate Action Team as CARB works to implement the Executive Orders S-3-05 and S-01-07 and help achieve the targets set forth in AB 32. Many of the strategies Caltrans is using to help meet the targets in AB 32...
come from the California Strategic Growth Plan, which is updated each year. Former Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger’s Strategic Growth Plan calls for a $222 billion infrastructure improvement program to fortify the state’s transportation system, education, housing, and waterways, including $100.7 billion in transportation funding during the next decade. The Strategic Growth Plan targets a significant decrease in traffic congestion below today’s level and a corresponding reduction in GHG emissions. The Strategic Growth Plan proposes to do this while accommodating growth in population and the economy. A suite of investment options has been created that combined together are expected to reduce congestion. The Strategic Growth Plan relies on a complete systems approach to attain CO₂ reduction goals: system monitoring and evaluation, maintenance and preservation, smart land use and demand management, and operational improvements as depicted in Figure 4.3-3, The Mobility Pyramid.

![Mobility Pyramid](image)

**Figure 4.3-3**

**Mobility Pyramid**

Caltrans is supporting efforts to reduce vehicle miles traveled by planning and implementing smart land use strategies: job/housing proximity, developing transit-oriented communities, and high density housing along transit corridors. Caltrans is working closely with local jurisdictions on planning activities; however, Caltrans does not have local land use planning authority. Caltrans is also supporting efforts to improve the energy efficiency of the transportation sector by increasing vehicle fuel economy in new cars, light and heavy-duty trucks; Caltrans is doing this by supporting on-going research efforts at universities, by supporting legislative efforts to increase fuel economy, and by its participation on the Climate Action Team. It is important to note, however, that the control of the fuel economy standards is held by U.S. EPA and CARB. Lastly, the use of alternative fuels is also being considered; Caltrans is participating in funding for alternative fuel research at the UC Davis.
Table 4.3-2 summarizes Caltrans and statewide efforts that it is implementing in order to reduce GHG emissions. More detailed information about each strategy is included in the Climate Action Program at Caltrans (December 2006).

To the extent that it is applicable or feasible for the project and through coordination with the project development team, the following measures will also be included in the project to reduce the GHG emissions and potential climate change impacts from the project.

GHG reduction measures:

1. Caltrans and the California Highway Patrol are working with regional agencies to implement Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) to help manage the efficiency of the existing highway system as part of other projects. ITS is commonly referred to as electronics, communications, or information processing used singly or in combination to improve the efficiency or safety of a surface transportation system.

2. Landscaping reduces surface warming, and through photosynthesis, decreases CO₂. The project proposes planting in the intersection slopes, drainage channels, and seeding in areas adjacent to frontage roads and planting a variety of different-sized plant material and scattered skyline trees where appropriate but not to obstruct the view of the mountains. Caltrans has committed to planting a minimum of 40 trees. These trees will help offset any potential CO₂ emissions increase. Based on a formula from the Canadian Tree Foundation¹⁵, it is anticipated that the planted trees will offset between 7 and 10 tons of CO₂ per year.

3. The project would incorporate the use of energy efficient lighting, such as LED traffic signals. LED bulbs cost $60 to $70 apiece but last 5 to 6 years, compared to the 1-year average lifespan of the incandescent bulbs previously used. The LED bulbs themselves consume 10 percent of the electricity of traditional lights, which will also help reduce the projects CO₂ emissions.¹⁶

4. According to Caltrans Standard Specifications, the contractor must comply with all local Air Pollution Control District's rules, ordinances, and regulations in regards to air quality restrictions, including, but not limited to, the SCAQMD’s Rules 401, 402, and 403.

¹⁵ Canadian Tree Foundation at http://www.tcf-fca.ca/publications/pdf/english_reduceco2.pdf. For rural areas the formula is: # of trees/360 x survival rate = tones of carbon/year removed for each of 80 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Partnership</th>
<th>Method/Process</th>
<th>Estimated CO₂ Savings (MMT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lead Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart Land Use</td>
<td>Intergovernmental Review (IGR)</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Review and seek to mitigate development proposals</td>
<td>Not Estimated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planning Grants</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Competitive selection process</td>
<td>Not Estimated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Plans and Blueprint Planning</td>
<td>Regional Agencies</td>
<td>Regional plans and application process</td>
<td>Not Estimated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Improvements &amp; Intelligent Trans. System (ITS) Deployment</td>
<td>Strategic Growth Plan</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>State ITS; Congestion Management Plan</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream Energy &amp; GHG into Plans and Projects</td>
<td>Office of Policy Analysis &amp; Research; Division of Environmental Analysis</td>
<td>Interdepartmental effort</td>
<td>Policy establishment, guidelines, technical assistance</td>
<td>Not Estimated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational &amp; Information Program</td>
<td>Office of Policy Analysis &amp; Research</td>
<td>Interdepartmental, CalEPA, CARB, CEC</td>
<td>Analytical report, data collection, publication, workshops, outreach</td>
<td>Not Estimated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleet Greening &amp; Fuel Diversification</td>
<td>Division of Equipment</td>
<td>Department of General Services</td>
<td>Fleet Replacement B20 B100</td>
<td>.0045 .0065 .045 .0225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-vehicular Conservation Measures</td>
<td>Energy Conservation Program</td>
<td>Green Action Team</td>
<td>Energy Conservation Opportunities</td>
<td>.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland Cement</td>
<td>Office of Rigid Pavement</td>
<td>Cement and Construction Industries</td>
<td>2.5 % limestone cement mix 25 % fly ash cement mix &gt; 50 % fly ash/slag mix</td>
<td>1.2 4.2 .36 3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.72 18.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Caltrans, 2011.
Adaptation Strategies

“Adaptation strategies” refer to how Caltrans and others can plan for the effects of climate change on the state’s transportation infrastructure and strengthen or protect the facilities from damage. Climate change is expected to produce increased variability in precipitation, rising temperatures, rising sea levels, storm surges and intensity, and the frequency and intensity of wildfires. These changes may affect the transportation infrastructure in various ways, such as damaging roadbeds by longer periods of intense heat; increasing storm damage from flooding and erosion; and inundation from rising sea levels. These effects will vary by location and may, in the most extreme cases, require that a facility be relocated or redesigned. There may also be economic and strategic ramifications as a result of these types of impacts to the transportation infrastructure.

At the Federal level, the Climate Change Adaptation Task Force, co-chaired by the White House Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ), the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP), and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), released its interagency report October 14, 2010 outlining recommendations to President Obama for how Federal Agency policies and programs can better prepare the United States to respond to the impacts of climate change. The Progress Report of the Interagency Climate Change Adaptation Task Force recommends that the Federal Government implement actions to expand and strengthen the Nation’s capacity to better understand, prepare for, and respond to climate change.

Climate change adaption must also involve the natural environment as well. Efforts are underway on a statewide-level to develop strategies to cope with impacts to habitat and biodiversity through planning and conservation. The results of these efforts will help California agencies plan and implement mitigation strategies for programs and projects.

On November 14, 2008, Governor Schwarzenegger signed Executive Order S-13-08 which directed a number of state agencies to address California’s vulnerability to sea level rise caused by climate change. This Executive Order set in motion several agencies and actions to address the concern of sea level rise.

The California Natural Resources Agency (Resources Agency) was directed to coordinate with local, regional, state and federal public and private entities to develop. The California Climate Adaptation Strategy (Dec 2009)17, which summarizes the best known science on climate change impacts to California, assesses California's vulnerability to the identified impacts, and then outlines solutions that can be implemented within and across state agencies to promote resiliency.

The strategy outline is in direct response to Executive Order S-13-08 that specifically asked the Resources Agency to identify how state agencies can respond to rising temperatures,

---

changing precipitation patterns, sea level rise, and extreme natural events. Numerous other state agencies were involved in the creation of the Adaptation Strategy document, including Environmental Protection; Business, Transportation and Housing; Health and Human Services; and the Department of Agriculture. The document is broken down into strategies for different sectors that include: Public Health; Biodiversity and Habitat; Ocean and Coastal Resources; Water Management; Agriculture; Forestry; and Transportation and Energy Infrastructure. As data continues to be developed and collected, the state's adaptation strategy will be updated to reflect current findings.

Resources Agency was also directed to request the National Academy of Science to prepare a Sea Level Rise Assessment Report by December 2010\(^\text{18}\) to advise how California should plan for future sea level rise. The report is to include:

- relative sea level rise projections for California, Oregon and Washington taking into account coastal erosion rates, tidal impacts, El Niño and La Niña events, storm surge and land subsidence rates;
- the range of uncertainty in selected sea level rise projections;
- a synthesis of existing information on projected sea level rise impacts to state infrastructure (such as roads, public facilities and beaches), natural areas, and coastal and marine ecosystems;
- A discussion of future research needs regarding sea level rise.

Prior to the release of the final Sea Level Rise Assessment Report, all state agencies that are planning to construct projects in areas vulnerable to future sea level rise were directed to consider a range of sea level rise scenarios for the years 2050 and 2100 in order to assess project vulnerability and, to the extent feasible, reduce expected risks and increase resiliency to sea level rise. Sea level rise estimates should also be used in conjunction with information regarding local uplift and subsidence, coastal erosion rates, predicted higher high water levels, storm surge and storm wave data.

Until the final report from the National Academy of Sciences is released, interim guidance has been released by The Coastal Ocean Climate Action Team (CO-CAT) as well as Caltrans as a method to initiate action and discussion of potential risks to the state's infrastructure due to projected sea level rise.

All projects that have filed a Notice of Preparation, and/or are programmed for construction funding from 2008 through 2013, or are routine maintenance projects as of the date of Executive Order S-13-08 may, but are not required to, consider these planning guidelines. An NOP was filed for the project in 2012.

\(^{18}\) The Sea Level Rise Assessment report is currently due to be completed in 2012 and will include information for Oregon and Washington State as well as California.
Furthermore, Executive Order S-13-08 directed the Business, Transportation, and Housing Agency to prepare a report to assess vulnerability of transportation systems to sea level rising, affecting safety, maintenance, and operational improvements of the system and economy of the state. Caltrans continues to work on assessing the transportation system vulnerability to climate change, including the effect of sea level rise.

Currently, Caltrans is working to assess which transportation facilities are at greatest risk from climate change effects. However, without statewide planning scenarios for relative sea level rise and other climate change impacts, Caltrans has not been able to determine what change, if any, may be made to its design standards for its transportation facilities. Once statewide planning scenarios become available, Caltrans will be able review its current design standards to determine what changes, if any, may be warranted in order to protect the transportation system from sea level rise.

Climate change adaptation for transportation infrastructure involves long-term planning and risk management to address vulnerabilities in the transportation system from increased precipitation and flooding; the increased frequency and intensity of storms and wildfires; rising temperatures; and rising sea levels. Caltrans is an active participant in the efforts being conducted in response to Executive Order S-13-08 and is mobilizing to be able to respond to the National Academy of Science report on Sea Level Rise Assessment which is due to be released in 2012.

4.4 Significant Environmental Effects which Cannot be Avoided if the Proposed Project is Implemented

Section 15126.2(b) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR “describe any significant impacts, including those which can be mitigated, but not reduced to a level of insignificance. Where there are impacts that cannot be alleviated without imposing an alternative design, their implications, and the reasons why the project is being proposed, notwithstanding their effect, should be described.”

Project-level environmental review is described in Chapter 3 of this EIR. The impact assessment was conducted with the assumption that the project would be constructed to include design features and BMPs, as well as requirements associated with applicable laws and regulations. As a result of these analyses, it has been determined that all impacts determined to be potentially significant could be offset to a less-than-significant level through application of mitigation measures.

4.5 Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes which Would be Caused by the Proposed Project Should it be Implemented

Analysis of significant irreversible environmental changes that would be caused by the proposed project is required by CEQA, Section 15126.2(c). With regard to this review, reference is directed to the individual Chapter 3 sections addressing each issue area.
Implementation of the I-10 HOV Lane Project would result in permanent modification to the existing freeway facility and, in this sense, it is considered irreversible for all practical purposes. The proposed project would also irreversibly, but insignificantly, alter the visual landscape along the freeway.

However, because nearly all of the proposed improvements would affect previously disturbed and/or paved surfaces, the irreversible effect on the natural environment is considered to be minimal. In this regard, the proposed project would not result in irreversible, direct losses to the native habitat or cultural resources.

A large quantity of nonrenewable energy resources would be consumed during construction of the proposed project. This includes burning of fossil fuels for construction equipment and vehicle operations. The use of these nonrenewable energy resources is considered to incrementally add to the loss of these resources; however, this impact would be offset by energy saved after the HOV lanes are in operation, as described below.

Recurrent congestion contributes to inefficient energy consumption as vehicles use extra fuels while idling in stop-and-go traffic or moving at slow speeds. Without adding the proposed HOV lanes, this congestion is predicted to worsen along the mixed-flow traffic lanes, with associated low travel speeds and long delays during peak hours. Such recurrent traffic congestion would result in inefficient energy consumption.
CHAPTER 5
ALTERNATIVES
5.0 Alternatives

In accordance with Section 15126.6 of the State CEQA Guidelines, an EIR must address a range of project alternatives that would feasibly accomplish most of the basic objectives of the proposed project while avoiding or substantially lessening one or more of the significant environmental effects that are assessed in the EIR. The No Project Alternative must also be evaluated, with its impacts, as part of the EIR [CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)].

The factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternative locations include site suitability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitation, jurisdictional boundaries, and whether the proponent can reasonably acquire, control, or otherwise have access to the alternative site. The decision to select alternative locations needs to be based on whether they would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project. Should the lead agency determine that no feasible alternative locations for the project exist, then the reasons for this determination must be disclosed within the alternatives discussion. In addition, the alternatives analysis must include a comparative evaluation of the No Project Alternative, which allows decision makers to compare the impacts of approving the proposed project with the impacts of not approving the project.

Because the I-10 HOV Lane Project would involve addition of lanes and other improvements to an existing freeway that has been operational since the 1950s, and the alignment traverses built-out areas, there are no options for alternative project locations. To meet the proposed project’s purpose and objectives, including closure of a current gap between existing and planned HOV facilities, the HOV lanes could not be located along alternative alignments outside of the existing developed area. As a result, selection of an alternative alignment is not a viable consideration for avoiding the impacts identified by the EIR in association with the proposed project.

5.1 Alternatives Considered

The current state of design and planning for the proposed project is the result of an ongoing, comprehensive process that began in the early 1990s. In 1991, Caltrans conducted a study that identified long-term operational and capacity deficiencies on I-10 from Baldwin Avenue to Citrus Street. This study was documented in the Project Study Report (PSR) approved on February 6, 1991. It developed several alternative solutions to address the operational deficiencies.

In May 1994, a separate PSR was approved by Caltrans for I-10 HOV Lane between Citrus Street and the SR 57/I-210/SR 71 interchange. Both PSRs included discussion about the following five alternatives: (1) No Project, (2) Traffic System Management (TSM), (3) HOV Standard and Nonstandard Treatments, (4) Additional General Purpose Lane, and (5)
Elevated Facility (Buses and HOV). Caltrans’ proposal is to construct a variation of the nonstandard HOV lane alternative recommended in the approved PSRs.

This Final EIR follows previous environmental documentation that was prepared for a longer HOV lane improvement project encompassing the same portion of I-10. In the early 2000s, Caltrans, in cooperation with Metro, completed an IS/EA to assess impacts associated with an approximately 11.2-mile-long section of I-10 from I-605 easterly to the SR 57/SR 71/I-210 interchange. The IS/EA evaluated a range of alternatives to meet existing (at the time) and future traffic demands. This process resulted in selection of the Build Nonstandard HOV Lane as the preferred alternative for subsequent design and construction.

5.1.1 Standard HOV Lane Alternative
The Standard HOV Lane Alternative would also provide construction of an HOV lane in each direction; however, it proposes a standard 10-foot-wide median and 12-foot-wide lanes. This cross section would require typical mainline widening of approximately 23 feet in each direction. This would result in the need for 10-foot-wide minimum sliver ROW acquisitions along approximately 4 miles of Garvey Avenue, resulting in the acquisition of many residential and business properties. It would have substantial utility impacts and create substantial construction disturbances beyond those anticipated for the proposed project. Significant ROW and traffic impacts are also likely at the local interchanges because the ramps would have to be reconfigured to provide acceptable geometrics. Vertical clearance constraints would be magnified and, in turn, so would the drainage and utility work associated with the profile lowering.

When compared to the Nonstandard HOV Lane Alternative, the Standard HOV Lane Alternative would provide only nominal operational benefits and safety improvements, yet have substantially higher cost and ROW and utility impacts. For these reasons, the Standard HOV Lane Alternative has been eliminated from further consideration.

5.1.2 Additional General Purpose Lane Alternative
An alternative that would add one mixed-flow lane in each direction instead of an HOV lane was considered. First, the Additional General Purpose Lane Alternative would not be consistent with the RTP and the ultimate configuration of I-10 as defined in the Project Reports as two HOV plus eight mixed-flow lanes. In addition, the Additional General Purpose Lane Alternative would not achieve the project purpose to increase the person-carrying capacity and promotion of ride sharing on I-10. Finally, any such alternative would not allow a logical extension to close an existing 9.2-mile-long HOV lane system gap; therefore, the Additional General Purpose Lane Alternative has been eliminated from further analysis.

5.1.3 Elevated Facility Alternative
The Elevated Facility Alternative would utilize the existing median to construct a viaduct over the existing freeway. While this alternative would achieve the project purpose to
increase the person-carrying capacity and promote ride sharing on I-10, while also providing a logical extension to close an existing 9.2-mile-long HOV lane system gap, this alternative would not be consistent with the RTP and the ultimate configuration of I-10 as defined in the Project Reports. In addition, this alternative would definitely involve unspecified, but excessive ROW and construction costs and impacts to build an elevated HOV facility. For these reasons, the Elevated Facility Alternative has been eliminated from further analysis.

5.1.4 Traffic System Management Alternative

TSM strategies consist of actions that increase the efficiency of existing facilities; they are actions that increase the number of vehicle trips a facility can carry without increasing the number of through lanes. The proposed project would help foster a unified urban transportation system by supporting automobile, public/private transit, ridesharing programs, and bicycle/pedestrian facility improvements; therefore, it would complement both existing and future TSM/Transportation Demand Management (TDM) improvements within the study area. Although TSM measures alone could not satisfy the purpose and objectives of the proposed project, the following TSM measures have been incorporated into the Proposed Project Alternative: ramp metering, auxiliary lanes, turning lanes, and traffic signal coordination; however, major construction would be necessary to substantially improve traffic LOS. Because the TSM Alternative would not be consistent with the RTP and the ultimate configuration of I-10 as defined in the Project Reports, would not achieve the project goals and objectives to increase the person-carrying capacity and promote ride sharing on I-10, and would not allow a logical extension to close an existing 9.2-mile-long HOV lane system gap, the TSM Alternative has been eliminated from further analysis.

5.2 No Project Alternative

This alternative provides a baseline scenario for comparison with the proposed alternative. The No Project Alternative assumes HOV improvements associated with the proposed project would not be made to the existing facility. With this alternative, temporary (i.e., construction) impacts associated with each of the build alternatives would be avoided. However, the No Project Alternative would not be consistent with local and regional plans of Metro and Caltrans because additional traffic demands would not be satisfied. Without improvements to I-10, safety, travel times, fuel consumption, and air quality would deteriorate throughout the project corridor.

5.3 Nonstandard HOV Lane Alternative (Proposed Project)

The Nonstandard HOV Lane Alternative is the proposed project and is fully described in Chapter 1 of this document.
5.4 Environmentally Superior Alternative

This section summarizes the environmental advantages and disadvantages associated with the proposed project and the alternatives. Based upon this discussion, the environmentally superior alternative is selected as required by CEQA.

CEQA does not provide specific direction regarding the methodology of comparing alternatives and the proposed project. Each project must be evaluated for the issues and impacts that are most important; this will vary depending on the project type and the environmental setting. Issue areas that are generally given more weight in comparing alternatives are those with significant long-term impacts. Impacts that are short-term (e.g., construction-related impacts) or those that can be mitigated to less than significant levels are generally considered less important.

This comparison is designed to satisfy the requirements of the CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(d), Evaluation of Alternatives, which states that:

“The EIR shall include sufficient information about each alternative to allow meaningful evaluation, analysis, and comparison with the proposed project. If an alternative would cause one or more significant effects in addition to those that would be caused by the project as proposed, the significant effects of the alternative shall be discussed, but in less detail than the significant effects of the project as proposed.”

The CEQA Guidelines (Section 15126.6(e)(2)) also state that “If the environmentally superior alternative is the “No Project” alternative, the EIR would also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives.”

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(d), this EIR provides sufficient information about each alternative to allow meaningful evaluation, analysis, and comparison with the proposed project and the other alternatives. The following impact comparison between project alternatives is based on the analyses provided in Chapter 3.0, Environmental Analysis, and in Section 4.2, Cumulative Impacts. An alternative would be considered superior to the proposed project if there is a reduction in impact classification.

Both the Proposed Project Alternative and the No Project Alternative are judged to be environmentally superior to the Standard HOV Lane Alternative and the Elevated Facility Alternative. While achieving the project purpose to close the 9.2-mile-long gap between HOV lane termini, the latter two alternatives would result in more extensive impacts, especially within the following issue areas: aesthetics and visual resources, noise, biological, land use (particularly acquisitions), and construction.

In comparing the proposed project with the TSM Alternative, it is important to note that the proposed project would include TSM components, as noted above in Section 5.1.4; therefore,
it is not possible to do a direct comparison between these two alternatives. In general, however, the TSM Alternative would be comparable in terms of impacts to the No Project Alternative as discussed in the following paragraphs.

In comparing the Nonstandard HOV Lane Alternative with the No Project Alternative, the key consideration is balancing the short-term construction impacts with the long-term benefits associated with I-10 operational improvements. In this regard, attention is directed to the following considerations:

- Construction impacts assessed by issue area in Chapter 3 of this EIR would not occur for the No Project Alternative. All significant impacts due to construction activities can be mitigated to a level of insignificance.

- While there would be degradation in traffic conditions on both the freeway mainline and local streets during construction of the proposed project, the mobility, capacity, and mode-shift benefits associated with the proposed project would not occur under the No Project Alternative. Peak-period traffic delays beyond those expected for proposed project operations would occur in both the westbound and eastbound directions.

- While there would not be temporary, localized increases in construction air emissions with the No Project Alternative, without the proposed project there would be long-term air quality deterioration associated with expected LOS degradation.

- While there would be no construction-related noise associated with the No Project Alternative, without the proposed project there would be more operational noise related to worse stop-and-go traffic conditions on the freeway mainline and ramps.

- While there would be no construction-related property acquisitions under the No Project Alternative, the No Project Alternative would be inconsistent with several regional planning documents identified in Section 1.4.8 of this EIR.

- The No Project Alternative would not achieve the purpose and objectives outlined in Chapter 1, Project Description. In particular, this alternative would not close the gap between existing and planned HOV facilities.

Given the relative impacts and merits of the proposed project and each alternative that was considered in this EIR, and based on the discussion presented above, as designed and with incorporation of the recommended mitigation measures, the Nonstandard HOV Lane Alternative (Proposed Project Alternative) is considered to be the environmentally superior alternative.
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COMMENTS AND COORDINATION
7.0 Comments and Coordination

CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR, Sections 15082-15083) recommend that federal, state, and local lead agencies use a public scoping process to help identify the various issues to be addressed in the environmental document. Scoping allows public agencies and the general public to learn about the proposed project and to provide suggestions regarding alternatives and the types of impacts to be evaluated.

This chapter summarizes the results of the affected jurisdictions and Caltrans’ efforts to fully identify, address, and resolve project-related issues through early and continuing public involvement and agency coordination.

7.1 Initiation of Studies Letters

7.1.1 1993 Initiation of Studies Letters and Scoping

Initiation of studies letters were distributed by Caltrans, District 7 to agencies, organizations, utilities and interested persons on April 7, 1993, describing a range of alternatives that would be considered for the project study area on Interstate Route 10. Responses to the 1993 initiation of studies letters were received from a total of five agencies and one utility. Issues raised in those response letters were addressed in a 2003 Initial Study/Environmental Assessment (IS/EA) for the proposed I-10 High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) Lane project. Copies of the 1993 initiation of studies letters, distribution list and responses to the initiation of studies letters are on file with Caltrans.

A scoping notice for the proposed I-10 HOV Lane project between Baldwin Avenue and the State Route 57/State Route 71/Interstate Route 210 (SR 57/SR 71/I-210) Interchange was published in six area newspapers on June 17 and June 24, 1993. Responses to the scoping notice were received from two cities and one utility agency. Issues raised in those response letters are addressed in the proposed I-10 HOV lanes project. The scoping newspaper notices and the responses to that notice are on file at Caltrans.

7.1.2 2001 Re-Initiation of Studies Letters

On December 17, 2001, Caltrans distributed re-initiation of studies letters for the proposed I-10 HOV lane project to 27 elected officials. On December 18, 2001, Caltrans distributed re-initiation of studies letters to 58 public agencies (federal, state, regional and local) and other interested parties. Copies of these re-initiation of studies letters are provided in the 2003 IS/EA.

A notice for the re-initiation of studies for the proposed I-10 HOV lane project between Baldwin Avenue and the SR 57/SR 71/I-210 Interchange was published in the following area newspapers on January 24, 2002: San Gabriel Valley Tribune; Los Angeles Times-San
Responses to the re-initiation of studies letters and the newspaper notices were received from:

- Foothill Transit (December 28, 2002).
- City of West Covina Public Works Department (January 22, 2002).
- West Covina Redevelopment Agency (January 17, 2002).

### 7.2 Consultation with Local Jurisdictions

During the preparation of the detailed engineering studies for the proposed HOV lanes, Caltrans conducted extensive coordination with affected local jurisdictions. Meetings were held with the cities of Baldwin Park on March 28, 2001, and West Covina on April 30, 2001 and March 27, 2002. These meetings were held to discuss the various alternatives; potential effects of the alternatives on local frontage roads, parking facilities, businesses and residences; design modifications that would avoid or reduce impacts associated with HOV lanes; and other issues of concern to these local jurisdictions.

As project design details have been modified, over time, including soundwall placement, ongoing consultation with the affected local jurisdictions has been conducted.

### 7.3 Distribution of the Draft Environmental Document (IS/EA)

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Caltrans circulated the Draft IS/EA for public review and comment between October 18, 2002 and December 6, 2002.

#### 7.3.1 Public Comment Period for the 2003 IS/EA

Caltrans published a Notice of Public Hearing on October 22, 2002 and November 7, 2002, which indicated that the IS/EA was available for public review and comment. The Notice was published in the following papers:

- San Gabriel Valley Tribune (10/22/02 and 11/7/02)
- Pasadena Star News (10/22/02 and 11/7/02)
- Whittier Daily News (10/22/02 and 11/7/02)
- Los Angeles Times-San Gabriel Valley edition (11/7/02)
- Inland Valley Daily Bulletin (10/22/02 and 11/7/02)
- La Opinión (10/22/02 and 11/7/02)

Copies of the Draft IS/EA were available for review at Caltrans’ District 7 Office located at 120 South Spring Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012, and at the following community facilities:
• Baldwin Park Library, 4181 Baldwin Park Boulevard
• West Covina Library, 1601 West Covina Parkway
• Covina Public Library, 234 North Second Avenue
• San Dimas Library, 145 North Walnut Avenue
• Pomona Library, 625 South Garey Avenue

In addition, the Draft ED was also available for review online during the public review period. Copies of the letters and Caltrans’ responses can be found in the 2003 IS/EA, available for review at Caltrans’ District 7 Office.

7.4 Public Hearing (IS/EA)

FHWA and Caltrans conducted a public hearing on the 2003 IS/EA on November 21, 2002 from 6:00 PM to 8:00 PM in the Community Room at West Covina City Hall, 1444 West Garvey Avenue, West Covina, CA 91790. As indicated above, a Notice of Public Hearing was published in area newspapers and was sent to elected officials, agencies, and interested individuals.

Meeting attendees’ comments and Caltrans’ responses are included under separate cover in the Official Transcripts from the hearing found in the Record of Public Hearing. A total of seven comment cards with written comments only were submitted at the public hearing. The comments/questions provided on the comment cards and Caltrans’ responses are included in 2003 IS/EA.

7.5 Distribution of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR)

Caltrans issued a Notice of Preparation for a Re-Evaluation document for Segments 2 and 3 due to project design changes that had occurred since the original MND/FONSI for all three segments of the project was issued in 2003. This Notice of Preparation can be found in Appendix B.

7.5.1 Public Comment Period for the 2012 EIR

Caltrans published a Notice of Public Hearing on December 12, 2011, which indicated that the EIR was available for public review and comment. A press release was also issued for the same meeting (See News Release below.) The Notice was published in the following papers:

• The World Journal (Chinese) - 11/23/11
• China Post (Chinese) - 12/8/11
• San Gabriel Valley Tribune - 11/21/11
• San Dimas/La Verne Highlander in combination with the West Covina Highlander, Covina Press Courier and La Verne Leader - 11/24/11
• Inland Valley Daily Bulletin - 11/21/11
• Impacto (Spanish) - 11/26/11
NEWS RELEASE

Date: December 12, 2011
District: Los Angeles/Ventura
Contact: Public Affairs
Phone: (213) 897-3656
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

CALTRANS SCHEDULES PUBLIC MEETING TO DISCUSS I-10 HOV CONSTRUCTION PROJECT

Pomona – The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) will host a public information meeting to discuss the status of the San Bernardino Freeway (I-10) High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV or carpool) lane construction project between Puente Avenue and the Orange Freeway (SR-57).

Participants will have an opportunity to provide comments and ask questions regarding project elements and environmental impacts, such as: noise abatement, air quality, traffic circulation, potential property acquisitions, construction impacts, schedule, and federal, state and local funding commitments.

The meeting will take place Tuesday, December 13 at Cal Poly Pomona (3801 West Temple Avenue, Pomona, CA 91768) starting at 6 p.m. Participants are encouraged to come at any time between 6 p.m. and 8 p.m. A live webcast of this meeting, along with Twitter updates will be provided, and can be found at the District 7 website, at http://www.dot.ca.gov/dist07/travel/projects/details.php?id=30
Caltrans personnel will be available to answer questions and discuss issues regarding the I-10 HOV project and other ongoing efforts to promote congestion relief in the area.

###
Copies of the Draft IS/EA were available for review at Caltrans’ District 7 Office located at 120 South Spring Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012, and at local libraries.

In addition, the Draft ED was also available for review online during the public review period. Copies of the letters and Caltrans’ responses can be found in the 2012 EIR, available for review at Caltrans’ District 7 Office.

7.6 Public Hearing (EIR)

Caltrans conducted a public hearing on the 2012 EIR on December 13, 2011 from 6:00 PM to 8:00 PM in the Ursa Minor Room of the Bronco Student Center at California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, 3801 W. Temple Avenue, Pomona, CA 91768. As indicated above, a Notice of Public Hearing was published in area newspapers and was sent to elected officials, agencies, and interested individuals.

Meeting attendees’ comments and Caltrans’ responses are included in Appendix J, Comments and Responses on the DEIR.

7.7 West Covina Community Meeting

A community meeting sponsored by the City of West Covina was conducted on January 5, 2012 from 5:00 PM to 7:30 PM in the West Covina City Hall Council Chambers, 1444 W. Garvey Avenue South, West Covina, CA 91790. The City of West Covina issued a press release on January 3, 2012 on the City’s website advertising this meeting.

Meeting attendees’ comments and Caltrans’ responses are included in Appendix J, Comments and Responses on the DEIR.
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<td><strong>City of Baldwin Park City Council</strong></td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agencies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental Protection Agency</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Federal Activities (A104)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401 M Street SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC 20460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>District Commander</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attn: Public Affairs office, Suite 1525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>911 Wilshire Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles, CA 90012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Director Office of Environmental Affairs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Health and Human Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 Independence Avenue SW, Room 537F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC 20201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental Clearance Officer</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Department of Housing &amp; Urban Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>451 7th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.W. Washington, D.C. 20410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Center for Disease Control</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Environmental Health &amp; Injury Control Special Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail Stop F-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600 Clifton Road Atlanta, GA 30333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Director, Office of Environmental Compliance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Department of Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000 Independence Avenue, SW, Room 4G-064</td>
</tr>
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<td>Washington, DC 20585</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office of Community and Planning Development Department of Housing and Urban Development 611 West 6th Street, Suite 800 Los Angeles, CA 90017</th>
<th>Office of Planning and Research State Clearinghouse P.O. Box 3044 Sacramento, CA 95812-3044</th>
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<tr>
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<td>Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board 320 West 4th Street, Suite 200 Los Angeles, CA 90013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Coast Air Quality Management District 21865 East Copley Drive Diamond Bar, CA 91765</td>
<td>Mr. Mark A. Pisano, Executive Director Southern California Association of Governments 818 West Seventh Street, 12th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90017</td>
<td>Los Angeles County Department of Public Works 125 South Baldwin Avenue Arcadia, CA 91007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin Park Unified School District 3699 North Holly Avenue Baldwin Park, CA 91706</td>
<td>Covina Valley Unified School District 519 East Badillo Road Covina, CA 91723</td>
<td>Foothill Transit District 100 North Barranca Avenue, Suite 100 West Covina, CA 91791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Wildlife Federation P.O. Box 1527 Sacramento, CA 95812</td>
<td>Sierra Club Los Angeles Chapter 3435 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 320 Los Angeles, CA 90010-1904</td>
<td>Automobile Club of Southern California 3333 Fairview Road Costa Mesa, CA 92626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Long Range Planning University of California 300 Lakeside Drive 12th floor Oakland, CA 94612</td>
<td>Los Angeles County Fire Department 1320 North Eastern Avenue Los Angeles, CA 90063</td>
<td>State Clearinghouse P.O. Box 3044 Sacramento, CA 95812-3044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Transportation Division of Environmental Analysis Attn: Caltrans CTC Liaison 1120 N Street, MS 27 Sacramento, CA 95814</td>
<td>United States Fish and Wildlife Service 2493 Portola Rd, Suite B Ventura, CA 93003</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration 201 Mission St, Suite 1650 San Francisco, CA 94105-1839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Aviation Administration 15000 Aviation Blvd Lawndale, CA 90260</td>
<td>United States Department of Agriculture 1400 Independence Ave, SW Washington DC 20250</td>
<td>Federal Emergency Management Agency 1111 Broadway, Suite 1200 Oakland, CA 94607-4052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Department of Conservation 801 K Street, MS 24-01 Sacramento, CA 95814</td>
<td>California Air Resources Board 200 Oceangate, 10th floor Long Beach, CA 90765-4182</td>
<td>California Integrated Waste Management Board 1001 I Street, PO Box 4025 Sacramento, CA 95814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Coastal Commission</td>
<td>State Water Resources Control Board</td>
<td>California Native American Heritage Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 Oceangate, 10th floor Long Beach, CA 90802</td>
<td>1001 I Street Sacramento, CA 95814</td>
<td>915 Capitol Mall Sacramento, CA 95814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Department of Water Resources</td>
<td>California Public Utilities Commission</td>
<td>Governor's Office of Emergency Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1416 9th Street Sacramento, CA 95814</td>
<td>505 Van Ness Ave. San Francisco, CA 94102</td>
<td>3650 Schreiver Ave. Mather, CA 95655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Department of Toxic Substances Control</td>
<td>CRA/LA</td>
<td>City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1449 W Temple St Los Angeles, CA 90026-5698</td>
<td>354 S Spring St, Suite 800 Los Angeles, CA 90013</td>
<td>100 S Main St, 10th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAFCO for Los Angeles County</td>
<td>Metropolitan Water District</td>
<td>Los Angeles Department of City Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700 N Central Blvd., Ste 445 Glendale, CA 91203</td>
<td>PO Box 54153 Los Angeles, CA 90054</td>
<td>200 N Spring St Los Angeles CA 90012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles County Department of Public Works</td>
<td>County of Los Angeles Parks/Recreation</td>
<td>Los Angeles County Dept of Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900 S Fremont Ave Alhambra, CA 91803</td>
<td>1200 W Seventh St Suite 700 Los Angeles, CA 90017</td>
<td>313 N Figueroa St, Room 806 Los Angeles, CA 90012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles County Dept of Regional Planning Hall of Records</td>
<td>Los Angeles County Sanitation District</td>
<td>Los Angeles Department of Water and Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13th Floor, 320 W Temple St Los Angeles, CA 90012</td>
<td>PO Box 4998 Whittier, CA 90607-4998</td>
<td>PO Box 51111 Los Angeles, CA 90051-0100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department</td>
<td>Los Angeles County Unified School District</td>
<td>Southern California Edison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4700 Ramona Blvd Monterey Park, CA 91754</td>
<td>PO Box 3307 Los Angeles, CA 90051</td>
<td>PO Box 800 Rosemead, CA 91770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles County Bicycle Coalition</td>
<td>U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration</td>
<td>United States Forest Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>634 S Spring St, Suite 821 Los Angeles, CA 90014</td>
<td>1200 New Jersey Ave SE, Washington, DC 20590</td>
<td>1400 Independence Ave., SW Washington, D.C. 20250-0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service</td>
<td>National Park Service Marilyn Sutton</td>
<td>Office of Planning and Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501 West Ocean Blvd. Long Beach, CA 90802-4213</td>
<td>401 West Hillcrest Drive Thousand Oaks, CA 91360</td>
<td>1400 Tenth Street Sacramento, California 95814</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interested Parties**

<p>| California Native Plant Society | Greyhound Lines | Jim Louder |
| 2707 K Street, Suite 1 Sacramento, CA 95816-5113 | 5110 North Dallas Parkway Dallas, TX 75248 | 3 Williamsburg Lane Rolling Hills, CA 90274 |
| Francis Park Park &amp; Velayos LLP | Ginny Ray | Olga Fernandez |
| 801 South Figueroa Street, Suite 350 Los Angeles, California 90017 | PO Box 75 West Covina, CA 91793 | 861 Forest Hills Dr. Covina, CA 91724 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sheri Bonstelle</th>
<th>Michael Nytzen</th>
<th>Mr. Gary Shepherd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeffer Mangles Co.</td>
<td>Park &amp; Velayos LLP</td>
<td>514 38th St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900 Avenue of the Stars,</td>
<td>801 South Figueroa Street,</td>
<td>Newport Beach, CA 92663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Floor</td>
<td>Suite 350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles, CA 90067</td>
<td>Los Angeles, California 90017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luis Batres</td>
<td>Joe Battaglia</td>
<td>David P. Waite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Puente, CA 91744</td>
<td>Glendora, CA 91741</td>
<td>1900 Avenue of the Stars,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7th Floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA 90067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Lopez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Baldwin Park, DPW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14403 East Pacific Ave.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin Park, CA 91706</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDICES
Appendix A  CEQA Environmental Checklist

CEQA Environmental Checklist

| 07-LA-10 | 33.2/42.4 | 119341, 1170U1 |
| Dist.-Co.-Rte. | P.M/P.M. | E.A. |

This checklist identifies physical, biological, social, and economic factors that might be affected by the proposed project. In many cases, background studies performed in connection with the projects indicate no impacts. A NO IMPACT answer in the last column reflects this determination. Where there is a need for clarifying discussion, the discussion is included either following the applicable section of the checklist or is within the body of the environmental document itself. The words "significant" and "significance" used throughout the following checklist are related to CEQA, not NEPA, impacts. The questions in this form are intended to encourage the thoughtful assessment of impacts and do not represent thresholds of significance.

### I. AESTHETICS: Would the project:

(a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?
- [ ] Potentially Significant Impact
- [ ] Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation
- [ ] Less Than Significant Impact
- [ ] No Impact

(b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?
- [ ] Potentially Significant Impact
- [ ] Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation
- [ ] Less Than Significant Impact
- [ ] No Impact

(c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?
- [ ] Potentially Significant Impact
- [ ] Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation
- [ ] Less Than Significant Impact
- [ ] No Impact

(d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?
- [ ] Potentially Significant Impact
- [ ] Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation
- [ ] Less Than Significant Impact
- [ ] No Impact

#### a. No Impact. Because of the urban nature of the surrounding area, scenic vistas are not present. In addition, obstruction of views due to numerous existing soundwall barriers exist; therefore, the proposed ‘Add One High-Occupancy Vehicle Lane in Each Direction on the San Bernardino Freeway (Interstate 10) from Puente Avenue to State Routes 57/71 in Los Angeles County’ Project (henceforth referred to as the ‘I-10 HOV Lane Project’ or ‘proposed project’) would not result in an adverse effect on a scenic vista. No mitigation is required.

#### b. No Impact. For the reasons stated above, the proposed project would not degrade scenic resources. In addition, I-10 within the proposed project area is not designed as a state scenic highway. No mitigation is required.

#### c. Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation. The proposed I-10 HOV Lane Project generally would neither substantially alter existing viewsheds in the study area nor change the overall composition of the visual environment. With the exception of the Kellogg Hill viewshed, views from surrounding land uses are not generally oriented toward I-10. There are no designated scenic corridors within the project limits. Existing desirable views of the distant San Gabriel Mountains from the motorist’s perspective would mostly remain unobstructed, even with the implementation of soundwalls and retaining walls.

Foreground views of construction activities in the median and at the shoulders of I-10 would be visible by motorists and from adjacent land uses such as the Forest Lawn Memorial Park Cemetery and Kellogg House mansion parking area. Use of
barriers to screen construction activities would be recommended.

The proposed project would result in a permanent change in the visual setting where the HOV lanes can be viewed from the foreground and the middle-ground distance zones in the vicinity of the California State Polytechnic University Pomona (Cal Poly Pomona) campus. Retaining walls proposed to be constructed on the south side of I-10, between the University House parking lot and the Kellogg Drive off-ramp, would be visible from the Cal Poly Pomona campus. While mature vegetation exists between these viewer groups and the retaining walls, this change in the visual setting could constitute an impact to some observers. Mitigation in the form of landscaping would lessen these impacts to a level of less than significant.

The proposed project would include landscaping in the remaining available public right-of-way (ROW), consistent with the California Department of Transportation's (Department’s) existing procedures and standards regarding plant materials and placement. Affected local jurisdictions would be invited to work with the Department on the landscaping plans associated with construction of the HOV lanes.

The Department has an existing program to collect litter, replace landscaping, and clean graffiti within the Department’s ROW, which would continue during operation of the HOV lanes; therefore, the proposed project would not result in substantial adverse aesthetic impacts related to litter, degraded landscaping, and graffiti.

d. **No Impact.** Existing light and glare sources in the I-10 project study area include lighting on the I-10 mainline and ramps, on area streets, in parking areas, and around existing land uses. Most of the study area is developed with urban uses, and there are no existing substantial adverse sources of light and glare. Existing shadow sources include structures such as residences, businesses, walls, and overcrossings. The existing visual quality in the study area is not high, and there are no sensitive land uses that would be adversely affected by light, glare, and/or shadow associated with the proposed project. The proposed project would not introduce changes to this condition. No mitigation is required.

### II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment Project; and the forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a. **No Impact.** Based on a review of the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, there are no Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance within the proposed project study area. No mitigation is required.

b. **Less Than Significant Impact.** Unincorporated land south of I-10 from approximately the intersection of East Garvey Avenue South and Palomino Drive (the western boundary of Forest Lawn Memorial Park Cemetery) to the SR 57/SR 71 interchange is zoned for agricultural use. An approximate 0.6-mile stretch of unincorporated land on the north side of I-10 east of the city of Covina boundary is also zoned for agricultural use (A-1-40000), but it is actually being used for large-lot residential purposes. Williamson Act contracts are not attached to these land parcels. Soundwalls are recommended along some of these areas. Most of the soundwalls would be within Caltrans ROW; however, some land may be acquired to accommodate the soundwalls. Because the land in question is not in active agricultural production but is zoned for such use, a less than significant impact is judged to exist. No mitigation is required.

c-d. **No Impact.** The subject I-10 corridor is within an urban area with some open space/agricultural zoning associated with Forest Lawn Memorial Park Cemetery and the Cal Poly Pomona campus. No forest land, timberland, or timberland-zoned Timberland Production areas are located within the proposed project vicinity. No mitigation is required.

e. **No Impact.** No land used for farming or forestry purposes would be affected by the proposed project. No mitigation is required.

### III. AIR QUALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III. AIR QUALITY: Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. **No impact.** To conform to state and federal air quality plans, a project must be included in approved transportation plans and programs. The proposed project is included in the Southern California Associated Government’s 2008 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) for which the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) issued a transportation and air quality conformity determination on June 5, 2008, and in the 2011 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), which was approved by FHWA and FTA on September 2, 2010; therefore, the proposed project would be in conformance with the Clean Air Act. Moreover, the project would add capacity intended for use by HOVs, which is an objective of both the regional and federal plans. A beneficial effect would therefore apply to the proposed project.

b. **Less than Significant Impact.** Short-term air quality impacts are expected during construction due to motor vehicle and construction equipment emissions. With the application of various required controls to be incorporated into the proposed project, these temporary air quality impacts are considered less than significant.

When operational, the proposed project is intended to reduce congestion and increase travel speed on I-10. It is anticipated that the proposed project would result in a slight decrease in the amount of some criteria pollutants when compared to the No Project Alternative; therefore, the proposed project should result in an overall beneficial effect, albeit small, on air pollutant emissions.

c. **Less than Significant Impact** See response to Item III.a. The South Coast Air Basin (SCAB) is designated as nonattainment for ozone (O₃), particulate matter of 2.5 microns or smaller in diameter (PM_{2.5}), and particulate matter of ten
microns or smaller in diameter (PM_{10}). Past project-specific air emission studies have shown that the proposed project would be expected to result in minor changes to area emissions of O_{3} precursors and particulate matter because it would not increase traffic volumes, but rather should reduce congestion and improve traffic flow. This result is consistent with the conclusions of other particulate matter emission studies prepared for HOV lane projects in the SCAB. Operation of the proposed project would comply with all applicable air quality plans and be expected to improve traffic circulation in the area, which would result in improved air quality; therefore, project contributions to cumulative air quality impacts would not be considered cumulatively considerable.

d. **Less than Significant Impact.** During construction, adjacent areas would be exposed to pollutants from grading and construction equipment. With the application of various required emission control measures to be incorporated into the proposed project, these temporary air quality impacts are considered less than significant.

Once operational, the proposed project should result in a reduction of carbon monoxide (CO) levels at all receptors, compared to the No Project Alternative. No mitigation is required.

The proposed project meets the four conditions of the Level Two Qualitative Screening of Transportation Project CO Protocol for projects, as follows:

Condition (a): Does the build alternative have at least 2 percent more traffic operating in cold start mode than the No Action (No Project) Alternative?

No, compared with the No Project Alternative, the Proposed Project Alternative would not generate a 2 percent or greater increase in the number of vehicles operating in cold start mode.

Condition (b): Does the build alternative significantly increase traffic volumes above the No Action (No Project) Alternative volumes?

There would not be a significant increase in traffic volumes under the proposed project compared to the No Action (No Project) Alternative. The projected traffic volumes are the same for both alternatives.

Condition (c): Does the build (proposed project) alternative improve traffic flow?

Yes, the proposed project improves traffic flow and reduces traffic delay, compared to the No Action (No Project) Alternative.

Condition (d): Does the build (proposed project) alternative move traffic closer to a receptor site?

No, traffic will not be move appreciably closer to receptor sites compared to the No Action (No Project) Alternative.

Because all four conditions are satisfied, the proposed project does not require a quantitative CO analysis. The proposed project would not cause or contribute to new localized CO violations or increase the severity or frequency of existing violations in the area affected by the project. Only project-level CO impacts were considered because regional air quality issues have already been addressed in the RTP and the TIP analyses.

e. **Less than Significant Impact.** There would be a short-term increase in intermittent diesel fume odors during construction in the vicinity of sensitive receptors. These odors would be temporary and should dissipate rapidly. Operation of the proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to the creation of odors because of the following considerations: (1) project would not increase diesel truck traffic; (2) travel lanes would not be appreciably closer to receptors; and (3) project is expected to reduce congestion conditions. No mitigation is required.

### IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐ ☐

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

a. Less than Significant Impact. The area within the project ROW is not known or expected to support any unique, threatened, or endangered species of plants, animals, or their critical habitats. One avian species on the California Watch List, the Cooper’s hawk (Accipiter cooperii), was observed in the study area. The loggerhead shrike, a California Species of Special Concern, may occur in the project area, but it is not expected to nest or forage in the I-10 ROW because of vehicular traffic disturbances.

b. No Impact. The extant embankments on Kellogg Hill do not afford suitable conditions for any of the other plant or animal species. The proposed construction of HOV lanes along I-10 would cause no direct adverse effect to any of the 10 species known to occur in the species-specific habitat on the south side of the San Jose Hills, which are within 0.5-mile of the freeway alignment. The proposed project would not result in impacts to riparian habitat or other sensitive biological communities within Forest Lawn Memorial Park Cemetery or Frank G. Bonelli Regional Park; therefore, the proposed project would not result in any impacts related to conservation plans. No mitigation is required.

c. No Impact. There are no designated jurisdictional wetlands adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of the project section of I-10. Walnut Creek is a concrete-lined flood control channel that crosses under I-10 and does not support any riparian vegetation. To avoid riparian vegetation, project construction activities in the vicinity of the unnamed drainage west of Forest Lawn Memorial Park Cemetery would be restricted to the area immediately adjacent to the existing freeway lanes, within the existing ROW; therefore, the proposed project would not result in adverse impacts on wetlands or riparian vegetation. No mitigation is required.

d. Less than Significant Impact. The project area consists of an existing freeway located within a developed urbanized area. There is one potentially functioning wildlife corridor that exists south of I-10 and west of the Forest Lawn Memorial Park Cemetery. The corridor consists of riparian woodland along an unnamed drainage that passes under the freeway; however, this corridor is limited due to the existence of the freeway and the lack of open space north of the freeway. Wildlife movement is expected to occur at a local level in the open space to the south of I-10. As such, the proposed project would not interfere substantially with any migratory wildlife corridor or wildlife nursery site.

e. No Impact. Based on review of the General Plans for the local jurisdictions in the vicinity of the project corridor, the proposed project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.

f. No Impact. Based on review of the General Plans for the local jurisdictions in the vicinity of the proposed project alignment, as well as USFWS and California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) maps and plans, there are no existing habitat conservation plans, natural community conservation plans or other approved local, regional, or state habitat plans (HCPs) applicable to this area. USFWS recently completed consultation with the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) under Section 7 of the federal Endangered Species Act relative to incidental take of the coastal California gnatcatcher.
(Polioptila californica californica) at Forest Lawn Memorial Park Cemetery and the identification of Habitat Preservation Areas (HPAs) on that property. The HPA at Forest Lawn Memorial Park Cemetery is south of, and some distance from, I-10. The proposed project would require the acquisition of only a small sliver of ROW from the Forest Lawn property. Based on a conversation with USFWS (Kevin Clark, July 10, 2002), the area proposed for acquisition is some distance from the boundary of the HPA and would not result in any impacts to the gnatcatcher or the HPA.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. **Less Than Significant Impact.** A total of 442 properties (constructed in or before 1949) located within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) were evaluated for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and/or the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR), and no affected properties were determined eligible for listing in the NRHP and/or the CRHR in the 1994 Historic Property Survey Report (HPSR) and the 2002 Supplemental HPSR. The W.K. Kellogg Arabian Horse Ranch (Ranch), located within the Cal Poly Pomona campus, was determined to be eligible for inclusion in the NRHP; however, the area proposed for acquisition is outside the area defined as the NRHP-eligible Ranch. The proposed project would require a minimal sliver acquisition of property from the Cal Poly Pomona campus and was evaluated for potential impacts to the Ranch. The nearest features of the NRHP-eligible Ranch to I-10 are the two Covina gate posts north of the Ranch (the primary location of the significant features of the NRHP-eligible property) and south of I-10. That evaluation found that project implementation would not adversely affect the Ranch because the gate posts would be fully screened from I-10 by mature landscaping. This finding received concurrence from the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) on March 13, 1995; therefore, no mitigation is necessary.

In a letter dated September 6, 2002, the SHPO further concurred that no additional buildings and/or structures identified in the Supplemental HPSR were eligible for inclusion on the NRHP and/or the CRHR, and that the proposed project would not result in an adverse effect/substantial adverse change to a historic property/historical resource; therefore, no mitigation is necessary.

b. **Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation.** No recorded prehistoric or historical archaeological sites were identified within the APE; therefore, the proposed I-10 HOV Lane Project would not result in adverse impacts/substantial adverse changes to known prehistoric or historical archaeological sites. If subsurface cultural resources are discovered during earth-moving activities, it is Department policy to discontinue work in the area of the find until a qualified archaeologist can evaluate the discovery. Mitigation of the discovered cultural resources must be conducted in accordance with the requirements outlined in the CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.4(b), ‘Mitigation Measures Related to Impacts on Historic Resources’. No further mitigation is required.

c. **No Impact.** It is not expected that native soils would be encountered during construction because the project site is located within a corridor that was extensively graded by past construction of the freeway, municipal streets, and other urban developments.

d. **Less Than Significant Impact.** Because the proposed project site was previously disturbed by urban development, construction would not be expected to affect human remains. No human remains are known to exist in the project location, nor is there past evidence of use as human burial grounds. Steps listed in the CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(e) will be followed if human remains are discovered during earth-moving construction activities. This includes requiring the contractor to stop work and contact the proper authorities (i.e., the Los Angeles County Coroner) should any previously unknown human remains be discovered. No further study of this issue is required.
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS: Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Significantly</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42?

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

iv) Landslides?

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?

a (i, ii, iv). **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project study area is in a seismically active area potentially influenced by several known active faults. While the San Jose Fault crosses the project limits in the vicinity of PM 42.4, the freeway does not traverse an Alquist-Priolo zone. Potential seismic effects that could affect the proposed I-10 HOV Lane Project include ground shaking, liquefaction, seismic settlement, and slope failure. Ground shaking during an earthquake is considered the primary risk of potential future structural damage to I-10 and the proposed project. The potential impacts associated with ground shaking would vary greatly, depending on the fault on which the earthquake occurs, the distance of the earthquake epicenter from I-10, and the magnitude and the duration of the earthquake episode.

The Puente Formation at Kellogg Hill has historically experienced landslides caused by weakness along the contorted bedding planes. Several slides have occurred within this area of I-10. Retaining walls are recommended to be included in the project design at locations where ROW constraints would not allow slopes to be cut parallel to the existing slope ratios. The proposed action may include other design features where determined necessary to minimize the potential for losses due to potential future slope failure activity.

Seismic settlement occurs when strong ground shaking allows sediment particles to become more tightly spaced, thereby reducing existing pore space. The soils in the project study area are not particularly susceptible to settlement. Standard Department final design and construction techniques include measures to address soil stabilization and minimize the potential for settlement to a less than significant level.

a (iii). **Less Than Significant Impact.** Liquefaction occurs when loose soils lose their shear strength and behave as a liquid when subjected to strong, sustained ground shaking during an earthquake. Based on a 1985 regional study by the United States Geological Survey, the relative susceptibility of the I-10 project study area to liquefaction is considered to be low to very low; therefore, the proposed project would not likely be affected by liquefaction during an earthquake. No mitigation is required.
b. **Less than Significant Impact.** The *Caltrans Highway Design Manual* requires the design of modified highways to direct storm and landscaping runoff to storm drains and to avoid unnecessary flow of water over unpaved and nonlandscaped areas. During construction, best management practices (BMPs) would be employed to minimize erosion to the maximum extent practicable; therefore, the proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts related to erosion. No mitigation is required.

c. **Less Than Significant Impact.** See response to VI.a.

d. **No Impact.** Soils containing high clay content often exhibit a relatively high potential to expand when saturated and contract when dried out. This shrink/swell movement can adversely affect building foundations, often causing them to crack or shift, with resulting damage to the buildings they support. The soils at the project site are situated on Holocene Alluvium materials consisting of unconsolidated gravel, sand, silt, and clay of various lithologies. Portions of the project would also encroach on rocks of Tertiary age from the Puente Formation which consist of thinly bedded olive gray to dark gray diatomaceous and tuffaceous shale and siltstone with interbedded feldspathic sandstone. These soils do not have a high clay content that would cause adverse effects to building foundations.

e. **No Impact.** Project implementation would not require the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. No impacts associated with use of a septic system would occur.

### VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS:
Would the project:

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

An assessment of the greenhouse gas emissions and climate change is included in the body of the environmental document. While Caltrans has included this good faith effort to provide the public and decision makers as much information as possible about the project, it is Caltrans’ determination that in the absence of further regulatory or scientific information related to greenhouse gas emissions and CEQA significance, it is too speculative to make a significance determination regarding the project’s direct and indirect impact with respect to climate change. Caltrans does remain firmly committed to implementing measures to help reduce the potential effects of the project. These measures are outlined in the body of the environmental document.

### VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS:
Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VI. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS: Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25-mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

a. **No Impact.** As with current conditions, vehicles carrying hazardous materials may use I-10 and the SR 57/SR 71 interchange as part of a routine transport route. While the proposed project involves improvement to an existing freeway, it would not result in increased traffic or increased use of the freeway or interchange specifically for the routine transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials; therefore, the proposed project would not create a significant hazard related to the routine transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials. No impacts are anticipated with the implementation of the proposed project.

b. **Less Than Significant with Mitigation.** There is a slight potential that previously unknown hazardous materials or underground storage tanks (USTs) would be uncovered during construction. Implementation of the Department’s standard construction procedures would substantially reduce the potential impacts on construction workers and the public due to discovery or disturbance of hazardous materials and USTs during construction.

The proposed I-10 HOV Lane Project would require the acquisition of ROW that may have been contaminated with hazardous materials based on existing and/or past uses, and that could be disturbed during construction. Required remediation of existing hazardous materials contamination would be addressed during the property acquisition phase and would be conducted consistent with all existing federal, state, and local regulations.

Soil contaminated with aerially deposited lead would be removed and disposed of in concurrence with the variance issued to the Department by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), effective date September 22, 2000. This material may be reused for embankment fill, retaining wall backfill, and/or excavation of clean soils and backfilling, and capped with an appropriate amount of clean fill material. Specifically, DTSC granted the Department a variance in 1995 to allow for the use of some lead-contaminated soils for fill and backfill during construction of freeway improvements, provided that the Department’s handling and use of those soils are consistent with the conditions, limitation, and requirements described in that variance. A copy of that variance is available for review at the Department’s District 7 office.

There is potential for the generation of asbestos-containing waste associated with the demolition and removal of existing bridges and structures on I-10 and of older structures on ROW acquired for the proposed project. Predemolition asbestos sampling and notification are included as part of the proposed project, consistent with the requirements of the South Coast Air Quality Management District. Compliance with existing regulations would reduce the potential for release of asbestos during construction to a level below significant.

The existing yellow thermoplastic and yellow-painted traffic stripes on I-10 may contain lead and/or chromium. Removed thermoplastic and yellow paint would be disposed of at an appropriate site, in accordance with local, state, and federal laws. This would reduce the potential for adverse impacts associated with any potential lead- and chromium-containing stripes to a level below significant.

The Department has existing programs for sweeping shoulder areas and for manual collection of litter along freeways. Department landscaping includes the collection of litter, grass clippings, and trimmings from bushes, shrubs, and trees. These procedures would also apply to the proposed project. No mitigation is required.

c. **Less Than Significant Impact.** While there are several schools located within 0.25-mile of the proposed project corridor, impacts associated with mobile-source air toxics (MSAT) are not expected to be significant given the following considerations:
(1) there is already an existing freeway in the study area; (2) highway improvements would not move the freeway appreciably closer to these schools; and (3) based on other similar HOV projects, studies have shown that, depending on the constituent, only slight percentage increases/decreases in MSAT emissions are projected to occur with the HOV lanes in operation.

d. **Less Than Significant With Mitigation.** The San Gabriel Valley Area 2 National Priorities List site (SGVA2) is located within the proposed project site. Groundwater within this vicinity may be contaminated; however, based on preliminary construction plans, excavation activity would not likely reach the existing groundwater table. Should encroachment into SGVA2 occur, appropriate procedures would be followed to provide adequate protection to works and the public.

e and f. **No Impact.** The proposed project location is not within 2 miles of an existing public or private use airport or within the vicinity of a private airstrip. The nearest airstrips (i.e., public or private) are: Brackett Field, located 2 miles northeast from the eastern project terminus; and El Monte Airport, approximately 3 miles west-northwest from the western project terminus. No mitigation is required.

g. **Less Than Significant Impact.** Construction and operation of the proposed project could potentially interfere with current emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans for local, state, or federal agencies. Emergency access issues could occur during construction without proper communication protocol and traffic controls. A Traffic Management Plan (TMP) would be prepared during the design stage of the proposed project. All emergency service providers would be informed of the construction schedule, lane closures, and detours well in advance of these activities being implemented throughout the construction period.

h. **Less Than Significant impact.** Based on a site visit plus review of the General Plans for jurisdictions through which I-10 passes, it has been determined that there are no defined wildlands in the immediate vicinity of the project study area. Frank G. Bonelli County Regional Park is located northeast of the I-10 Interchange with SR 57/SR 71, but outside the study area. The city of West Covina categorizes land in the San Jose Hills to the east of Grand Avenue and south of I-10 as ‘very high’ risk area for wildland fires. This area is at the wildland/urban interface where the potential for fire damage is heightened; however, considering that the proposed project would neither involve construction of habitable structures nor land use changes, it is concluded that there would not be an increased exposure of people or structures to a significant risk involving wildland fires. Caltrans’ ongoing programs for brush clearance and weed abatement would continue through construction and operation of the proposed project. No mitigation is required.

### IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? 

h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? 

i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? 

j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow 

a. Less than Significant Impact. Design, construction, and operation of the proposed I-10 HOV Lane Project would be consistent with applicable federal, state, and local water quality standards. The Department’s Storm Water Management Plan, Storm Water Quality Handbooks, and District Directive 20 address stormwater management and would apply, as appropriate, to construction and operation of the HOV lanes. The proposed project would also be subject to the requirements of the Department’s existing National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit (Order No. 99-06-DWQ, NPDES No. CAS0000003), which prescribes the use of BMPs to minimize erosion to the maximum extent practicable; therefore, the proposed project would not result in inconsistencies with or violations of federal, state, and local water quality standards. No mitigation is required.

b. No impact. The proposed project site overlies the San Gabriel Valley Groundwater Basin (RWQCB, 1995). According to the Geotechnical Investigation for this project, construction activities would not impact groundwater (Caltrans, 1993a). No mitigation is required.

c. No impact. The proposed project would result in only minor changes to the existing drainage pattern within the subject I-10 corridor, and with the aforementioned BMP controls would not result in related erosion or downstream siltation either on- or off-site. The Caltrans Highway Design Manual requires the design of modified highways to direct storm and landscaping runoff to storm drains and to avoid unnecessary flow of water over unpaved and nonlandscaped areas; therefore, the proposed project would not result in substantial impacts related to erosion. No mitigation is required.

d. Less Than Significant Impact. Walnut Creek crosses the project corridor in a reinforced concrete box culvert to the west of Grand Avenue. An unnamed drainage also crosses the project corridor west of Forest Lawn Memorial Park Cemetery in an earth-lined channel. Because no permanent structures would be placed within these watercourses, the proposed project would not result in adverse impacts related to changes in water courses. No mitigation is required.

A small concrete-lined drainage channel parallel to eastbound I-10 west of Kellogg Drive would be realigned. Permits will be required from USACE (Clean Water Act Section 404 permit), Regional Water Quality Control Board (Clean Water Act Section 401 permit), and CDFG (Section 1601 Streambed Alteration Agreement). This unnamed concrete drainage channel would be replaced in kind, using BMPs for water quality and in conjunction with the desires of the applicable permitting agencies. All conditions of the permit would be made part of this project and would be implemented to ensure there are no significant impacts to water conveyances.

e. Less Than Significant Impact. Most of the locations where new construction is expected to occur are currently paved. The Design Manual requires that 100 percent of potential runoff from new impervious surface areas associated with the proposed project be treated before offsite discharge. In addition, current drainage facilities within the project area would be upgraded to provide improved treatment of runoff. Drainage facilities would be designed to be consistent with established drainage plans for the area.

f. Less Than Significant Impact. Walnut Creek, which drains Puddingstone Reservoir before crossing I-10 west of Grand Avenue and traversing parallel to and south of the freeway, is listed as a Section 303(d) water body for pH and toxicity; therefore, it is subject to total maximum daily load discharge restrictions for these constituents. Considering traffic volume is expected to grow substantially in the future, the amount of motor vehicle-related pollutants discharged into the watershed and drainage channels from impervious surfaces would increase either with or without implementation of the proposed project. The increased area of impervious surfaces is small in comparison to the local watershed. The project design would include permanent BMPs to control and minimize discharge of pollutants to the watershed. Given these considerations, the proposed project would not have a significant impact on local water resources and quality.

The groundwater table in this area is at depths from approximately 50 to 500 feet below ground surface elevation. Because there are only limited areas of pervious surfaces in the existing I-10 ROW, this area is not a major source of groundwater recharge; therefore, the proposed project would not result in any substantial change in the rate or amount of groundwater
recharge. Given these considerations, the proposed project would not impact groundwater quality in this area. No mitigation is required.

g. **No Impact.** The proposed project would not involve construction of housing within the 100-year floodplain.

h. **Less Than Significant Impact.** A review of 2008 flood insurance rate maps prepared by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) indicates the entire project area is within Zone X. These areas are protected from the 100-year flood event by levees that prevent overtopping of adjacent flood channels. This designation is consistent with conclusions reached in other project-specific floodplain studies prepared in 1993-94. The design of the proposed project at drainage crossings and stormwater facilities would be coordinated with the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works and the Public Works Departments of the local jurisdictions.

Runoff volumes would not increase substantially because there would be only a minor increase in impervious surface area on I-10 as a result of the proposed project. Runoff from I-10, including the HOV lanes, would be accommodated by the existing storm drain system; therefore, the proposed project would not result in substantial changes in the amount of water in surface water bodies. No mitigation is required.

i. **Less Than Significant Impact.** I-10, within the project area, is located within the inundation areas of three upstream reservoirs: Santa Fe, San Dimas, and Puddingstone dams. Santa Fe Dam, located in Irwindale approximately 2.5 miles north of I-10, is a ‘dry dam’ operated by USACE. This facility is used for groundwater recharge, control of heavy runoff, and as a backup for upstream reservoirs. San Dimas Dam, located in the Angeles National Forest north of San Dimas, has a rated capacity of 1,496 acre-feet. Puddingstone Dam, located at Frank G. Bonelli County Regional Park approximately 1-mile north of I-10, has a limited capacity by agreement of 6,083 acre-feet. Flows released from this reservoir discharge to Walnut Creek. The latter two facilities are managed by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works. The dam owners/operators have developed Emergency Action Plans for each of these facilities, as required by FEMA. The proposed project would not increase exposure of the existing freeway to the floodwater effects in the very unlikely event of failure on one of these dams. The very small risk associated with failure of one of these dams could affect a wide swath of the project area, not just the existing I-10 with future improvements; therefore, the proposed project would not likely result in an increase in exposure of people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding.

j. **No Impact.** The project site is not located on a lake and is approximately 30 miles inland from the nearest coastal area, so there is no potential for inundation by seiche or tsunami. See response to VI.a(iv) regarding the potential impact associated with a mudflow.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X. LAND USE AND PLANNING: Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. **No Impact.** I-10 has been in this location since the 1950s. The communities have grown around the existing freeway. The proposed project would result in mostly minor property acquisitions at several locations; however, these acquisitions should have no effect with regard to dividing an established community. No mitigation is required.

b. **No Impact.** The proposed project area is nearly built out; therefore, it has little unused land that could potentially be affected by the proposed project. The proposed project would not trigger any zoning changes. Neither would it conflict with any General Plan designations of the affected local agency jurisdictions. The proposed project would be consistent with the environmental goals and policies outlined in the cities of Baldwin Park, West Covina, Covina, San Dimas, Pomona, Walnut, and County of Los Angeles General Plans.

c. **No Impact.** See IV.f.
XI. MINERAL RESOURCES: Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a-b. **No impact.** Based on review of General Plans for the jurisdictions through which I-10 passes, there are no known natural mineral resources or locally important mineral resource recovery sites in the I-10 project study area; therefore, the proposed project would not result in adverse impacts related to mineral resources. No mitigation is required.

XII. NOISE: Would the project result in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. **Less Than Significant Impact.** Operation of the proposed project would result in a slight increase in noise at some adjacent uses due to the freeway widening bringing traffic noise closer to sensitive noise receptors. Additional noise would also be created by the higher speeds of vehicles traveling in the HOV lanes and an incremental increase in freeway speeds in the general-purpose lanes due to the reduction in congestion. As detailed in the *Traffic Noise Impact Technical Report*, existing noise levels range from 57 A-weighted decibels (dBA) to 79 dBA and are primarily due to freeway noise. The proposed project would increase noise levels by 1 to 2 dBA compared to existing conditions. This increase is below the threshold of human hearing to detect a noticeable change in noise levels, generally considered to be 5 dBA. This increase is not considered a substantial noise impact as defined by Caltrans as an increase of 12 dB or more relative to existing conditions. Given these considerations, the proposed project would not result in a significant increase in noise levels in adjoining areas.

Although the proposed project would not result in a significant increase in noise levels, existing noise levels due to traffic on I-10 currently exceed the Department’s Noise Abatement Criteria (NAC). The NAC were established to identify excessive levels of traffic noise at noise sensitive uses. Where determined to be reasonable and feasible, soundwalls are proposed to be constructed as part of the proposed project to reduce existing traffic noise levels at frequent outdoor use areas. The general locations of these soundwalls are shown in the *Traffic Noise Impact Technical Report*. The final soundwall locations, heights,
and lengths would be determined during final design. With the construction of soundwalls in areas found to exceed the Department’s NAC, no mitigation is required.

It should be noted that if pertinent parameters change substantially during the final design of the proposed project, then the noise abatement design may be changed or eliminated during final design. A final decision on noise abatement measures, such as noise barriers, would be made on completion of final design and the public involvement review process. Consequently, if the specific location, length, and height of noise barriers that have been shown to be feasible and reasonable are altered or changed during the design phase, reevaluation of the noise abatement will be required. Each of the noise barriers recommended by this study was found to be feasible, providing 5 dBA or more noise reduction to affected noise receivers. For any of the noise barriers considered to be reasonable from a cost perspective, the total estimated cost of the barrier must be at or below the allowance calculated for each noise barrier. The final decision to include noise barriers in the project design and the final design of the soundwalls, if included, will be made based on the information contained in the noise technical report and pertinent information received during the public review process.

b. Less Than Significant Impact. Construction activity can result in varying degrees of ground vibration, depending on the equipment and methods used. The operation of construction equipment causes vibrations that spread through the ground and diminish in strength with traveled distance. Buildings in the vicinity of the construction site can be affected by these vibrations, with resulting damage in the most severe cases. Vibratory rollers and impact pile driving would be the most dominant sources of overall construction vibration for the proposed project. The vibration levels created by the normal movement of vehicles, including graders, front loaders, and backhoes, are comparable in order-of-magnitude to groundborne vibrations created by heavy vehicles traveling on streets and highways. Building damage can be cosmetic or structural. Normal buildings that are not particularly fragile would not experience any cosmetic damage (e.g., plaster cracks) at distances beyond 25 feet based on typical construction equipment vibration levels. This distance can vary substantially depending on the soil composition between vibration source and receiver. There are many standard construction procedures that would be included in project specifications to minimize intrusion without placing unreasonable constraints on the construction process or substantially increasing costs.

Regarding facility operation, significant vibration impact from rubber-tire-fitted vehicles is extremely rare. This is because rubber-tire-fitted vehicles are typically well-isolated by the vehicle suspension design and rubber tires, which act as a highly effective barrier to vibration transmission from the vibration-generating carriage and the main propagation medium for vibration excitation, the ground; therefore, potential vibration impact from traffic on the freeway can be reasonably dismissed. There may be slight vibration issues at residences close to the traveled way if there are cracks, uneven slabs, and/or damaged expansion joints; therefore, the proposed project would not result in substantial levels of vibration. No mitigation is required.

c. Less Than Significant Impact. See response to XII.a. The proposed project with soundwall abatement is not expected to result in a substantial permanent ambient noise level increase above levels existing without the project at frequent outdoor use areas.

d. Less Than Significant Impact. Equipment involved in construction is expected to generate noise levels ranging from 80 to 89 decibels at a distance of 50 feet. Noise produced by construction equipment would be reduced at a rate of approximately 6 dB per doubling of distance from the source. Measures would be applied during construction to reduce short-term noise disturbances at sensitive receptors. These include, but are not limited to, using equipment with noise mufflers in good condition; applying construction methods and using equipment that would provide the lowest level of noise impact; turning off idling equipment; and using temporary noise barriers, as needed.

e and f. No Impact. The project location is not within 2 miles of an existing public or private use airport or within the vicinity of a private airstrip. The nearest airstrips (i.e., public or private) are: Brackett Field, located 2 miles northeast from the eastern project terminus; and El Monte Airport, approximately 3 miles west-northwest from the western project terminus. No mitigation is required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING: Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A-14 June 2012
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?  

a-c. **Less Than Significant Impact.** Numerous temporary construction easements and partial parcel acquisitions would be required at various locations within the proposed project corridor. The partial property acquisitions would mostly be required to provide 1 to 2 feet of additional ROW. These partial acquisitions would include, but not be limited to, land currently used for parking, frontage roads, single-family residential, and public access purposes. Coordination with affected property owners within each local jurisdiction would occur. During the acquisition process, issues such as parking supply and public access would be addressed; therefore, no mitigation is required.

No full residential acquisitions are anticipated to result as part of the proposed project; however, as discussed in the previous paragraph, partial residential acquisitions may result as part of the proposed project. If there are any full property acquisitions, property owners would be compensated the fair market value for properties subject to acquisition. As required by existing federal and state laws, Caltrans would comply with the provisions of the Uniform Relocation and Assistance Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended (California Government Code, Chapter 16, Section 7260, et seq.). Displaced persons would be entitled to reimbursement of certain actual, reasonable moving expenses pursuant to 25 California Code of Regulations (CCR) §6090 and compensation for replacement housing payments as provided by 25 CCR §§6102 and 6104. All benefits and services would be provided equitably to all affected parties without regard to race, color, religion, age, national origins, and disability as specified under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

### XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire protection?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police protection?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other public facilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a (Fire and Police). **Less than Significant Impact.** Emergency access issues could occur during construction without proper communication protocol and traffic controls. A TMP would be prepared during the design stage of the proposed project. All emergency service providers would be informed of the construction schedule, lane closures, and detours well in advance of these activities being implemented throughout the construction period.

Because the proposed project would result in safer freeway operations, there would be no impact due to increased demand or creation of new demand on fire or police protection services.

a (Schools). **No Impact.** The proposed project would not increase the demand, or create new demand, for school services.

a (Parks). **No Impact.** The proposed project would not increase the demand, or create new demand, for park services.

a (Other Public Facilities). **No Impact.** There are several public service facilities located within the project study area; however, the proposed project would not require the need for new or physically altered government facilities or the need to construct new facilities to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for public services.
XV. RECREATION:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. No Impact. There are no publicly owned parks or recreation areas adjacent to the project corridor. The southwest corner of Frank G. Bonelli County Regional Park is located northeast of the I-10 interchange with SR 57/SR 71 but outside the study area. The proposed project would not result in a substantial adverse impact on bicycle trails because existing trails would be retained during facility construction and operation; therefore, the proposed project would not impact any publicly owned park or recreation area. No mitigation is required.

b. No Impact. The proposed project would involve adding HOV lanes to an existing freeway, among other improvements. No recreational facilities are part of the proposed project. No mitigation is required.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC: Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a. and b. **Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would not conflict with any applicable plans, ordinances, or policies establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. In fact, the proposed project is designed to improve level of service and to help relieve congestion on the freeway and adjacent roadways. There would, however, be increased congestion at different locations during construction. These impacts would be minimized through development and implementation of a required TMP. Caltrans will use a public outreach team for this project to communicate with the public in advance regarding potential delays associated with construction activities.

c. **No Impact.** The proposed project is a highway project and not in the vicinity of an airport; therefore, it would not affect air traffic patterns.

d. **Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would be designed in accordance with Caltrans’ design requirements and local and state regulations. The proposed project chiefly utilizes standard design features; however, the use of some nonstandard design features would be applied to decrease the need for substantial ROW property acquisition, reduce project costs, and help minimize environmental impacts. On- and off-ramps would be designed to improve traffic flow characteristics to accommodate projected traffic volumes and improve operating safety. No mitigation is required.

e. **Less Than Significant Impact.** When the proposed project is operational, the improved operating conditions on I-10 would beneficially affect emergency service providers by reducing travel times. For construction impacts, see response to Item XIV.a (Fire and Police) above. No mitigation is required.

f. **Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation.** The proposed project would facilitate improved transit use within the corridor and would not conflict with any adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. During construction, there would be short-term transit service delays during bridge work at local street over- or under-crossings, as well as during temporary ramp closures. Bicycle and pedestrian traffic would also be affected during construction by temporary detours at local street crossings. Most of the lane closures would be planned to occur during non-peak hours to minimize effects on bicyclists and pedestrians. These impacts would be minimized through development and implementation of a required TMP. Mitigation would include coordination with regional transit companies to discuss in advance construction methods and scheduling for street, connector, and ramp closures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a. **No Impact.** In comparison to overall system capacity, minimal wastewater would be generated by the proposed project during construction. Due to the nature of the proposed project, there would be no wastewater produced during facility operation.

b. **No Impact.** The proposed project consists of adding HOV lanes to an existing freeway. New wastewater or water treatment facilities are not a component of the proposed project. Limited water used at the site, such as for dust control during construction, would be metered from local fire hydrants.

c. **Less Than Significant Impact.** As stated above, construction of the proposed project could result in minor modifications to the storm water drainage system; however, the effects of these changes on the environment are expected to be less than significant because the major flow regime within the study area (discharge to Walnut Creek) would be retained intact. As the study area is mostly developed urban land, the increase in pavement and structures due to the proposed project would not be expected to substantially increase the amount of stormwater runoff (Caltrans, 2002b).

d. **No Impact.** While irrigation water would be required for landscaping, the volume of water needed for this purpose would be small and would not trigger the need for new water sources or affect expansion of an existing facility to meet the additional water needs.

e. **No Impact.** As a proposed transportation project, neither its construction nor operation would substantially increase the amount of wastewater generated at the site over current rates; therefore, the capacity of current providers to treat the wastewater volumes within the study area would basically be unaffected by the proposed project.

f. **Less Than Significant Impact.** The nearest operating landfill is Puente Hills Landfill, located more than 4 miles southwest from the Puente Avenue interchange. In 2009, the landfill had an estimated remaining capacity of 35.2 million cubic yards, approximately 47 percent of its total capacity. The Puente Hills Landfill is capable of accommodating waste from the proposed project that needs to be disposed; accordingly, it would have a less than significant impact on the landfill's available capacity.

g. **Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would be in compliance with all federal, state, and local codes and regulations pertaining to the disposal of solid waste. These codes include Part 13 Title 42 – Public Health and Welfare of the California Health and Safety Code, and Chapter 39 Solid Waste Disposal – of the United States Code. The proposed project would also be compliant with AB 939, the California Solid Waste Management Act, which requires each city in the state to divert at least 50 percent of their solid waste from landfill disposal through source reduction, recycling, and composting. Most concrete demolition debris would be crushed and reused for this project. Given these considerations, there would be no significant impacts associated with consistency related to laws pertaining to solid waste disposal.

### XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. **Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed I-10 HOV Lane Project would improve the quality of the environment. The addition of the HOV lanes on I-10 would improve traffic flow, encourage shared ride travel modes, and reduce congestion. Operation of the proposed project would save fuel per vehicle passenger mile, reduce vehicle emissions, and improve air quality. The incorporation of soundwalls at various locations along I-10 would reduce noise levels on adjacent sensitive land.
uses. Because I-10 is in a highly urbanized area, there are only limited native plant species and wildlife species in this area; therefore, the proposed project would not affect any unique, threatened, or endangered species of plants, animals, or their critical habitats. There are no important extant examples of major periods of California history or prehistory known to be in the project study area that would be subject to adverse effects.

b. **Less than Significant Impact.** Other Department projects in the study area vicinity are largely within the existing I-10 freeway ROW and are not considered to result in adverse environmental effects. The ongoing ‘Segment 1’ HOV project, as well as currently programmed projects for the I-10 corridor, would beneficially affect the flow of traffic in and near the study area. Associated landscaping and soundwall projects would result in cumulatively beneficial visual and noise reduction effects in the study area. When considered cumulatively with the proposed project, these Department projects would benefit the traveling public without contributing to a substantial cumulative adverse impact on the environment.

c. **Potentially Significant Impact.** The proposed project corridor, while not traversed by any Alquist-Priolo Zone, is in a seismically active area potentially influenced by several known active faults, including the San Jose Fault which crosses I-10 at the eastern project terminus. Ground shaking during an earthquake is considered the primary risk for potential future structural damage to I-10 and the proposed project. The potential impacts associated with ground shaking would vary greatly, depending on the fault on which the earthquake occurs, the distance of the earthquake epicenter from I-10, and the magnitude and the duration of the earthquake episode. The Puente Formation at Kellogg Hill has historically experienced several landslides caused by weakness along the contorted bedding planes. Retaining walls are recommended to be included in the project design in instances where ROW constraints would not allow all slopes to be cut parallel to the existing slope ratios. The proposed action may include other design features, where determined necessary, to minimize the potential for losses due to potential future slope failure activity.
Appendix B  Notice of Preparation and Responses

Notice of Preparation
For an Environmental Document for:
Interstate Route 10 High Occupancy Vehicle Lanes Project in Los Angeles County

WHAT IS BEING PLANNED?
The California Department of Transportation (Department) is proposing to widen the existing Interstate Route 10 facility in Baldwin Park and West Covina from Puente Avenue and Citrus Street (Segment 2) and between Citrus Street and State Route 57/Interstate Route 210 (Segment 3) by constructing one High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lane in each direction with possible climbing lanes, pavement rehabilitation, restriping existing lanes, widening existing freeway bridges, installing guardrails, alteration of on and off-ramps at Vincent Avenue, and constructing soundwalls and retaining walls as necessary. This project will accommodate traffic growth associated with planned, approved development and it is an integral element of the proposed regional freeway-based HOV system in Los Angeles County.

WHY THIS NOTICE?
In 2003, the Department and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) signed a Mitigated Negative Declaration/Finding of No Significant Impact (MND/FONSI) for all three segments of the I-10 HOV Lanes project. In 2006, an Environmental Re-Evaluation document was signed for Segment 1 (from Interstate 605 to Puente Avenue) and this particular segment was built. In 2010, the Department began to prepare a Re-Evaluation document for Segments 2 and 3 due to project design changes that had occurred in the intervening time. In the process of preparing this document, the Department determined that an Environmental Assessment/Environmental Impact Report (EA/EIR) should be prepared and publically circulated due to substantial design changes.

WHERE DO YOU COME IN?
The purpose of this notice is to inform public involvement, including public agencies, interested groups, and individuals, in the environmental process. Additionally, a public hearing will be held to discuss the project studies when sufficient engineering, environmental, and socioeconomic data is collected. This hearing will be publicized and you will be notified in advance of the time and location.

CONTACT
If you wish to be on a mailing list for actions concerning this project or if you have any questions regarding this project, please contact Gary Iverson, Senior Environmental Planner, in the Division of Environmental Planning at (213) 897-3818.
Notice of Preparation

January 13, 2012

To: Reviewing Agencies

Re: 10 HOV - Add one HOV Lane in the Median in Each Direction from Puente Avenue to SR 57
    SCH# 2012011028

Attached for your review and comment is the Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the 10 HOV - Add one HOV Lane in the Median in Each Direction from Puente Avenue to SR 57 draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

Responsible agencies must transmit their comments on the scope and content of the NOP, focusing on specific information related to their own statutory responsibility, within 30 days of receipt of the NOP from the Lead Agency. This is a courtesy notice provided by the State Clearinghouse with a reminder for you to comment in a timely manner. We encourage other agencies to also respond to this notice and express their concerns early in the environmental review process.

Please direct your comments to:

Ron Kosinski
California Department of Transportation, District 7
100 South Main Street
Los Angeles, CA 90650

with a copy to the State Clearinghouse in the Office of Planning and Research. Please refer to the SCH number noted above in all correspondence concerning this project.

If you have any questions about the environmental document review process, please call the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613.

Sincerely,

Scott Morgan
Director, State Clearinghouse

Attachments
cc: Lead Agency

1400 10th Street P.O. Box 3044 Sacramento, California 95812-3044
I-10 HOV LANE PROJECT
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
APPENDIX B

Document Details Report
State Clearinghouse Data Base

SCH# 2012011028
Project Title 10 HOV - Add one HOV Lane in the Median in Each Direction from Puente Avenue to SR 57
Lead Agency Caltrans #7

Type NOP Notice of Preparation
Description Project proposes to add one high Occupancy vehicle lane in the east and west bound directions in the center median of I-10 from Puente Avenue to SR 57.

Lead Agency Contact
Name Ron Kosinski
Agency California Department of Transportation, District 7
Phone 213 897 0703
Fax
Email
Address 100 South Main Street
City Los Angeles
State CA
Zip 90610

Project Location
County Los Angeles
City Baldwin Park, West Covina, Pomona
Region
Cross Streets Puente Avenue to SR 57
Lat / Long 34°.065' N / 117°.938' W
Parcel No. Various
Township

Proximity to:
Highways I-10
Airports No
Railways No
Waterways No
Schools

Land Use Primarily in the State-Owned Right-of-Way on Route 10.2 business takes, some partial takes and construction easement takes.

Project Issues Aesthetic/Visual; Air Quality; Archaeologic-Historic; Biological Resources; Drainage/Absorption; Flood Plain/Flooding; Geologic/Seismic; Noise; Population/Housing Balance; Public Services; Schools/Universities; Soil Erosion/Compaction/Grading; Toxic/Hazardous; Traffic/Circulation; Vegetation; Water Quality; Landuse; Cumulative Effects

Reviewing Agencies Resources Agency; California Coastal Commission; Department of Conservation; Office of Historic Preservation; Department of Parks and Recreation; Department of Water Resources; Department of Fish and Game, Region 5; Native American Heritage Commission; Public Utilities Commission; Air Resources Board, Transportation Projects; Department of Toxic Substances Control; Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 4

Date Received 01/13/2012
Start of Review 01/13/2012
End of Review 02/13/2012

Note: Blanks in data fields result from insufficient information provided by lead agency.
null
April 3, 2012

Ron Kosinski
California Department of Transportation, District 7
100 South Main Street
Los Angeles, CA 90650

Subject: 10 HOV - Add one HOV Lane in the Median in Each Direction from Puente Avenue to SR 57
SCH#: 2012011028

Dear Ron Kosinski:

The State Clearinghouse submitted the above named Draft EIR to selected state agencies for review. The review period closed on April 2, 2012, and no state agencies submitted comments by that date. This letter acknowledges that you have complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act.

Please call the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613 if you have any questions regarding the environmental review process. If you have a question about the above-named project, please refer to the ten-digit State Clearinghouse number when contacting this office.

Sincerely,

Scott Morgan
Director, State Clearinghouse

1400 10th Street P.O. Box 3044 Sacramento, California 95812-3044
(916) 445-0613 FAX (916) 323-3018 wwwopr.ca.gov
January 19, 2012

Mr. Ron Kosinski
California Department of Transportation, District 7
100 South Main Street
Los Angeles, CA 90650

Re: SCH#2012011028 CEQA Notice of Preparation (NOP): draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the "I-10 HOV – Add One HOV lane in the Median in Each Direction from Puente Avenue to S.R. 57 Project;:" located in Los Angeles County, California

Dear Mr. Kosinski:

The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) is the State of California ‘Trustee Agency’ for the protection and preservation of Native American cultural resources pursuant to California Public Resources Code §21070 and affirmed by the Third Appellate Court in the case of EPIC v. Johnson (1986; 170 Cal. App. 3rd 804). The court held that the NAHC has jurisdiction and special expertise, as a state agency, over affected Native American resources, impacted by proposed projects including archaeological, places of religious significance to Native Americans and burial sites. The NAHC wishes to comment on the proposed project.

This letter includes state and federal statutes relating to Native American historic properties of religious and cultural significance to American Indian tribes and interested Native American individuals as ‘consulting parties’ under both state and federal law. State law also addresses the freedom of Native American Religious Expression in Public Resources Code §5097.9.

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA – CA Public Resources Code 21000-21777, amendments effective 3/18/2010) requires that any project that causes a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource, that includes archaeological resources, is a ‘significant effect’ requiring the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) per the CEQA Guidelines defines a significant impact on the environment as ‘a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of physical conditions within an area affected by the proposed project, including… objects of historic or aesthetic significance.’ In order to comply with this provision, the lead agency is required to assess whether the project will have an adverse impact on these resources within the ‘area of potential effect (APE), and if so, to mitigate that effect.

The NAHC Sacred Lands File (SLF) search resulted as follows: Native American cultural resources were not identified within the project area identified. Also, the absence of archaeological resources does not preclude their existence. California Public Resources Code §§5097.94(a) and 5097.96 authorize the NAHC to establish a Sacred Land Inventory to record Native American sacred sites and burial sites. These records are exempt from the provisions of the California Public Records Act pursuant to, California Government Code §6254 (r). The purpose of this code is to protect such sites from vandalism, theft and destruction. The NAHC “Sacred Sites,” as defined by the Native American Heritage Commission and the California Legislature in California Public Resources Code §§5097.94(a) and 5097.96. Items in the NAHC
Sacred Lands Inventory are confidential and exempt from the Public Records Act pursuant to California Government Code §6254 (r).

Early consultation with Native American tribes in your area is the best way to avoid unanticipated discoveries of cultural resources or burial sites once a project is underway. Culturally affiliated tribes and individuals may have knowledge of the religious and cultural significance of the historic properties in the project area (e.g. APE). We strongly urge that you make contact with the list of Native American Contacts on the list of Native American contacts, to see if your proposed project might impact Native American cultural resources and to obtain their recommendations concerning the proposed project. Special reference is made to the Tribal Consultation requirements of the California 2006 Senate Bill 1059: enabling legislation to the federal Energy Policy Act of 2005 (P.L. 109-58), mandates consultation with Native American tribes (both federally recognized and non federally recognized) where electric transmission lines are proposed. This is codified in the California Public Resources Code, Chapter 4.3 and §25330 to Division 15.

Furthermore, pursuant to CA Public Resources Code § 5097.95, the NAHC requests that the Native American consulting parties be provided pertinent project information. Consultation with Native American communities is also a matter of environmental justice as defined by California Government Code §65040,12(e). Pursuant to CA Public Resources Code §5097.95, the NAHC requests that pertinent project information be provided consulting tribal parties. The NAHC recommends avoidance as defined by CEQA Guidelines §15370(a) to pursuing a project that would damage or destroy Native American cultural resources and Section 2183.2 that requires documentation, data recovery of cultural resources.

Consultation with tribes and interested Native American consulting parties, on the NAHC list, if the project is under federal jurisdiction, should be conducted in compliance with the requirements of federal NEPA and Section 106 and 4(f) of federal NHPA (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq), 38 CFR Part 800.3 (f) (2) & .5, the President’s Council on Environmental Quality (CSQ, 42 U.S.C 4371 et seq; and NAGPRA (25 U.S.C. 3001-3013) as appropriate. The 1982 Secretary of the Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties were revised so that they could be applied to all historic resources types included in the National Register of Historic Places and including cultural landscapes. Also, federal Executive Orders Nos. 11693 (preservation of cultural environment), 13175 (coordination & consultation) and 13007 (Sacred Sites) are helpful, supportive guides for Section 106 consultation. The aforementioned Secretary of the Interior’s Standards include recommendations for all ‘lead agencies’ to consider the historic context of proposed projects and to “research” the cultural landscape, that might include the ‘area of potential effect.’

Confidentiality of “historic properties of religious and cultural significance” should also be considered as protected by California Government Code §6254(r) and may also be protected under Section 304 of the NHPA or at the Secretary of the Interior discretion if not eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. The Secretary may also be advised by the federal Indian Religious Freedom Act (cf. 42 U.S.C., 1998) in issuing a decision on whether or not to disclose items of religious and cultural significance identified in or near the APEs and possibility threatened by proposed project activity.

Furthermore, Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, California Government Code §27481 and Health & Safety Code Section 7050.5 provide for provisions for accidentally discovered archeological resources during construction and mandate the processes to be followed in the event of an accidental discovery of any human remains in a project location other than a ‘dedicated cemetery’.
To be effective, consultation on specific projects must be the result of an ongoing relationship between Native American tribes and lead agencies, project proponents and their contractors, in the opinion of the NAHC. Regarding tribal consultation, a relationship built around regular meetings and informal involvement with local tribes will lead to more qualitative consultation tribal input on specific projects.

If you have any questions about this response to your request, please do not hesitate to contact me at (916) 653-6251.

Sincerely,

Dave Singleton
Program Analyst

Cc: State Clearinghouse

Attachment: Native American Contact List
California Native American Contacts
Los Angeles County
January 19, 2012

LA City/County Native American Indian Comm
Ron Andrade, Director
3175 West 8th St, Rm. 403
Los Angeles, CA 90020
randrade@css.lacounty.gov
(213) 351-5324
(213) 386-3995 FAX

Gabrieleno Tongva Nation
Sam Dunlap, Chairperson
P.O. Box 86908
Los Angeles, CA 90086
samdunlap@earthlink.net
(909) 262-9351 - cell

Ti'At Society/Inter-Tribal Council of Pimu
Cindi M. Alvitre, Chairwoman/Manisar
3098 Mace Avenue, Apt. D
Gabrieleno
Costa Mesa, CA 92626
calvitre@yahoo.com
(714) 504-2486 Cell

Gabrieleno Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council
Robert F. Dorame, Tribal Chair/Cultural Resources
P.O. Box 490
Ballifower, CA 90707
gtongva@verizon.net
562-761-6417 - voice
562-761-6417 - fax

Tongva Ancestral Territorial Tribal Nation
John Tommy Rosas, Tribal Admin.
Private Address
Gabrieleno Tongva
sattinlaw@gmail.com
310-570-6567

Gabrieleno Tongva Tribe
Bernie Acuna
1875 Century Pk East #1500
Gabrieleno
Los Angeles, CA 90003
(619) 294-6660-work
(310) 428-5690 - cell
(310) 587-0170 - FAX
bacuna1@gabrielenotribe.org

Gabrieleno/Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission
Anthony Morales, Chairperson
PO Box 693
Gabrieleno Tongva
San Gabriel, CA 91777
GTTRibalcouncil@aol.com
(626) 286-1632
(626) 286-1758 - Home
(626) 286-1262 - FAX

Gabrieleno-Tongva Tribe
Linda Candelaria, Chairwoman
1875 Century Park East, Suite 1500
Los Angeles, CA 90067
Gabrieleno
candelaria1@gabrielenotribe.org
626-676-1184 - cell
(310) 587-0170 - FAX
760-904-6533-home

This list is current only as of the date of this document.

Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of the statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7060.6 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code and Section 6597.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resources for the proposed SCH201011028: CEQA Notice of Preparation (NOP); draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the "I-10 HOV - Add One HOV Lane in the Median in Each Direction, from Puente Avenue to State Route 67 Project; located in Los Angeles County, California."
California Native American Contacts
Los Angeles County
January 19, 2012

Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians
Andrew Salas, Chairperson
P.O. Box 393
Gabrieleno
Covina, CA 91723
(626) 926-4131
 gabrielenoindians@yahoo.com

This list is current only as of the date of this document.

Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of the statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7060.6 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 6997.04 of the Public Resources Code and Section 6997.06 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resources for the proposed SCH#201101023; CEQA Notice of Preparation (NOP); draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the "I-10 HOV - Add One HOV Lane in the Median in Each Direction, from Pueblito Avenue to State Route 57 Project, located in Los Angeles County, California."
February 10, 2012

Mr. Ron Kosinski
Department of Transportation, District 7 (Caltrans)
100 South Main Street, MS-16A
Los Angeles, California 90650
Phone (213) 897-3818
Fax (213) 897-0805

Subject: Notice of Preparation of a Supplemental/Subsequent Environmental Impact Report for I-10 HOV Lane from Puente Avenue to State Route 57 Project, SCH # 2012011028, in Los Angeles County

Dear Mr. Kosinski:

The Department of Fish and Game (Department) has reviewed the above-referenced Notice of Preparation (NOP) for above-mentioned project relative to impacts to biological resources. The project proposes to construct in the Median in each direction of Interstate-10 (I-10) a High Occupancy Vehicle lane (HOV) from Puente Avenue to State Route-57 (SR-57).

To enable Department staff to adequately review and comment on the proposed project we recommend the following information, where applicable, be included in the Supplemental/Subsequent Environmental Impact Report:

1. The Department opposes the elimination of watercourses (including concrete channels) and/or the canalization of natural and manmade drainages or conversion to subsurface drains. All wetlands and watercourses, whether intermittent, ephemeral, or perennial, must be retained and provided with substantial setbacks which preserve the riparian and aquatic habitat values and maintain their value to on-site and off-site wildlife populations. The Department recommends a minimum natural buffer of 100 feet from the outside edge of the riparian zone on each side of a streambed.

   a. The Department requires a Streambed Alteration Agreement (Agreement), pursuant to Section 1600 et seq. of the Fish and Game Code, with the applicant prior to any direct or indirect impact to stream bed, bank or channel or associated riparian resources. The Department’s issuance of a Agreement may be a project that is subject to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). To facilitate our issuance of the Agreement when CEQA applies, the Department as a responsible agency under CEQA may

Conserving California’s Wildlife Since 1870
consider the local jurisdiction's (lead agency) document for the project. To minimize additional requirements by the Department under CEQA the document should fully identify the potential impacts to the lake, stream or riparian resources and provide adequate avoidance, mitigation, monitoring and reporting commitments for issuance of the Agreement. Early consultation is recommended, since modification of the proposed project may be required to avoid or reduce impacts to fish and wildlife resources.

2. A complete, recent assessment of flora and fauna within and adjacent to the project area, with particular emphasis upon identifying endangered, threatened, and locally unique species and sensitive habitats (Attachment 1).

   a. A thorough recent assessment of rare plants and rare natural communities, following the Department's Guidelines for Assessing Impacts to Rare Plants and Rare Natural Communities (Attachment 2).

      i. There appears to be inconsistency in the number and species of native plants to be permanently impacted. In the Summary of Impacts (S6) it is stated three black walnuts, a member of rare plant community, will be removed. In the proposed mitigation for this impact it states that black walnut and toyon will be replaced. However, there is no mention of impacts to toyon. This discrepancy should be clarified.

   b. A complete, recent assessment of sensitive fish, wildlife, reptile, and amphibian species. Seasonal variations in use of the project area should also be addressed.

      i. Coastal California gnatcatchers (CCGN) were present in suitable habitat on the south side of the San Jose Hills during surveys completed between 2001 and 2003. Adjacent to the proposed project is CCGN designated critical habitat and a Significant Ecological Area (SEA), both in the vicinity of Kehllogg Hill and the proposed project footprint. Recent, focused, species-specific surveys, conducted at the appropriate time of year and time of day when the sensitive species are active or otherwise identifiable, are required. Acceptable species-specific survey procedures should be developed in consultation with the Department and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

   c. Rare, threatened, and endangered species to be addressed should include all those which meet the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) definition (see CEQA Guidelines, Section 15380).

   d. The Department's Wildlife Habitat Data Analysis Branch in Sacramento should be contacted at (916) 322-2493 to obtain current information on
any previously reported sensitive species and habitats, including Significant Natural Areas identified under Chapter 12 of the Fish and Game Code. Also, any Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs) or Environmentally Sensitive Habitats (ESHs) or any areas that are considered sensitive by the local jurisdiction that are located in or adjacent to the project area must be addressed.

3. A thorough discussion of direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts expected to adversely affect biological resources, with specific measures to offset such impacts. This discussion should focus on maximizing avoidance, and minimizing impacts.

a. CEQA Guidelines, Section 15125(a), direct that knowledge of the regional setting is critical to an assessment of environmental impacts and that special emphasis should be placed on resources that are rare or unique to the region.

b. Project impacts should also be analyzed relative to their effects on off-site habitats and populations. Specifically, this should include nearby public lands, open space, adjacent natural habitats, and riparian ecosystems. Impacts to and maintenance of wildlife corridor/movement areas, including access to undisturbed habitat in adjacent areas are of concern to the Department and should be fully evaluated and provided. The analysis should also include a discussion of the potential for impacts resulting from such effects as increased vehicle traffic, outdoor artificial lighting, noise and vibration.

c. A cumulative effects analysis should be developed as described under CEQA Guidelines, Section 15130. General and specific plans, as well as past, present, and anticipated future projects, should be analyzed relative to their impacts on similar plant communities and wildlife habitats.

d. Impacts to migratory wildlife affected by the project should be fully evaluated including proposals to removal/disturb native and ornamental landscaping and other nesting habitat for native birds. Impact evaluation may also include such elements as migratory butterfly roost sites and neotropical bird and waterfowl stop-over and staging sites. All migratory nongame native bird species are protected by International treaty under the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) of 1918 (50 C.F.R. Section 10.13). Sections 3503, 3503.5 and 3513 of the California Fish and Game Code prohibit take of birds and their active nests, including raptors and other migratory nongame birds as listed under the MBTA.

e. Impacts to all habitats from City or County required Fuel Modification Zones (FMZ). Areas slated as mitigation for loss of habitat shall not occur within the FMZ.
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f. Proposed project activities (including disturbances to vegetation) should take place outside of the breeding bird season (February 1 - September 1) to avoid take (including disturbances which would cause abandonment of active nests containing eggs and/or young). If project activities cannot avoid the breeding bird season, nest surveys should be conducted and active nests should be avoided and provided with a minimum buffer as determined by a biological monitor (the Department recommends a minimum 500-foot buffer for all active raptor nests).

4. A range of alternatives should be analyzed to ensure that alternatives to the proposed project are fully considered and evaluated. A range of alternatives which avoid or otherwise minimize impacts to sensitive biological resources including wetlands/riparian habitats, alluvial scrub, coastal sage scrub, etc. should be included. Specific alternative locations should also be evaluated in areas with lower resource sensitivity where appropriate.

a. Mitigation measures for project impacts to sensitive plants, animals, and habitats should emphasize evaluation and selection of alternatives which avoid or otherwise minimize project impacts. Compensation for unavoidable impacts through acquisition and protection of high quality habitat elsewhere should be addressed with offsite mitigation locations clearly identified.

b. The Department considers Rare Natural Communities as threatened habitats having both regional and local significance. Thus, these communities should be fully avoided and otherwise protected from project-related impacts (Attachment 2).

5. A California Endangered Species Act (CESA) Permit must be obtained, if the project has the potential to result in “take” of species of plants or animals listed under CESA, either during construction or over the life of the project. CESA Permits are issued to conserve, protect, enhance, and restore State-listed threatened or endangered species and their habitats. Early consultation is encouraged, as significant modification to the proposed project and mitigation measures may be required in order to obtain a CESA Permit. Revisions to the Fish and Game Code, effective January 1996, require that the Department issue a separate CEQA document for the issuance of a CESA permit unless the project CEQA document addresses all project impacts to listed species and specifies a mitigation monitoring and reporting program that will meet the requirements of a CESA permit. For these reasons, the following information is requested:
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a. Biological mitigation monitoring and reporting proposals should be of sufficient detail and resolution to satisfy the requirements for a CESA Permit.

b. A Department-approved Mitigation Agreement and Mitigation Plan are required for plants listed as rare under the Native Plant Protection Act.

Thank you for this opportunity to provide comment. Please contact Ms. Jamie Jackson, Staff Environmental Scientist, at (805) 382-6906 or jjackson@dfg.ca.gov if you should have any questions and for further coordination on the proposed project.

Sincerely,

Jamie Jackson  
Staff Environmental Scientist  
South Coast Region

Attachments

cc: Ms. Leslie S. MacNair, Los Alamitos  
    Ms. Terri Dickerson, Laguna Niguel

HabCon-Chron  
Department of Fish and Game  
State Clearinghouse, Sacramento

JLJ: jjj  
Jljackson/Caltrans/I-10HOVLanesProject/NOP 2012
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# Appendix C  Glossary of Technical Terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>abutting</td>
<td>With respect to jurisdictional determinations, wetlands that are not separated from the tributary by an upland feature, such as a berm or dike, is “abutting.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>active fault</td>
<td>A fault on which movement has occurred in the past 10,000 years and that may be subject to recurring movement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adjacent</td>
<td>The term “adjacent” means bordering, contiguous, or neighboring. Wetlands separated from other waters of the U.S. by human-made dikes or barriers, natural river berms, beach dunes, and the like are “adjacent wetlands.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aesthetics</td>
<td>The science or philosophy concerned with the quality or sensory experience. It is also viewed as a body of knowledge about those characteristics of objects that make them pleasing or displeasing to the senses, and those characteristics of human perception that affect sensation. The quality of being aesthetics is not the opposite of ‘practicality’ or ‘reality’, but rather another aspect or way of experiencing the same real world phenomena. Thus, blue skies, uncontaminated water, and uncluttered urban landscapes all have aesthetic value, because they imply health, pleasure, and security.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Pollution Control District (APCD)</td>
<td>A county agency with authority to regulate stationary, indirect, and area sources of air pollution (e.g., power plants, highway construction, and housing developments) within the county, and which is governed by a district air pollution control board composed of the elected county supervisors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality Management District (AQMD)</td>
<td>A group of counties or portions of counties with authority to regulate stationary, indirect, and area sources of air pollution within the region and which is governed by a regional air pollution control board primarily consisting of elected officials from within the region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP)</td>
<td>A plan prepared by an air pollution control district or an air quality management district for a county or region designated as a nonattainment area. The plan’s purpose is to bring the area into compliance with the requirements of national and or California ambient air quality standards. AQMPs are incorporated into the State Implementation Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alluvium</td>
<td>Sediments deposited by flowing water, as in a river bed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alquist–Priolo Special Studies Zone</td>
<td>An area established along and parallel to the traces of active faults to prohibit the location of structures on the traces of such faults.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ambient air</td>
<td>That portion of the atmosphere outside buildings to which the general public has access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambient Air Quality Standards (AAQS)</td>
<td>Standards established at state or federal levels that define the limits for airborne concentrations of designated pollutants in order to protect health and welfare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aquifer</td>
<td>A water-bearing rock, rock formation, or group of formations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>archaeology</td>
<td>The systematic recovery and study of material evidence (e.g., structures, tools, and pottery) remaining from past human life and cultures in order to study human ecology and cultural progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>area of potential effect</td>
<td>A term used in Section 106 regulations (36 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 800) to describe the area in which historic and archaeological resources may be affected by a federal undertaking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arterial</td>
<td>A signalized street with signal spacings of 2 miles or less and turning movements at intersections that do not exceed 20 percent of total traffic. Urban arterials primarily serve through traffic and are designed to facilitate traffic movement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attainment area</td>
<td>An area designated by EPA and appropriate state air quality agency as having ambient air quality levels below ceiling levels defined by the National Ambient Air Quality Standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average daily traffic (ADT)</td>
<td>Average volume of traffic in number of vehicles at a given location within a 24-hour period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>base floodplain</td>
<td>The area subject to flooding by the flood or tide having a 1-percent chance of being exceeded in any given year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>baseline</td>
<td>Characterization of existing and future growth of an area without the proposed project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>basin</td>
<td>Drainage or catchment area of a stream or lake.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beneficial use</td>
<td>A use of a natural water resource that enhances the social, economic, and environmental well-being of the user. Twenty-one (21) beneficial uses are defined for the waters of California, ranging from municipal and domestic supply to fisheries and wildlife habitat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Management Practice (BMP)</td>
<td>Policies, practices, procedures, or structures implemented to mitigate the adverse environmental effects on surface water quality resulting from development. BMPs are categorized as structural or nonstructural.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Air Resources Board (CARB)</td>
<td>California's lead air quality agency, consisting of a nine-member governor-appointed board. CARB is responsible for attaining and maintaining state and federal air quality standards and is fully responsible for controlling motor vehicle pollution. CARB oversees county and regional air pollution management programs. <a href="http://www.arb.ca.gov/homepage.htm">http://www.arb.ca.gov/homepage.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG)</td>
<td>State regulatory agency with jurisdiction over various permitting activities for wetlands and state-listed endangered species (plants and animals). <a href="http://www.dfg.ca.gov/">http://www.dfg.ca.gov/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)</td>
<td>State agency that issues encroachment permits to ensure that the proposed encroachment is compatible with the state highway system, highway drivers' safety, and the state’s investment in highway facilities. <a href="http://www.dot.ca.gov/">http://www.dot.ca.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)</td>
<td>State environmental legislation enacted in 1970 that is intended to ensure that the environmental consequences of a proposed public agency action are considered by decision makers with regard to project approval. Environmental Impact Reports (EIRs) are a principal means by which such environmental consequences are disclosed. <a href="http://ceres.ca.gov/ceqa/">http://ceres.ca.gov/ceqa/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB)</td>
<td>State Endangered Species Act program responsible for maintaining information on the status and distribution of rare, threatened, and endangered species in California. <a href="http://www.dfg.ca.gov/biogeodata/cnddb/">http://www.dfg.ca.gov/biogeodata/cnddb/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>capacity</td>
<td>The road’s ability to carry particular traffic volumes while maintaining prescribed operational qualities (e.g., a specific level of service); the maximum amount of traffic that a facility can accommodate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carbon monoxide (CO)</td>
<td>A colorless, odorless gas resulting from the incomplete combustion of fossil fuels. More than 80 percent of the CO emitted in urban areas comes from motor vehicles. CO interferes with the blood’s ability to carry oxygen to the body and causes many adverse health effects. CO is a criteria air pollutant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carrying capacity</td>
<td>The maximum number of animals that an area can support during a given period of the year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean Air Act (CAA)</td>
<td>The Clean Air Act of 1970 and the subsequent amendments, including the Clean Air Act Amendments (CAAAs) of 1990 (42 USC 7401–7671g), is the primary federal law that protects the nation's air resources. This act establishes a comprehensive set of standards, planning processes, and requirements to address air pollution problems and reduce emissions from major sources of pollutants. Basic elements of the act include National Ambient Air Quality Standards for the major air pollutants, air toxics standards, acid rain control measures, and enforcement provisions. <a href="http://www.epa.gov/air/caa/">http://www.epa.gov/air/caa/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean Water Act (CWA) of 1972</td>
<td>Also known as the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (FWPCA) 33USCA Sections 1251 to 1387 (alternatively cited as Sections 101 - 607). The primary goal as defined in Section 1251(a) is “to restore and maintain the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the Nation’s waters.” Jurisdiction to regulate “waters of the U.S.” vested under this Act include: Section 303 (Water Quality Standards and Implementation Plans), Section 311 (Spill Program and Oil Pollution Act), Section 401 (State Water Quality Certification), Section 402 (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System [NPDES]), Section 404 (permits for dredge or fill material). <a href="http://www.epa.gov/lawsregs/laws/cwa.html">http://www.epa.gov/lawsregs/laws/cwa.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 303</td>
<td>Section 303 Water Quality Standards Program: Under this program, State and authorized Indian Tribes establish water quality standards for navigable waters to “protect the public health or welfare” and “enhance the quality of water,” “taking into consideration their use and value for public water supplies, propagation of fish and wildlife, recreational purposes, and agriculture, industrial, and other purposes, and also taking into consideration their use and value for navigation.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 401</td>
<td>Section 401 Water Quality Certification: Provides that no Federal permit or license for activities that might result in a discharge to navigable waters may be issued unless a CWA Section 401 Water Quality Certification is obtained from or waived by States or authorized Tribes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 402</td>
<td>Section 402 National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Program: This program established a permitting system to regulate point source discharges of pollutants (other than dredged or fill material) into waters of the U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 404</td>
<td>Section 404 Dredged and Fill Material Permit Program: This program has established a permitting system to regulate the discharges of dredged or fill material into waters of the U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensatory mitigation</td>
<td>The restoration, establishment (creation), enhancement, or reservation of aquatic resources for the purpose of compensating for unavoidable adverse impacts which remain after all appropriate and practicable avoidance and minimization has been achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act</td>
<td>CERCLA, commonly known as Superfund, was enacted by Congress on December 11, 1980. This law created a tax on the chemical and petroleum industries and provided broad Federal authority to respond directly to releases or threatened releases of hazardous substances that may endanger public health or the environment. <a href="http://www.epa.gov/superfund/policy/cercla.htm">http://www.epa.gov/superfund/policy/cercla.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridor</td>
<td>A strip of land centered on a linear facility such as a highway or utility right-of-way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative impact</td>
<td>The combined impacts from all projects occurring concurrently in a specific geographic area or to a particular system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decibel (dB)</td>
<td>A unit of noise measured on a logarithmic scale that compresses the range of sound pressures audible to the human ear over a range from zero to 140, where zero decibels represents sound pressure corresponding to the threshold of human hearing and 140 decibels corresponds to a pressure at which pain occurs. Noise analysts measure sound pressure levels that people hear in decibels, much like other analysts measure linear distances in yards or meters. A-weighted decibels (dBA) refer to a weighting that accounts for the various frequency components in a way that corresponds to human hearing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decibel on the A-weighted scale (A-weighted decibel)</td>
<td>Sound pressure level in decibels as measure on a sound level meter using the A-weighted filter network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>direct impact</td>
<td>Impacts caused solely and immediately by project implementation, frequently resulting physical removal of the affected resource.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discharge</td>
<td>Any discharge of dredged or fill material and any activity that causes or results in such a discharge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disturbed area</td>
<td>Land that has had its surface altered by grading, digging, or other construction-related activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>earthquake</td>
<td>A sudden motion or trembling in the earth caused by displacement of rocks below the earth’s surface as a result of a release of strain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effect</td>
<td>A change in attribute. Effects can be caused by a variety of events, including those that result from project attributes acting on the resource attribute (direct effect), those that do not result directly from the project or from the attributes of other resources acting on the attribute being studied (indirect effect), those that result from attributes of other projects or other attributes that change because of other projects (cumulative effects), and those that result from natural causes (e.g., seasonal change).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>endangered species</td>
<td>A species that is threatened with extinction throughout all or a significant portion of its range.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>energy equivalent noise level (Leq)</td>
<td>The mean A-weighted sound level during a given time interval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enhancement</td>
<td>The manipulation of the physical, chemical, or biological characteristics of an aquatic resource to heighten, intensify, or improve a specific aquatic resource function(s). Enhancement results in the gain of selected aquatic resource function(s), but may also lead to a decline in other aquatic resource function(s). Enhancement does not result in a gain in aquatic resource area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Document</td>
<td>A draft or final EIS or EIR, Finding of No Significant Impact, Environmental Assessment, or Negative Declaration. A Categorical Exclusion form is not considered an environmental document; it is rather the documentation that the project is exempt/excluded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impact Report (EIR)</td>
<td>A disclosure document prepared pursuant to CEQA to evaluate potential impacts and to propose mitigation for significant impacts to facilitate informed decision making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environmental justice</td>
<td>The fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people regardless of race, color, national origin, or income with respect to the development, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies. Fair treatment means that no group of people, including racial, ethnic, or socioeconomic groups, should bear a disproportionate share of the negative environmental consequences resulting from industrial, municipal, and commercial operations or the execution of federal, state, local, and tribal programs and policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)</td>
<td>An agency of the executive branch of the federal government charged with establishing and enforcing environmental regulations. <a href="http://www.epa.gov/">http://www.epa.gov/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exotic species</td>
<td>An organism or species that is not native to the area in which it is found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fault</td>
<td>A fracture or zone of fractures along which there has been movement of the sides relative to one another and parallel to the fracture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fault zone</td>
<td>An area or region with numerous fractures or faults.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>floodplain</td>
<td>The relatively flat land lying adjacent to a river channel that is covered by water when the river overflows its banks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flora</td>
<td>Plants collectively, especially the plants of a particular region or period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fluvial</td>
<td>Pertaining to a river or stream.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forage</td>
<td>Food for animals (e.g., deer), especially when taken by browsing or grazing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>freeway</td>
<td>A multilane, divided highway with a minimum of two lanes in each direction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geographic information system (GIS)</td>
<td>A computerized tool that allows complex sets of data to be combined in various layers and manipulated for purpose of analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geologic hazard</td>
<td>A naturally occurring or human-made geologic condition or phenomenon that presents a risk or is a potential danger to life or property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geologic unit</td>
<td>A geologic formation, group, or member.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP)</td>
<td>A planning document required to obtain a FESA section permit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hazardous material</td>
<td>A substance, or combination of substances, which because of its quantity, concentration, or physical, chemical, or infectious characteristics may either cause, or significantly contribute to, an increase in mortality or an increase in serious irreversible illness; or pose a substantial present or potential hazard to human health or the environment when improperly treated, stored, transported, disposed of, or otherwise managed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hazardous waste</td>
<td>Waste materials that, by their nature, are inherently dangerous to handle or dispose of (e.g., old explosives, radioactive materials, some chemicals, some biological wastes). Usually, industrial operations produce these waste materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>historic property</td>
<td>Any prehistoric or historic district, site (including archaeological site), building, structure, or other object included in, or eligible for inclusion in, the National Register of Historic Places maintained by the Secretary of the Interior. This term includes artifacts, records, and remains that are related to and located within such properties. The term includes properties of traditional religious and cultural importance to an Indian tribe or Native Hawaiian organization that meet the National Register criteria (36 CFR Part 60).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hydrologic area</td>
<td>A major logical subdivision of a hydrologic unit (see definition below) that includes both water-bearing and nonwater-bearing formations. It is best typified by a major tributary of a stream, a major valley, or a plain along a stream Containing one or more groundwater basins and having closely related geologic, hydrologic, and topographic characteristics. Area boundaries are based primarily on surface drainage boundaries. However, where strong subsurface evidence indicates that a division of groundwater exists, the area boundary may be based on subsurface characteristics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hydrologic subarea</td>
<td>A major logical subdivision of a hydrologic area (see definition above) that includes both water-bearing and nonwater-bearing formations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hydrologic unit</td>
<td>A classification embracing one of the following features that are defined by surface drainage divides: (1) In general, the total watershed area, including water-bearing and nonwater-bearing formations; and (2) in coastal areas, two or more small contiguous watersheds having similar hydrologic characteristics, each watershed being directly tributary to the ocean and all watersheds emanating from one mountain body immediately adjacent to the ocean. As prescribed by the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), hydrologic unit refers to the four levels of subdivisions, used for the collection and organization of hydrological data. The hierarchy of hydrological units include: (1) Regions (2) Subregions (3) Accounting Units, and (4) Cataloging Units. The identifying codes associated with these units are “hydrological unit codes.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hydrological unit – regions</td>
<td>The first level of USGS hydrological classification, which divides the Nation into 21 Major geographic areas. These geographic areas (hydrologic areas based on surface topography) contain either the drainage area of a major river, or the combined drainage areas of a series of rivers. Most of California is located within region “18.” Notable exceptions include the Tahoe basin (Great Basin Region 16) and the Colorado River (Lower Colorado Region 15). All smaller hydrological units with the region begin with the region number (18).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hydrology</td>
<td>The science dealing with the properties, distribution, and circulation of water on the surface of the land and in the soil and underlying rocks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>igneous rock</td>
<td>Rock formed by solidification from a molten or partially molten state.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impact analysis</td>
<td>An assessment of the changes in attributes being studied for a given resource resulting from the implementation of the project; an aggregation of all (usually adverse) effects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indirect impacts</td>
<td>Project-related impacts (usually because of population shifts or increased access) not attributable to being in the path of the project footprint but that would not have occurred without project construction or operation (e.g., a project maintenance road may provide access to an area previously inaccessible), resulting in disturbance to sensitive species.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Study</td>
<td>Under CEQA, the Initial Study is prepared to determine whether there may be significant environmental effects resulting from a project. The Initial Study is attached to the Negative Declaration or Mitigated Negative Declaration. It can become the basis of an EIR if it concludes that the project may cause significant environmental effects that cannot be mitigated below the level of significance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td>The designated National System of Interstate and Defense Highways located in both rural and urban areas; they connect the East and West coasts and extend from Canadian border points to various points on the Mexican border.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrusive rock</td>
<td>Igneous rocks that cooled below the surface of the planet, however, and generally display large crystals due to the increased amount of time spent at mineral crystallization temperatures from the insulating effect of surrounding material.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L&lt;sub&gt;eq&lt;/sub&gt; noise level</td>
<td>Average noise level over a specified time period (e.g., 1 hour).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>level of service (LOS)</td>
<td>A term that denotes traffic operating conditions at a given intersection. There are six levels of service, A through F, which relate to traffic congestion from best to worst. In general, LOS A represents free-flow conditions with no congestion. Conversely, LOS F represents severe congestion with stop-and-go conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liquefaction</td>
<td>The transformation during an earthquake of unconsolidated, granular, water-saturated sediment into a liquid form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>locality</td>
<td>A particular spot within a geologic unit from which a specimen is obtained or may be found; usually a location of dense or well-preserved fossils.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long-term impacts</td>
<td>Impacts resulting from project construction or operation that would occur over an extended period of time. Construction activities may result in long-term impacts if a resource is destroyed or irreparably damaged or if the recovery rate of the resource is very slow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low-income population</td>
<td>A population composed of persons whose median household income is below the Department of Health and Human Services poverty guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magnitude (earthquake)</td>
<td>A measure of strength of an earthquake or the energy it releases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maximum credible earthquake</td>
<td>The largest earthquake capable of being produced from a source, structure, or region as it is currently known.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)</td>
<td>A federal designation for the forum for cooperative transportation decision making for an urbanized area with a population of more than 50,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority population</td>
<td>A population composed of persons who are Black (non-Hispanic), Hispanic, Asian American, American Indian, or Alaskan Native.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mitigation measure</td>
<td>An action or precaution that can reduce or eliminate individual project impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS)</td>
<td>Standards set by EPA for the maximum levels of air pollutants that can exist in the outdoor air without unacceptable effects on human health or the public welfare.   <a href="http://www.epa.gov/air/criteria.html">http://www.epa.gov/air/criteria.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA)</td>
<td>The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966. as amended (16 USC 470-470 et seq.; P.L 89-665), is the basic legislation of the nation's historic preservation program that established the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the Section 106 review process. NHPA Section 106 requires every federal agency to &quot;take into account&quot; the effects of its undertakings on historic properties. <a href="http://www.achp.gov/nhpa.html">http://www.achp.gov/nhpa.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit</td>
<td>A permit that is required for facilities and activities that discharge waste into surface waters from a confined pipe or channel. <a href="http://cfpub.epa.gov/npdes/">http://cfpub.epa.gov/npdes/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Priorities List (NPL)</td>
<td>Sites designated for Superfund cleanup by EPA. <a href="http://www.epa.gov/superfund/sites/npl/">http://www.epa.gov/superfund/sites/npl/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)</td>
<td>Administered by the National Park Service, the nation's master inventory of known historic properties, including buildings, structures, sites, objects, and districts that possess historic, architectural, engineering, archeological, or cultural significance at the federal, state, and local levels. The NRHP lists districts, sites, structures, and objects important in American history, architecture, archaeology, and culture; maintained by the Secretary of the Interior under authority of Section 2(b) of the Historic Sites Act of 1935 and Section 101 (a)(l) of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended. <a href="http://www.nps.gov/nr/">http://www.nps.gov/nr/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>native vegetation</td>
<td>Plant life that occurs naturally in the study area without agricultural or cultivational efforts and prior to Euro-American contact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nitrogen dioxide (NO₂)</td>
<td>A poisonous gas used in the manufacture of nitric acid and sulfuric acids. Also a criteria air pollutant resulting from the combustion of fossil fuels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nitrogen oxides (NOₓ) -</td>
<td>A general term pertaining to compounds of nitric oxide (NO), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), and other oxides of nitrogen. Nitrogen oxides are typically created during combustion processes, and are major contributors to smog formation and acid deposition. NO₂ is a criteria pollutant and may result in numerous adverse health effects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nonattainment area</td>
<td>A geographic area that has been designated by EPA and the appropriate state air quality agency as not complying with one or more National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nonnative vegetation</td>
<td>Plant communities dominated by exotic species.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>open water</td>
<td>Any area that, in a year with normal patterns of precipitation, has water flowing or standing above ground to the extent that an ordinary high water mark can be determined. Aquatic vegetation within the area of standing or flowing water is either nonemergent, sparse, or absent. Vegetated shallows are considered to be open waters. Examples of open waters include rivers, streams, lakes, and ponds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ozone (O₃)</td>
<td>A strong-smelling, pale blue, reactive toxic chemical gas consisting of three oxygen atoms. It is a product of the photochemical process involving the sun’s energy. Ozone exists in the upper atmosphere ozone layer, as well as at the earth’s surface. Ozone at the earth’s surface causes numerous health effects and is a criteria air pollutant. It is a major component of smog.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paleontological resources</td>
<td>Fossilized plant or animal remains from past geologic periods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>particulate matter finer than 10 microns (PM₁₀)</td>
<td>A major air pollutant consisting of tiny solid or liquid particles of soot, dust, smoke, fumes, and mists. The size of the particles (10 microns or smaller: 0.0004 inch or less) allows them to easily enter the air sacs deep in the lungs where they may be deposited to result in adverse health effects. PM₁₀ also reduces visibility and is a criteria air pollutant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peak period</td>
<td>The hour of highest traffic volume on a given section of roadway between 7:00 a.m. and 9:00 a.m. or between 4:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>practicable</td>
<td>Available and capable of being done after taking into consideration cost, existing technology, and logistics in light of overall project purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prehistoric</td>
<td>The period of time before the written record (i.e., before Euro-American entry into the study area).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preservation</td>
<td>The removal of a threat to, or preventing the decline of, aquatic resources by an action in or near those aquatic resources. This term includes activities commonly associated with the protection and maintenance of aquatic resources through the implementation of appropriate legal and physical mechanisms. Preservation does not result in a gain of aquatic resource area or functions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recharge</td>
<td>The process by which water is absorbed and added to the zone of saturation, either directly into a formation or indirectly via another formation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)</td>
<td>The official intermodal metropolitan transportation plan that is developed through the metropolitan planning process for the metropolitan planning area, developed pursuant to 23 CFR Part 450.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)</td>
<td>State or regional regulatory agency whose jurisdiction includes regulation of waste discharges. The RWQCB is the state water pollution control agency for all purposes stated in the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rehabilitation</td>
<td>The manipulation of the physical, chemical, or biological characteristics of a site with the goal of repairing natural/historic functions to a degraded aquatic resource. Rehabilitation results in a gain in aquatic resource function, but does not result in a gain in aquatic resource area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relevant reach</td>
<td>With respect to &quot;significant nexus determinations,&quot; the &quot;relevant reach&quot; will include all tributary waters of the same order. Typically this will include the tributary and all adjacent wetlands reaching downstream from the project site to the confluence with the next tributary or upstream to a similar confluence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>restoration</td>
<td>The manipulation of the physical, chemical, or biological characteristics of a site with the goal of returning natural/historic functions to a former or degraded aquatic resource. For the purpose of tracking net gains in aquatic resource area, restoration is divided into two categories: re-establishment and rehabilitation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>revegetation</td>
<td>Regrowth or replacement of a plant community on a disturbed site. Revegetation may be assisted by site preparation, planting, and treatment, or it may occur naturally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>right-of-way</td>
<td>The land used by a public utility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>riparian</td>
<td>Of or relating to land laying immediately adjacent to water and having specific characteristics of that transitional area (e.g., riparian vegetation).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>riparian area</td>
<td>Riparian areas are lands adjacent to streams, lakes, and estuarine-marine shorelines. Riparian areas are transitional between terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems through which surface and subsurface hydrology connects waterbodies with their adjacent uplands. Riparian areas provide a variety of ecological functions and services and help improve or maintain local water quality. (See General Condition No. 20, in the NWP.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>riprap</td>
<td>A foundation or sustaining wall of stones or chunks of concrete thrown together on an embankment slope to prevent erosion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>river miles</td>
<td>The flowing distance between the waterbodies in question. Typically not a straight line; rather, the measurement is based on how far the water will travel from waterbody A to waterbody B. For example, the water in a meandering tributary will flow further than water flowing in a channelized tributary provided the two waterbodies are the same distance apart in the landscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>runoff</td>
<td>Nonabsorbed excess water entering a stream or other conveyance channel shortly after rainfall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rural area</td>
<td>A geographic area characterized by very low-density housing concentrations, agricultural land uses and a general lack of most public services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sampling</td>
<td>The selection of a portion of a study area or population, the analysis of which is intended to permit a generalization about the entire population. In archaeology, samples are often used to reduce the amount of land area covered in a survey or the number of artifacts analyzed from a site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scoping</td>
<td>A process for determining the scope of issues to be addressed in an Environmental Assessment and environmental impact statement (EIS) and for identifying significant issues to be analyzed in depth in an EIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seismic</td>
<td>Pertaining to an earthquake or earth vibrations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seismic zone</td>
<td>An area of intense local seismicity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>short-term impact</td>
<td>Transitory effects of a proposed project, generally caused by construction activities or operations startup.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>significance (CEQA)</td>
<td>CEQA defines a &quot;Significant effect on the environment&quot; as &quot;a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project, including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic or aesthetic significance. An economic or social change by itself shall not be considered a significant effect on the environment. A social or economic change related to a physical change may be considered in determining whether the physical change is significant (§15382). CEQA requires that the lead agency identify each &quot;significant effect on the environment resulting from the project and avoid or mitigate it. The CEQA Guidelines include mandatory findings of significance for certain effects, thus requiring preparation of an EIR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>significant nexus</td>
<td>In the context of CWA jurisdiction post-Rapanos, a waterbody is considered to have a &quot;significant nexus&quot; with a traditional navigable water if its flow characteristics and functions in combination with the ecological and hydrological functions performed by all wetlands adjacent to such a tributary, affect the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of a downstream traditional navigable water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>single and complete project</td>
<td>The term “single and complete project” is defined at 33 CFR 330.2(i) as the total project proposed or accomplished by one owner/developer or partnership or other association of owners/developers. A single and complete project must have independent utility (see definition). For linear projects, a “single and complete project” is all crossings of a single water of the US (i.e., a single waterbody) at a specific location. For linear projects crossing a single waterbody several times at separate and distant locations, each crossing is considered a single and complete project. However, individual channels in a braided stream or river, or individual arms of a large, irregularly shaped wetland or lake, etc., are not separate waterbodies, and crossings of such features cannot be considered separately.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Coast Air Basin (SCAB)</td>
<td>A 6,600-square-mile area bounded by the Pacific Ocean to the west and the San Gabriel, San Bernardino, and San Jacinto mountains to the north and east. The Basin includes all of Orange County and the nondesert portions of Los Angeles, Riverside, and San Bernardino counties. The topography and climate of the region combine to make the Basin an area of high air pollution potential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern California Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD)</td>
<td>The local agency that is responsible for achieving and maintaining the CAAQS and the NAAQS in the South Coast Air Basin. <a href="http://www.aqmd.gov/">http://www.aqmd.gov/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>species diversity</td>
<td>A measure of the number of species and their relative abundance in a given assemblage or community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO)</td>
<td>The official within each state, authorized by the state at the request of the Secretary of the Interior, to act as liaison in implementing the National Historic Preservation Act. <a href="http://ohp.parks.ca.gov/">http://ohp.parks.ca.gov/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Implementation Plan (SIP)</td>
<td>A compilation of goals, strategies, schedules, and enforcement actions that will lead the state into compliance with all federal air quality standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB)</td>
<td>The principal authority of California for regulating the quantity and quality of waters of the state, established by the legislature in 1967. It assumed responsibility for administration of the Porter–Cologne Water Quality Control Act of 1969. The SWRCB and the nine RWQCBs are responsible for regulating, protecting, and administering water quality in California. The SWRCB, which sets state policies on administrating water rights and water quality control, is run by five full-time members appointed by the governor and includes legal, technical, and administrative staff. The principal laws that have been established to plan, implement, manage, and enforce control of water quality are the Federal Clean Water Act and the California Porter–Cologne Water Quality Control Act (California Water Code, Division 7). <a href="http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/">http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stormwater management</td>
<td>Stormwater management is the mechanism for controlling stormwater runoff for the purposes of reducing downstream erosion, water quality degradation, and flooding and mitigating the adverse effects of changes in land use on the aquatic environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>streambed</td>
<td>The substrate of the stream channel between the ordinary high water marks. The substrate may be bedrock or inorganic particles that range in size from clay to boulders. Wetlands contiguous to the streambed, but outside of the ordinary high water marks, are not considered part of the streambed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>structure</td>
<td>An object that is arranged in a definite pattern of organization. Examples of structures include, without limitation, any pier, boat dock, boat ramp, wharf, dolphin, weir, boom, breakwater, bulkhead, revetment, riprap, jetty, artificial island, artificial reef, permanent mooring structure, power transmission line, permanently moored floating vessel, piling, aid to navigation, or any other manmade obstacle or obstruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sulfur dioxide (SO$_2$)</td>
<td>A strong-smelling, colorless gas formed by the combustion of fossil fuels. Power plants, which may use coal or oil high in sulfur content, can be major sources of SO$_2$, which is a criteria pollutant. SO$_2$ and other sulfur oxides contribute to acid deposition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>surficial</td>
<td>Material at or near the surface.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taxon (pl. taxa)</td>
<td>A taxonomic entity (species, subspecies, or variety) or a group of such entities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>texture</td>
<td>The visual manifestation of the interplay of light and shadow created by variations in the surface of an object.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>threatened species</td>
<td>Plant and wildlife species likely to become endangered in the foreseeable future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transportation control measure (TCM)</td>
<td>Any measure that is specifically identified and committed to in the applicable implementation plan that is either one of the types listed in Clean Air Act § 108, or any other measure to reduce emissions or concentrations of air pollutants from transportation sources by reducing vehicle use or changing traffic flow or congestion conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transportation improvement plan</td>
<td>A staged, multiyear, intermodal program of transportation projects that is consistent with the metropolitan transportation plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tributary</td>
<td>A “tributary,” as defined in the Rapanos guidance document, means a natural, man-altered, or man-made waterbody that carries directly or indirectly into a traditional navigable water. For the purposes of determining significant nexus with a traditional navigable water, a “tributary” is the entire reach of the stream that is of the same order (i.e., from the point of confluence, where two lower order streams meet to form the tributary, downstream to the point such tributary enters a higher order stream).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tuff</td>
<td>A rock made up of particles of volcanic ash, varying in size from fine sand to coarse gravel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)</td>
<td>The agency that holds the responsibility for protection and development of the nation’s water resources, including navigation, flood control, energy production through hydropower management, water supply storage, and recreation. <a href="http://www.iwr.usace.army.mil/">http://www.iwr.usace.army.mil/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)</td>
<td>A key federal oversight agency with jurisdiction over many environmental issue areas, including compliance with NEPA. <a href="http://www.epa.gov/">http://www.epa.gov/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)</td>
<td>Federal agency responsible for ensuring that any actions are not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of endangered or threatened species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of the critical habitat of such species. <a href="http://www.fws.gov/">http://www.fws.gov/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unique and sensitive habitats</td>
<td>Areas that are especially important to regional wildlife populations or protected species that have other important biological characteristics (e.g., nesting areas and wetlands).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>upland</td>
<td>Ground elevated above bottomlands (e.g., rolling hill terrain and terraces).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>visual resource management (VRM)</td>
<td>The management of appearance of the features that make up the visible landscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>volume (transportation)</td>
<td>The total number of vehicles that pass over a given point or section of a roadway during a given time interval. Volumes may be expressed in terms of annual, daily, hourly, or subhourly periods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>volume to capacity ratio (v/c)</td>
<td>The ratio of an intersection's traffic volume (v) to its capacity (c), with capacity defined as the theoretical maximum number of vehicles that can pass through an intersection during a specified time period. When the V/C ratio is 1.0, traffic is considered to be “at capacity” and there is traffic congestion. A V/C ratio of 1.0 or more translates to an LOS F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>water table</td>
<td>The surface in an unconfined aquifer (or in a confined aquifer) at which the pore water pressure is atmospheric.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>waterbody</td>
<td>A waterbody is a jurisdictional water of the U.S. that, during a year with normal patterns of precipitation, has water flowing or standing above ground to the extent that an ordinary high water mark (OHWM) or other indicators of jurisdiction can be determined, as well as any wetland area (see 33 CFR 328.3(b)). If a jurisdictional wetland is adjacent—meaning bordering, contiguous, or neighboring—to a jurisdictional waterbody displaying an OHWM or other indicators of jurisdiction, that waterbody and its adjacent wetlands are considered together as a single aquatic unit (see 33 CFR 328.4(c)(2)). Examples of “waterbodies” include streams, rivers, lakes, ponds, and wetlands.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Waters of the United States | (1) All waters that are currently used, or were used in the past, or may be susceptible to use in interstate or foreign commerce, including all waters that are subject to the ebb and flow of the tide;  
(2) All interstate waters, including interstate wetlands;  
(3) All other waters, such as intrastate lakes, rivers, streams (including intermittent streams), mudflats, sandflats, wetlands, sloughs, prairie potholes, wet meadows, playa lakes, or natural ponds, the use, degradation or destruction of which could affect interstate or foreign commerce including any such waters:  
(i) Which are or could be used by interstate or foreign travelers for recreational or other purposes; or  
(ii) From which fish or shellfish are or could be taken and sold in interstate or foreign commerce; or  
(iii) Which are used or could be used for industrial purpose by industries in interstate commerce;  
(4) All impoundments of waters otherwise defined as waters of the U.S. under the definition;  
(5) Tributaries of waters identified in paragraphs (a)(1)-(4) of this section;  
(6) The territorial seas;  
(7) Wetlands adjacent to waters (other than waters that are themselves wetlands) identified in paragraphs (a)(1)–(6) of this section, (waste treatment systems, including treatment ponds or lagoons designed to meet the requirements of CWA [other than cooling ponds as defined in 40 CFR 123.11(m) which also meet the criteria of this definition] are not waters of the U.S.) and  
(8) Waters of the U.S. do not include prior converted cropland. Notwithstanding the determination of an area’s status as prior converted cropland by any other federal agency, for the purposes of the CWA, the final authority regarding CWA jurisdiction remains with EPA. |
| watershed                   | A drainage or catchment area of a stream or lake.                                                                                           |
| wetlands                    | Areas that are inundated or saturated by surface or groundwater at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and that under normal circumstances do support, a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions. Wetlands generally include swamps, marshes, bogs, and similar areas. The criteria for determining wetlands is set forth in the USACE Wetlands Delineation Manual (1987) and relevant Regional Supplements (Arid West, December 2006). |
| zoning                      | The division of a municipality (or county) into districts for the purpose of regulating land use, bulk of building, required yards, necessary off-street parking, and other prerequisites to development. Zones are generally shown on a map and the text of the zoning ordinance specifies requirements for each zoning category. |
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## District 7 ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITMENTS RECORD

Add One High Occupancy Vehicle Lane in Each Direction on the San Bernardino Freeway (Interstate 10) from Puente Avenue to State Routes 57/71 in Los Angeles County

EA 1170U1/119341
07-LA-10 PM 33.2/42.4

### Log No. | Commitment Type | Responsible Party | Monitoring Frequency | Implementation/ Monitoring Phase | Env Doc/Permit/Specs/ Plans/Estimates | Reference | Completed Signature Page | Remarks
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
1-1 | Retaining Wall Aesthetics | Caltrans Design | One time | Design | EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.1.5, MM VA 1 | During the project design stage, architectural detailing will be applied to the retaining walls and soundwalls, including textures and patterns. | | |
1-2 | Vegetation Protection | Caltrans Construction Manager | Periodically | Design & Construction | EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.1.5, MM VA 2 | During the project design and construction stages, existing vegetation in the corridor will be saved and protected to the extent that is feasible. | | |
1-3 | Vegetation Replacement | Caltrans Design | One time | Design & Construction | EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.1.5, MM VA 3 | During the project design stage, and to the extent feasible, skyline trees will be included in the new plantings to replace those removed by construction. | | |
1-4 | Soundwalls | Caltrans Design | One time | Design & Construction | EIR, App H (Environmental Commitment Letter) | The City of West Covina, Caltrans will design aesthetic themes on soundwalls and landscape. | | |
1-5 | Graffiti Prevention | Caltrans Design | One time | Design & Construction | EIR, App H (Environmental Commitment Letter) | Caltrans will work with the City of West Covina on its request for graffiti prevention measures. | | |
1-6 | Soundwalls | Caltrans Design | One time | Design & Construction | EIR, App H (Environmental Commitment Letter) | Caltrans, when feasible, will arrange for vines or vines on soundwalls as requested by the City of West Covina. | | |
1-7 | Vegetation Replacement | Caltrans Design and Construction Manager | Periodically | Construction | EIR, App H (Environmental Commitment Letter) | Caltrans will replace vegetation when feasible in the City of West Covina. | | |
1-8 | Vegetation Replacement | Caltrans Design and Construction Manager | Periodically | Construction | EIR, App H (Environmental Commitment Letter) | Caltrans, where reasonable and feasible, will replace trees within Caltrans ROW project limits in the City of West Covina. | | |
1-9 | Soundwall | Caltrans Design | One time | Design & Construction | EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.1.5, MM VA 4; MMRP (2003) | The final design of the proposed project will include soundwalls and retaining walls designed to be easily cleaned of graffiti, as well as landscaping where feasible to soften the appearance of these walls. | | |
1-10 | Soundwall | Caltrans Design | One time | Design & Construction | EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.1.5, MM VA 5; MMRP (2003) | Coordinate the design of soundwall aesthetics with local agencies. | | |
1-11 | Vegetation Replacement | Caltrans Design | One time | Design & Construction | EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.1.5, MM VA 6; MMRP (2003) | The final design, conceptual landscape guidelines for planting in designated right-of-way areas to be revegetated, consistent with existing Caltrans policies and procedures, will be developed, in coordination with the adjacent local jurisdictions. | | |
1-12 | Landscaping | Caltrans Design | One time | Design & Construction | EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.1.5, MM VA 7; MMRP (2003) | For Segment 3, final design will incorporate features to ensure that landscaping plantings are integrated with proposed earth berms and cut slopes to screen undesirable views. The grading guidelines will address issues such as where berms are recommended, the sizes of the berms and the recommended slope gradients to minimize soil erosion. | | |
1-13 | Landscaping | Caltrans Construction Manager | One time | Construction | EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.1.5, MM VA 8; MMRP (2003) | Landscape areas that will take the longest time to establish and achieve their desired visual effects will be installed as early as feasible in the construction process. Rehabilitation priorities will be established as a framework based on the size of the area to be landscaped, the visibility of the area and the feasibility of installing landscaping prior to or during construction, rather than after construction is complete. | | |
### District 7 ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITMENTS RECORD
Add One High Occupancy Vehicle Lane in Each Direction on the San Bernardino Freeway (Interstate 10) from Puente Avenue to State Routes 57/71 in Los Angeles County
EA 1170U1/119341
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Log No.</th>
<th>Commitment Type</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Monitoring Frequency</th>
<th>Implementation/ Monitoring Phase</th>
<th>Env Doc/ Permits/ Specs/ Plans/ Estimates/ SSP# / NSSP#</th>
<th>Commitment Measure</th>
<th>Completed Signature Page</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-14</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Caltrans Construction Manager</td>
<td>Periodically</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.1.5, MM VA:9, MMRP (2003)</td>
<td>Caltrans will require construction contractors to shield construction and storage areas from travelers on I-10 and from viewsheds along I-10 to the extent feasible and where the safety of construction and traffic operations is not compromised.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-15</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Caltrans Construction Manager</td>
<td>Periodically</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.1.5, MM VA:10, MMRP (2003)</td>
<td>Construction will be phased such that areas to be re-landscaped are landscaped as soon as possible after construction in the immediate vicinity is completed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TRAFFIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Log No.</th>
<th>Commitment Type</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Monitoring Frequency</th>
<th>Implementation/ Monitoring Phase</th>
<th>Env Doc/ Permits/ Specs/ Plans/ Estimates/ SSP# / NSSP#</th>
<th>Commitment Measure</th>
<th>Completed Signature Page</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-1</td>
<td>Traffic Management</td>
<td>Caltrans Traffic Manager and Construction Manager</td>
<td>One time (Design), Periodically (Construction)</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.2.5</td>
<td>A Traffic Management Plan (TMP) will be prepared to offset the effects of traffic congestion and access during construction on the freeway, ramps, and local streets. In addition to the standard requirements of a TMP, special focus will be placed on improving transit services during construction, as well as traffic incident management. Reducing the frequency of incidents, detection time, response time, and clearance time will all be addressed in the TMP. The TMP will include a public awareness program, including informational sources such as radio, Caltrans overhead changeable message board, and Internet. Some best practices to be considered include: ● Designated towing services for keeping the work zone free of disabled vehicles; ● Contractor-provided 24-hour-per-day monitoring of traffic control devices; ● Establishing proper communication channels with “first responder” agencies; and ● Providing safe pullout locations for disabled vehicles.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-2</td>
<td>Construction Timing</td>
<td>Caltrans Traffic Manager and Construction Manager</td>
<td>One time (Design), Periodically (Construction)</td>
<td>Pre-construction and Construction</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.2.5</td>
<td>Area residents will be regularly informed through public outreach of proposed project development and construction plans prior to and during the construction period so that they are aware of the construction timing, traffic/transit detour plans, and lane/road closures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>Traffic Operations</td>
<td>Caltrans Traffic</td>
<td>One time</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.2.5</td>
<td>At the northbound Vincent Avenue approach to eastbound I-10 on-ramp, modify the existing shared (through/right) lane to an exclusive through lane and add an exclusive full right turn lane.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>Traffic Operations</td>
<td>Caltrans Traffic</td>
<td>One time</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.2.5</td>
<td>Increase the capacity of the eastbound I-10 on-ramp from northbound Vincent Avenue through the addition of a lane and the relocation of the proposed ramp meter approximately 370 feet downstream.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>Construction Timing</td>
<td>Caltrans Traffic</td>
<td>Periodically</td>
<td>Pre-construction and Construction</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.2.5</td>
<td>Caltrans will periodically coordinate with the transit companies to discuss changes in the construction operations and potential impacts to the transit providers. Caltrans will coordinate all street, connector, and ramp closures with the transit service. Whenever possible, these closures should not take place during the peak commute hours. In addition, consecutive ramp and street closures will be avoided.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-6</td>
<td>Traffic Management</td>
<td>Caltrans Construction Manager</td>
<td>One time</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>EIR, App H (Environmental Commitment Letter)</td>
<td>Caltrans will work with the City of West Covina to ensure that as few ramps as possible are closed at any one time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log No.</td>
<td>Commitment Type</td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
<td>Monitoring Frequency</td>
<td>Implementation/ Monitoring Phase</td>
<td>SSP# / NSSP#</td>
<td>Env Doc/ Permits/ Specs/ Plans/ Estimates</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Commitment Measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-7</td>
<td>Traffic Management</td>
<td>Caltrans Traffic</td>
<td>One time</td>
<td>Design &amp; Construction</td>
<td>EIR, App H (Environmental Commitment Letter)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Traffic Management Plan (TMP) will identify any signal improvements and ramp upgrades needed as a result of the proposed project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-8</td>
<td>Traffic Management</td>
<td>Caltrans Traffic</td>
<td>One time</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.2.5; MMRP (2003)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prior to the initiation of site preparation, grading or construction activities, Caltrans will require construction contractors to provide travel plans to the local jurisdictions along the project study area. The travel plans will indicate the expected travel routes of construction trucks carrying construction materials and construction debris.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-9</td>
<td>Traffic Management</td>
<td>Caltrans Traffic and Construction Manager</td>
<td>Design &amp; Construction</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.2.5; MMRP (2003)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>During final design, a Traffic Management Plan (TMP) will be prepared in consultation with emergency service providers, area transit operators, local agencies, and major traffic generators (such as large shopping centers and businesses including Forest Lawn Cemetery) which may include the following elements:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-10</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Caltrans Traffic and Construction Manager</td>
<td>During all site preparation, grading, and construction</td>
<td>Pre-construction and Construction</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.2.5; MMRP (2003)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prior to the initiation of any site preparation, grading or construction activities, Caltrans will require construction contractors to provide construction and traffic management plans (TMPs) to the affected police, fire and emergency medical services in the project area indicating possible detours, lane and ramp closures, and areas which may experience overall traffic delays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log No.</td>
<td>Commitment Type</td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
<td>Monitoring Frequency</td>
<td>Implementation/ Monitoring Phase</td>
<td>SSP# / NSSP#</td>
<td>Env Doc/ Permits/ Specs/ Plans/ Estimates</td>
<td>Commitment Measure</td>
<td>Completed Signature Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-1</td>
<td>Pollution Control</td>
<td>Caltrans Construction Manager</td>
<td>Periodically during construction</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.3.4, MM AQ-1</td>
<td>The construction contractor shall comply with Caltrans' Standard Specifications in Section 14 (2010). Section 14-9.01 specifically requires compliance by the contractor with all applicable laws and regulations related to air quality, including air pollution control district and air quality management district regulations and local ordinances. Section 14-9.02 is directed at controlling dust. If dust palliative materials other than water are to be used, material specifications are contained in Section 18. Apply water or dust palliative to the site and equipment as frequently as necessary to control fugitive dust emissions. Fugitive emissions generally must meet a “no visible dust” criterion either at the point of emission or at the right of way line, depending on local regulations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-2</td>
<td>Pollution Control</td>
<td>Caltrans Construction Manager</td>
<td>Periodically during construction</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.3.4, MM AQ-2</td>
<td>Spread soil binder on any unpaved roads used for construction purposes, and all project construction parking areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>Pollution Control</td>
<td>Caltrans Construction Manager</td>
<td>Periodically during construction</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.3.4, MM AQ-3</td>
<td>Disperse a dust control plan documenting sprinkling, temporary paving, speed limits, and expedited revegetation of disturbed slopes as needed to minimize construction impacts to existing communities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>Pollution Control</td>
<td>Caltrans Construction Manager</td>
<td>Periodically during construction</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.3.4, MM AQ-4</td>
<td>Properly tune and maintain construction equipment and vehicles. Use low-sulfur fuel in all construction equipment as provided in California Code of Regulations Title 17, Section 9311A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>Pollution Control</td>
<td>Caltrans Construction Manager</td>
<td>Periodically during construction</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.3.4, MM AQ-5</td>
<td>Use track-out reduction measures such as gravel pads at project access points to minimize dust and mud deposits on roads affected by construction traffic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-6</td>
<td>Pollution Control</td>
<td>Caltrans Construction Manager</td>
<td>Periodically during construction</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.3.4, MM AQ-6</td>
<td>Establish Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESAs) or their equivalent near sensitive air receptors within which construction activities involving extended idling of diesel equipment would be prohibited, to the extent feasible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-7</td>
<td>Pollution Control</td>
<td>Caltrans Construction Manager</td>
<td>Periodically during construction</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.3.4, MM AQ-7</td>
<td>Use track-out reduction measures such as gravel pads at project access points to minimize dust and mud deposits on roads affected by construction traffic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-8</td>
<td>Pollution Control</td>
<td>Caltrans Construction Manager</td>
<td>Periodically during construction</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.3.4, MM AQ-8</td>
<td>Use track-out reduction measures such as gravel pads at project access points to minimize dust and mud deposits on roads affected by construction traffic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-9</td>
<td>Pollution Control</td>
<td>Caltrans Construction Manager</td>
<td>Periodically during construction</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.3.4, MM AQ-9</td>
<td>Use track-out reduction measures such as gravel pads at project access points to minimize dust and mud deposits on roads affected by construction traffic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-10</td>
<td>Pollution Control</td>
<td>Caltrans Construction Manager</td>
<td>Periodically during construction</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.3.4, MM AQ-10</td>
<td>Use track-out reduction measures such as gravel pads at project access points to minimize dust and mud deposits on roads affected by construction traffic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-11</td>
<td>Pollution Control</td>
<td>Caltrans Construction Manager</td>
<td>Periodically during construction</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.3.4, MM AQ-11</td>
<td>Properly and regularly remove dust and mud that are deposited on paved, public roads due to construction activity and traffic to decrease particulate matter.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-12</td>
<td>Pollution Control</td>
<td>Caltrans Construction Manager</td>
<td>Periodically during construction</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.3.4, MM AQ-12</td>
<td>Route and schedule construction traffic to avoid peak travel times as much as possible, to reduce congestion and related air quality impacts caused by idling vehicles along local roads.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Log No.</th>
<th>Commitment Type</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Monitored Frequency</th>
<th>Implementation/ Monitoring Phase</th>
<th>Env Doc/ Permits/ Specs/ Plans/ Estimates REFERENCE</th>
<th>Commitment Measure</th>
<th>Completed Signature Page</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-13</td>
<td>Pollution Control</td>
<td>Caltrans Construction Manager</td>
<td>Periodically during construction</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.3.4, MM AQ-13</td>
<td>Install mulch or plant vegetation as soon as practical after grading to reduce windblown particulate in the area. Be aware that certain methods of mulch placement, such as straw blowing, may themselves cause dust and visible emission issues, and may need to use controls such as dampened straw.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-14</td>
<td>Pollution Control</td>
<td>Caltrans Construction Manager</td>
<td>During all site preparation, grading, and construction</td>
<td>Before construction and during Construction</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.3.4, MM AQ-14, MMRP (2003)</td>
<td>Caltrans will require the construction contractors to prepare a dust control plan and to submit the plan to the South Coast Air Quality Management District (AQMD) prior to construction. The plan is expected to include, but not be limited to: stabilization of construction roads to 24 kilometers per hour (15 miles per hour), daily removal of dirt spilled onto paved roads; ceasing grading and excavation activities when wind speeds exceed 40.2 kilometers per hour (25 miles per hour) and during extreme air pollution episodes; phasing and scheduling of construction activities to avoid days with high ozone (O3) levels; possibly interrupting construction activities on days with elevated smog levels (such as Stage 2 smog alerts); use of alternative fuel/clean fuel equipment when available; covering haul trucks; phasing of grading to minimize daily emissions; property maintenance of construction vehicles to maximize efficiency and minimize emissions; and prompt revegetation of exposed cut slopes, road medians and shoulders.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-15</td>
<td>Pollution Control</td>
<td>Caltrans Construction Manager</td>
<td>During all site preparation, grading, and construction</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.3.4, MM AQ-15, MMRP (2003)</td>
<td>Caltrans will require construction contractors to maintain and tune equipment engines consistent with the manufacturers' requirements to maximize the efficiency of the equipment and to minimize air and noise emissions, including the use of noise mufflers and/or other noise abatement features.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-16</td>
<td>Pollution Control</td>
<td>Caltrans Construction Manager</td>
<td>During all site preparation, grading, and construction</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>ECR only</td>
<td>Caltrans Standard Specifications pertaining to dust control and dust palliative applications are required for all construction contracts and will effectively reduce and control emission impacts during construction. The provisions of Caltrans Standard Specifications, Section 14-9.0.2 &quot;Air Pollution Control&quot;, and Section 14-9.03 &quot;Dust Control&quot; require the construction contractor to comply with local dust control rules such as SCAQMD Rule 403 &quot;Fugitive Dust Control&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NOISE AND VIBRATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Log No.</th>
<th>Commitment Type</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Monitored Frequency</th>
<th>Implementation/ Monitoring Phase</th>
<th>Env Doc/ Permits/ Specs/ Plans/ Estimates REFERENCE</th>
<th>Commitment Measure</th>
<th>Completed Signature Page</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-1</td>
<td>Noise control</td>
<td>Caltrans Design</td>
<td>One time</td>
<td>Design and Construction</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.4.5, MMRP (2003)</td>
<td>Soundwalls will be implemented as a part of this project to reduce existing traffic noise levels in excess of the Noise Abatement Criteria. Final locations, heights and lengths of these soundwalls would be determined in final design.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-2</td>
<td>Noise control</td>
<td>Caltrans Construction Manager</td>
<td>Periodically during site preparation, grading, and construction</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.4.5, MMRP (2003)</td>
<td>Caltrans will require construction contractors to maintain and tune equipment engines consistent with the manufacturers' requirements to maximize the efficiency of the equipment and to minimize air and noise emissions, including the use of noise mufflers and/or other noise abatement features.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-3</td>
<td>Noise control</td>
<td>Caltrans Design and Construction Manager</td>
<td>One time</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.4.5, MMRP (2003)</td>
<td>Construction of soundwalls will be incorporated as early as possible in the phasing of the project, consistent with Caltrans' construction procedures and as reasonable and feasible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Log No.</th>
<th>Commitment Type</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Monitoring Frequency</th>
<th>Implementation Monitoring Phase</th>
<th>SSP# / NSSP#</th>
<th>Env Doc/ Permits/ Specs/ Plans/ Estimates</th>
<th>Committee Measure</th>
<th>Completed Signature Page</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-4</td>
<td>Noise control</td>
<td>Caltrans Design and Construction Manager</td>
<td>Periodically during site preparation, grading, and construction</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.4.5; MMRP (2003)</td>
<td>Caltrans will require construction contractors to comply with applicable Los Angeles County and local jurisdiction noise control regulations and ordinances.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>Noise control</td>
<td>Caltrans Construction Manager</td>
<td>Periodically during site preparation, grading, and construction</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.4.5; MMRP (2003)</td>
<td>Caltrans will require construction contractors to use construction techniques that reduce or minimize construction noise including, but not limited to: • Grouping construction activities that will occur outside normal construction hours to avoid continuing periods of noise disturbances during the evening and night hours. • Scheduling work, as feasible, at times that would cause the least amount of impact to the surrounding land uses. • Scheduling, as feasible, the noisiest activities as close together as possible. • Use of the quietest type of equipment available, which will perform identically to equipment types which generate more noise. • Use of haul trucks that do not rely on air or jake brakes. • Locating stockpiles and vehicle staging areas away from occupied residences and other sensitive receptors whenever possible. • Use of approved haul routes, which minimize the exposure of sensitive receptors to potential noise impacts associated with hauling operations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Log No.</th>
<th>Commitment Type</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Monitoring Frequency</th>
<th>Implementation Monitoring Phase</th>
<th>SSP# / NSSP#</th>
<th>Env Doc/ Permits/ Specs/ Plans/ Estimates</th>
<th>Committee Measure</th>
<th>Completed Signature Page</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5-1</td>
<td>Nesting Bird Protection</td>
<td>Caltrans Biologist</td>
<td>Periodically</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.5.5</td>
<td>Removal of all trees should occur between September 15 and January 15 to avoid the breeding season. If tree removal must occur during the breeding season, then a qualified biologist shall be required to survey all trees for presence of active nests scheduled for removal. Discovery of nests with eggs or unhatched young birds will necessitate establishing an off-limits buffer around particular trees. The size of that buffer shall be determined in consultation with CDFG biologists. Disturbance potentially caused by various tools and equipment shall be considered in light of the nesting requirements of birds found in the zone of construction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-2</td>
<td>Tree Replacement</td>
<td>Caltrans Biologist</td>
<td>Periodically</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.5.5</td>
<td>Trees of both toyon and black walnut species will be planted from suitable nursery stock, three replacements for each natural tree removed. The stream course itself does not afford enough ground inside the ROW fence to accommodate more than two or three trees, thus the remainder would need to go into locations on Kellogg Hill where wider ROW exists.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Log No.</th>
<th>Commitment Type</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Monitoring Frequency</th>
<th>Implementation/ Monitoring Phase</th>
<th>Env Doc/ Permits/ Specs/ Plans/ Estimates</th>
<th>Commitment Measure</th>
<th>Completed Signature Page</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5-3</td>
<td>Tree Replacement</td>
<td>Caltrans Biologist</td>
<td>Periodically</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.5.5; MMRP (2003)</td>
<td>Walnut and oak trees native to southern California that are removed or damaged during project construction will be replaced at a minimum ratio of 5:1. The actual planting ratios will depend on the tree species and their connectivity to native habitats, in compliance with regional and local walnut and oak tree regulations. Planting sites for walnut and oak trees will be within Caltrans’ right-of-way to the maximum extent feasible and in adjacent open space areas if sites within Caltrans’ right-of-way are not sufficient.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-4</td>
<td>Gnatcatcher Habitat Protection</td>
<td>Caltrans Biologist</td>
<td>Periodically</td>
<td>Pre-construction</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.5.5; MMRP (2003)</td>
<td>Prior to the start of construction, the gnatcatcher habitat shall be delineated by the Caltrans Biologist. The delineated area shall be designated as an Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA). Temporary fencing shall be placed by the contractor at the direction of the Caltrans Biologist to surround the ESA during construction to prevent any debris, equipment or people from entering the ESA. Construction crews shall be educated and instructed to avoid entering into, or in any way disturbing, the ESA. Intrusion into the ESA shall not be allowed for any purposes (except for those identified by emergency service personnel). The ESA fencing will be maintained during construction by the contractor, from outside the ESA. The ESA will be designated as a sensitive noise receptor, and as such, all measures outlined in the Noise Section of this Final Environmental Document will apply to the ESA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-5</td>
<td>Gnatcatcher Habitat Protection</td>
<td>Caltrans Biologist</td>
<td>One time</td>
<td>Post-construction</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.5.5; MMRP (2003)</td>
<td>Future maintenance activities, such as mowing and chemical weed control, have the potential to impact the already degraded RSS habitat. After project construction is complete, efforts will be instituted to study (in conjunction with appropriate parties) the establishment of another, permanent ESA. This post-construction ESA will serve to establish any areas of degraded habitat in the project area for further disruption, as allowed by law and Caltrans policy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>Vector Control</td>
<td>Construction Contractor</td>
<td>One time</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.5.5; MMRP (2003)</td>
<td>Just prior to the start of construction in a particular area, including any clearing of vegetation, vector control shall be performed to prevent the invasion of homes and businesses by displaced pests.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-7</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Caltrans Design and Construction Manager</td>
<td>Periodically during site preparation, grading, and construction</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.5.5; MMRP (2003)</td>
<td>Phase site preparation, grading and construction so that these activities adjacent to the degraded California walnut woodland area are conducted outside the March 1 to September 1 bird nesting season.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-8</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Caltrans Construction Manager</td>
<td>Periodically during site preparation, grading, and construction</td>
<td>Pre-construction and Construction</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.5.5; MMRP (2003)</td>
<td>Conduct a survey prior to any site disturbance in the degraded California walnut woodland area if site preparation, grading and/or construction activities must occur in the bird nesting season adjacent to this area. If any nests are within 305 meters (1,000 feet) of the construction limits, temporary measures, such as the use of specialized mufflers on construction equipment, will be used to reduce noise. A biological monitor will be employed to provide suggestions in the field to reduce intrusions into sensitive areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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#### Log No. | Commitment Type | Responsible Party | Monitoring Frequency | Implementation/ Monitoring Phase | SSP# / NSSP# | Env Doc/ Permits/ Specs/ Plans/ Estimates | Reference | Commitment Measure | Completed | Signature | Page |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CULTURAL RESOURCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>Archaeological Resources</td>
<td>Caltrans Archaeologist</td>
<td>Periodically</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.6.5, MM CUL-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In the unlikely event cultural materials are discovered during construction, all earth-moving activity within and around the immediate discovery area will be diverted until a qualified archaeologist can assess the nature and significance of the find.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-2</td>
<td>Paleontological Resources</td>
<td>Caltrans Paleontologist</td>
<td>Periodically</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.6.5, MM CUL-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A qualified principal paleontologist (MS or Ph.D. in paleontology or geology familiar with paleontological procedures and techniques) will be retained to be present to consult with grading and excavation contractors at pregrading meetings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-3</td>
<td>Paleontological Resources</td>
<td>Caltrans Paleontologist</td>
<td>During all site preparation, grading, and construction.</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.6.5, MM CUL-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paleontological monitor, under the direction of the qualified principal paleontologist, will be onsite to inspect cuts for fossils during original grading involving sensitive geologic formations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-4</td>
<td>Paleontological Resources</td>
<td>Caltrans Paleontologist</td>
<td>During all site preparation, grading, and construction.</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.6.5, MM CUL-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>When fossils are discovered, the paleontologist, or paleontological monitor, will recover them. Construction work in these areas will be halted or redirected to allow recovery of fossil remains in a timely manner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-5</td>
<td>Archaeological Resources</td>
<td>Caltrans Paleontologist</td>
<td>One time</td>
<td>Post-construction</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.6.5, MM CUL-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fossil remains collected during the monitoring and salvage portion of the mitigation program will be cleaned, repaired, sorted, and catalogued.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-6</td>
<td>Paleontological Resources</td>
<td>Caltrans Paleontologist</td>
<td>One time</td>
<td>Post-Construction</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.6.5, MM CUL-6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prepared fossils, along with copies of all pertinent field notes, photos, and maps, will then be deposited in a scientific institution with paleontological collections.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-7</td>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>Caltrans Paleontologist</td>
<td>One time</td>
<td>Post-Construction</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.6.5, MM CUL-7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A final report will be compiled that outlines the results of the mitigation program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>Human Remains</td>
<td>Caltrans Archaeologist</td>
<td>When necessary</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.6.5, MM CUL-8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In the unlikely event human remains are discovered, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that further disturbances and activities shall cease in any area or nearby area suspected to overlie remains, and the County Coroner contacted. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, if the remains are thought to be Native American, the coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) who will then notify the Most Likely Descendent (MLD). At this time, the person who discovered the remains will contact Gary Iverson, Environmental Chief, so that they may work with the MLD on the respectful treatment and disposition of the remains. Further provisions of PRC 5097.98 are to be followed as applicable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Log No.</th>
<th>Commitment Type</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Monitoring Frequency</th>
<th>Implementation/ Monitoring Phase</th>
<th>Env Doc/ Permits/ Specs/ Plans/ Estimates REFERENCE</th>
<th>Commitment Measure</th>
<th>Completed Signature Page</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7-1</td>
<td>Retaining Walls</td>
<td>Caltrans Design</td>
<td>One time</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.7.5</td>
<td>Retaining walls will be included in the project design for the Kellogg Hill area where ROW constraints do not allow slopes to be cut parallel to the existing slope ratios. The proposed project may include other design features where determined necessary to minimize the potential for losses due to possible future slope failure activity. Retaining walls will be designed and constructed in a manner that satisfies both State and Federal standards and requirements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-2</td>
<td>Retaining Walls</td>
<td>Caltrans Design</td>
<td>One time</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>EIR, App H (Environmental Commitment Letter)</td>
<td>Caltrans will make sure that all retaining wall footings between 289+00 and 362+00 be Cast in Drilled Hole (CIDH).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-3</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Caltrans Design</td>
<td>One time</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>EIR, App H (Environmental Commitment Letter)</td>
<td>Caltrans will notify Forest Lawn prior to final plans and provide an opportunity for a meeting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-4</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Caltrans Design</td>
<td>One time</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.7.5; MMRP (2003)</td>
<td>The grading plans for Segment 3 will include provisions to ensure that graded areas will be compatible with, and reflect, the landform character of the existing surroundings, consistent with the need for retaining walls along parts of Segment 3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-5</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Caltrans Design</td>
<td>During all site preparation, grading, and construction.</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.7.5; MMRP (2003)</td>
<td>Slopes along Segment 3 affected by construction of the proposed I-10 HOV Lane project will be recontoured to a 1:2 slope, or as determined appropriate through geotechnical investigation, to provide a smooth and gradual transition between the modified topography and existing grade, and to minimize the appearance of manufactured grading. Use of crib-type retaining walls in place of slopes will be minimized, except where necessary to provide greater slope stability. The top and toe of slope edges will be rounded to reduce the angular effects of manufactured grading. These design features will be incorporated in Segment 3, as feasible, to stay within the I-10 right-of-way limits.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-6</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Caltrans Design</td>
<td>During all site preparation, grading, and construction.</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.7.5; MMRP (2003)</td>
<td>The proposed project would be designed and constructed consistent with Caltrans’ guidelines, specifications, applicable building codes and design criteria, which provide state of the art seismic construction for Seismic Zone A structures. These measures may include the use of hinge retainers to hold superstructure elements together during extreme motion, the use of heavy keys to limit movement between the superstructure and abutment; and/or the use of increased reinforcement in column sections to assure effective confinement of concrete allowing large movements without collapse.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log No.</td>
<td>Commitment Type</td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
<td>Monitoring Frequency</td>
<td>Implementation/ Monitoring Phase</td>
<td>Env Doc/ Permits/ Specs/ Plans/ Estimates</td>
<td>SSP# / NSSP#</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Commitment Measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HAZARDOUS WASTE/MATERIALS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-1</td>
<td>Groundwater</td>
<td>Caltrans Construction Manager</td>
<td>When necessary</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.8.5, MMM HAZ-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Groundwater is not expected to be disturbed and/or disposed during construction activities. If groundwater needs to be disturbed and/or extracted during construction, then appropriate disposal and treatment (if required) options will be determined through coordination with the regulatory agencies in order to prevent possible cross contamination. If contamination is found, then a work plan shall be prepared by a registered geotechnical engineer to protect the health of construction workers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-2</td>
<td>Aerially Deposited Lead (ADL)</td>
<td>Caltrans Construction Manager</td>
<td>When necessary</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.8.5, MMM HAZ-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ADL soil management will be evaluated for the applicability of the lead variance issued to Caltrans by DTSC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-3</td>
<td>Asbestos Containing Materials (ACM) &amp; Lead-Based Paint (LBP)</td>
<td>Caltrans Construction Manager</td>
<td>When necessary</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.8.5, MMM HAZ-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bridges and structures shall be surveyed to screen for ACMs and LBP prior to construction activities. If ACMs are found, then the contractor will comply with the SCAQMD Rule 1403 notification and removal processes. In addition, disposal of ACMs will be handled in compliance with local, state, and federal requirements. If LBP and/or heavy metals are found, then the contractor shall comply with local, state, and federal rules and regulations for notification, removal process, and disposal activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-4</td>
<td>Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>Caltrans Construction Manager</td>
<td>One time</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.8.5, MMM HAZ-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Any hazardous materials or wastes encountered before or during the demolition stage of the proposed project shall be disposed according to current regulatory guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-5</td>
<td>Health and Safety Plan (HSP)</td>
<td>Caltrans Construction Manager</td>
<td>One time</td>
<td>Pre-Construction</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.8.5, MMM HAZ-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A worker Health and Safety Plan (HSP) that meets the provisions of California Code of Regulations (Title 22, Section 5192) shall be developed by the proposed project contractor. HSP procedures will address the identification, evacuation, handling, and disposal of hazardous wastes and materials that may be found in construction areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-6</td>
<td>Thermoplastic &amp; Yellow Paint</td>
<td>Caltrans Construction Manager</td>
<td>When necessary</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.8.5, MMM HAZ-6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Removed thermoplastic and yellow paint will be disposed at an appropriate landfill in accordance with local, state, and federal laws.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-7</td>
<td>Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>Caltrans Construction Manager</td>
<td>When necessary</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.8.5, MMM HAZ-7, MMMR (2003)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If unknown wastes or underground storage tanks are discovered during construction which the construction contractor believes may involve hazardous materials, he/she will (1) immediately stop work in the vicinity of the suspected contamination, remove workers, and the public from the area; (2) notify Caltrans Resident Engineer; and (3) secure the area as directed by Caltrans' Resident Engineer. Caltrans' Plans and Procedures for Hazardous Wastes and Materials, the Construction Hazardous Materials Response Plan and the Construction Underground Tank Contingency Plan, as appropriate, will be implemented by Caltrans and the construction contractors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Log No.</th>
<th>Commitment Type</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Monitoring Frequency</th>
<th>Implementation/ Monitoring Phase</th>
<th>Env Doc/ Permits/ Specs/ Plans/ Estimates REFERENCE</th>
<th>Commitment Measure</th>
<th>Completed Signature Page</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8-8</td>
<td>Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>Caltrans Design</td>
<td>One time</td>
<td>Pre-construction</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.8.5, MMRP (2003)</td>
<td>Prior to the start of construction, Caltrans will conduct a Site Investigation (SI) for all sites in the proposed right-of-way identified as having the potential for hazardous waste. The SI will consist of drilling and testing. Based on the findings of the drilling and testing, specific remediation measures will be identified in the SI to address documented hazardous wastes contamination at the affected sites in accordance with applicable federal and state laws. For sites documented through the SI process to contain hazardous waste, Caltrans will include the mitigation defined in the SI in the construction contract and specifications.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-9</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Caltrans Environmental and Construction Manager</td>
<td>During all site preparation, grading, and construction.</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.8.5, MMRP (2003)</td>
<td>Hazardous substances are strictly regulated by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the California and Federal Occupational Health and Safety Administration (OSHA), the United States Department of Transportation (DOT) and a number of other federal, state and local agencies. DOT specifies procedures for safely transporting hazardous material and procedures to follow in case of accidental spills during transport. EPA specifies the requirements for proper labeling and placarding of hazardous substances. The American National Standards Institute (ANSI) recommends safety procedures for handling and storing hazardous materials. OSHA specifies the procedures required for using and storing hazardous materials. Other local, state and federal regulations address the identification, removal, handling and disposal of hazardous wastes. Project contractors will be required to follow these procedures and to maintain the required documentation during all site preparation, grading and construction of the proposed project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Log No.</th>
<th>Commitment Type</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Monitoring Frequency</th>
<th>Implementation/ Monitoring Phase</th>
<th>Env Doc/ Permits/ Specs/ Plans/ Estimates REFERENCE</th>
<th>Commitment Measure</th>
<th>Completed Signature Page</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9-1</td>
<td>Flood Control</td>
<td>Caltrans Design</td>
<td>One time</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.9.5</td>
<td>As part of the I-10 HOV Lane Project final design, Caltrans will conduct a detailed hydrologic analysis to determine if any flood control devices will require modification to protect the project site and facility from design flood levels. The final design of these flood control devices will be coordinated with all affected cities and the LACDPW.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-2</td>
<td>FEMA Coordination</td>
<td>Caltrans Design</td>
<td>One time</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.9.5</td>
<td>Caltrans will coordinate with FEMA prior to completion of the final project design to confirm any necessary revisions to the FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Maps or FEMA Special Flood Hazard Areas maps.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log No.</td>
<td>Commitment Type</td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
<td>Monitoring Frequency</td>
<td>Implementation/ Monitoring Phase</td>
<td>SSPs / NSSPs / Env Doc/ Permits/ Specs/ Plans/ Estimates</td>
<td>Commitment Measure</td>
<td>Completed Signature Page</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-3</td>
<td>Stormwater Management Plan</td>
<td>Caltrans Design</td>
<td>One time</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.9.5</td>
<td>The Caltrans SWMP describes BMPs and practices to reduce the discharge of pollutants associated with the stormwater drainage systems of state highways, facilities, and activities. The completed project plans would incorporate all necessary Maintenance BMP’s (Category IIA), Design Pollution BMP’s (Category IIB), and Treatment BMP’s (Category III) to meet the maximum extent practicable requirements. As part of the project design development, a Storm Water Data Report (SWDR) will be prepared to document the decision-making process relating to the selection and implementation of BMPs. The SWDR will be updated as the project progresses towards final design.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-4</td>
<td>BMPs</td>
<td>Caltrans Construction Manager</td>
<td>As needed</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.9.5</td>
<td>BMPs to be incorporated into the project during construction will be required for soil stabilization (erosion control), sediment control, temporary tracking control, wind erosion control, and non-stormwater runoff management. See Table 3.9-1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-5</td>
<td>Construction Site Monitoring Plan (CSMP)</td>
<td>Caltrans Construction Manager</td>
<td>One time</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.9.5</td>
<td>A written site-specific Construction Site Monitoring Plan (CSMP) will be developed prior to commencement of construction activities, and it shall be revised as necessary to reflect project revisions. The CSMP will be developed to meet the specific requirements and objectives identified in the General Permit for the proposed project’s risk level to be identified in the SWPPP. The CSMP shall include monitoring procedures and instructions, location maps, forms, and checklists, and a description of the project site’s watershed, including drainage patterns and all site discharge locations. The CSMP will include specific details about sample collection frequency, sample constituents; sample collection methodologies, including clean sample collection techniques, and use of pH and turbidity field meters and field quality assurance/quality control.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-6</td>
<td>River or Stream Channel</td>
<td>Caltrans Design and Environmental</td>
<td>As needed, during final design and construction</td>
<td>Design and Construction</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.9.5; MMRP (2003)</td>
<td>A small concrete lined drainage parallel to eastbound I-10 west of Kellogg Drive will be realigned. Permits will be required from the Army Corps of Engineers (Clean Water Act Section 404 permit), Regional Water Quality Control Board, (Clean Water Act Section 401 permit) and California Department of Fish and Game (Section 1601 Streambed Alteration Agreement). This drainage will be replaced in kind using Best Management Practices for water quality and in conjunction with the desires of the applicable permitting agencies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-7</td>
<td>Floodplains and Flooding</td>
<td>Caltrans Design</td>
<td>During final design</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.9.5; MMRP (2003)</td>
<td>During final design, detailed hydrologic analysis will be conducted to determine if any flood control devices would require modification to protect the site and facility from design flood levels. The final design of the flood control devices will be coordinated with the Cities of Baldwin Park, West Covina, Covina, San Dimas and Pomona and the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (LACDPW).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-8</td>
<td>Floodplains and Flooding</td>
<td>Caltrans Design</td>
<td>Coordinate with FEMA during Final Design and incorporate any revisions</td>
<td>Design and Construction</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.9.5; MMRP (2003)</td>
<td>The final design of the proposed project will be coordinated with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) to confirm any needed revisions to the FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Maps or FEMA Special Flood Hazard Areas Maps.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**District 7 ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITMENTS RECORD**
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### Log No. | Commitment Type | Responsible Party | Monitoring Frequency | Implementation/ Monitoring Phase | Env Doc/ Permits/ Specs/ Plans/ Estimates | Commitment Measure | Completed Signature Page | Remarks
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---
9-9 | Water Quality | Caltrans Environmental | One time | Design | EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.9.5; MMRP (2003) | The proposed project would be subject to the requirements of Caltrans' existing National Pollutant Discharge Elimination Systems (NPDES) permit regarding water pollution control. Caltrans would coordinate construction and operation of the proposed project under the existing NPDES permit with the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), consistent with the requirements of the existing permit, for any discharges of wastes to surface waters. Issues related to water quality would be mitigated to a level less than significant based on implementation of existing Caltrans plans and programs which address water pollution control and stormwater management. These are the Department Storm Water Management Plan (SWMP) and the Storm Water Quality Handbooks (three manuals: Project Planning Design Guidelines, Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and Water Pollution Control Program (WPCP) Preparation Manual). In addition, District Directive DD20 also applies to storm water management. These plans and programs would apply to the proposed project. |...
9-10 | Erosion Control and Water Quality | Caltrans Environmental | One time | Design | EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.9.5; MMRP (2003) | Appropriate erosion control measures will be incorporated in a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) approved by Caltrans Resident Engineer. The SWPPP will be implemented during site preparation, grading and construction. The SWPPP will include, but not be limited to, measures to protect exposed slope areas, control of surface flows over exposed soils, use of wetting or sealing agents and/or sedimentation ponds. |...

### LAND USE

1-1 | Real Estate Acquisition Management Plan (RAMP) | Caltrans Right of Way | One time | Property Acquisition | EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.10.5 | A Real Estate Acquisition Management Plan (RAMP) shall be developed adhering to the requirements pertaining to land acquisition for projects funded by FTA as prescribed in Volume 49 CFR Part 24, Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act for Federal and Federally Assisted Programs, and the California Relocation Assistance Act, 1970. All acquisitions shall follow state and local guidelines for compliance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act. |...
1-2 | CHP Enforcement Area | Caltrans Design | One time | Design | EIR, App H (Environmental Commitment Letter) | Maximize California Highway Patrol (CHP) enforcement area while creating the least impact to the surrounding resources in the City of West Covina. |...
1-3 | Acquisitions | Caltrans Right of Way | During property acquisitions | Property Acquisition | EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.10.5; MMRP (2003) | As required by existing federal and state laws, Caltrans will comply with the provisions of the Uniform Relocation and Assistance Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended (California Government Code, Chapter 16, Section 7280, et. seq.). |...
1-4 | Parking | Caltrans Design | One time | Property Acquisition | EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.10.5; MMRP (2003) | More efficient redesign and rearrangement of existing parking. |...
1-5 | Parking | Caltrans Right of Way | One time | Property Acquisition | EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.10.5; MMRP (2003) | Fair market value compensation for the loss of parking spaces to the space owners including development and coordination of parking mitigation options. |...
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Log No.</th>
<th>Commitment Type</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Monitoring Frequency</th>
<th>Implementation/ Monitoring Phase</th>
<th>Env Doc/ Permits/ Specs/ Plans/ Estimates</th>
<th>Commitment Measure</th>
<th>Completed Signature Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11-1</td>
<td>Emergency Service Providers</td>
<td>Caltrans Construction Manager</td>
<td>As needed</td>
<td>Design and Construction</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.12.5</td>
<td>Emergency service providers will be alerted in advance of any temporary road closures and delays so they have adequate time to make appropriate accommodations to ensure prompt emergency response times that fulfill their responsibilities and defined service objectives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-2</td>
<td>Utility Providers</td>
<td>Caltrans Construction Manager</td>
<td>As needed</td>
<td>Design and Construction</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.12.5</td>
<td>Utility providers will be made aware of project developments and be involved in planning of utility rerouting, identification of potential conflicts, and formulation of strategies to deal with unanticipated problems that may arise once construction has begun.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-3</td>
<td>Construction Management</td>
<td>Caltrans Design</td>
<td>During Design and Construction</td>
<td>Design and Construction</td>
<td>EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.12.5; MMRP (2003)</td>
<td>Final design will include coordination with all the affected public services and utilities providers to ensure that existing facilities are protected in place, removed and/or relocated to the satisfaction of the provider to minimize the potential disruption of existing utilities in the I-10 right-of-way.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 11-4    | Construction Management   | Caltrans Construction Manager                    | As needed            | Construction                      | EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.12.5; MMRP (2003)     | Caltrans will require construction contractors to:  
  - Reuse excess soil materials for fill to the maximum extent feasible.  
  - Reuse or recycle material taking into consideration the feasibility, safety and reasonableness of such actions.  
  - Dispose of waste material removed as part of project construction in accordance with the Standard Specification for solid waste removal, listed in the California Administration Code. |                         |
| 11-5    | Construction Management   | Caltrans Design and Construction Manager         | During all site preparation, grading, and construction. | Construction                      | EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.12.5; MMRP (2003)     | Caltrans will require construction contractors to conduct all utility protection, removal and replacement consistent with Caltrans' construction procedures and the procedures of the affected utilities. |                         |
| 11-6    | Construction Management   | Caltrans Design and Construction Manager         | During all site preparation, grading, and construction. | Construction                      | EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.12.5; MMRP (2003)     | Caltrans will require construction contractors to ensure that proposed haul routes, detours and temporary lane closures will not adversely impact utility and service providers; and that necessary public services and utilities can be provided adequately in the project study area during construction. |                         |
| 11-7    | Construction Management   | Caltrans Design and Construction Manager         | As needed            | Construction                      | EIR, Ch 3, Sec. 3.12.5; MMRP (2003)     | Final design will include coordination with the area school districts regarding the construction schedule, phasing and any proposed detours and/or other traffic delays, so the school districts can prepare and plan for any possible disruptions in student transportation services. |                         |
Appendix E    Recommended Noise Barrier Locations
## Appendix F

### List of Acronyms and Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>µg/m³</td>
<td>micrograms per cubic meter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAM</td>
<td>Annual Arithmetic Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AASHTO</td>
<td>American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACHP</td>
<td>Advisory Council on Historic Preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACMs</td>
<td>asbestos-containing materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA</td>
<td>Americans with Disabilities Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADL</td>
<td>aerially deposited lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADT</td>
<td>average daily traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEP</td>
<td>Association of Environmental Professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APE</td>
<td>Area of Potential Effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQMP</td>
<td>Air Quality Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASR</td>
<td>Archaeological Survey Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASTM</td>
<td>American Society for Testing and Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAT/BCT</td>
<td>Best Available Technology economically available/Best Conventional Pollutant Control Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bgs</td>
<td>below ground surface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMPs</td>
<td>Best Management Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPUSD</td>
<td>Baldwin Park Unified School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSA</td>
<td>Biological Study Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAA</td>
<td>Clean Air Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAAAs</td>
<td>California Air Act Amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAAQS</td>
<td>California Ambient Air Quality Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>California Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARB</td>
<td>California Air Resources Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBC</td>
<td>California Building Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD</td>
<td>Central Business District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCAA</td>
<td>California Clean Air Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCR</td>
<td>California Code of Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDFG</td>
<td>California Department of Fish and Game</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDMG</td>
<td>California Division of Mines and Geology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQA</td>
<td>California Environmental Quality Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERCLA</td>
<td>Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERFA</td>
<td>Community Environmental Response Facilitation Act of 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFR</td>
<td>Code of Federal Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cfs</td>
<td>cubic feet per second</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHP</td>
<td>California Highway Patrol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIWMB</td>
<td>California Integrated Waste Management Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMA</td>
<td>Congestion Management Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMP</td>
<td>Congestion Management Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNDDDB</td>
<td>California Natural Diversity Database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNPS</td>
<td>California Native Plant Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>carbon monoxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO₂</td>
<td>carbon dioxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTC</td>
<td>California Transportation Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVUSD</td>
<td>Covina-Valley Unified School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWA</td>
<td>Clean Water Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cy</td>
<td>cubic yards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dB</td>
<td>decibel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dBA</td>
<td>A-weighted decibels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEIR</td>
<td>Draft Environmental Impact Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>California Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOT</td>
<td>United States Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPM</td>
<td>diesel particulate matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSA</td>
<td>disturbed soil area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTSC</td>
<td>Department of Toxic Substances Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EO</td>
<td>Executive Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>United States Environmental Protection Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESA</td>
<td>Endangered Species Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETA</td>
<td>Ecological Transition Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>°F</td>
<td>degrees Fahrenheit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEIR</td>
<td>Final Environmental Impact Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMA</td>
<td>Federal Emergency Management Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA</td>
<td>Federal Highway Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIFRA</td>
<td>Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FONSI</td>
<td>Finding of No Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHG</td>
<td>greenhouse gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWP</td>
<td>global warming potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAPs</td>
<td>hazardous air pollutants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM</td>
<td>Highway Capacity Manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCP</td>
<td>Habitat Conservation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOV</td>
<td>high-occupancy vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPSR</td>
<td>Historic Property Survey Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSAs</td>
<td>hydrologic subareas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSP</td>
<td>Health and Safety Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-10</td>
<td>Interstate Route 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-210</td>
<td>Interstate Route 210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-605</td>
<td>Interstate Route 605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-710</td>
<td>Interstate Route 710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPCC</td>
<td>Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS/EA</td>
<td>Initial Study/Environmental Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISA</td>
<td>Initial Site Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISTEA</td>
<td>Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPA</td>
<td>Joint Powers Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LACDPW</td>
<td>Los Angeles County Department of Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LACFCD</td>
<td>Los Angeles County Flood Control District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBP</td>
<td>lead-based paint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>level of service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRTP</td>
<td>Long Range Transportation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUE</td>
<td>Land Use Element</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>magnitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATES</td>
<td>Multiple Air Toxics Exposure Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCE</td>
<td>maximum credible earthquake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mg/m³</td>
<td>milligrams per cubic meter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLD</td>
<td>Most Likely Descendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MND</td>
<td>Mitigated Negative Declaration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mph</td>
<td>miles per hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPO</td>
<td>Metropolitan Planning Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS4</td>
<td>Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSAT</td>
<td>mobile source air toxics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>msl</td>
<td>mean sea level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSW</td>
<td>municipal solid waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUTCD</td>
<td>Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVM</td>
<td>million vehicle miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAAQS</td>
<td>National Ambient Air Quality Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAC</td>
<td>Noise Abatement Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAHC</td>
<td>Native American Heritage Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NES</td>
<td>Natural Environment Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHPA</td>
<td>National Historic Preservation Act of 1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO₂</td>
<td>nitrogen dioxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOA</td>
<td>naturally occurring asbestos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOAA</td>
<td>National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOC</td>
<td>Notice of Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOCC</td>
<td>Notice of Completion of Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOI</td>
<td>Notice of Intent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOP</td>
<td>Notice of Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOₓ</td>
<td>nitrogen oxides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPDES</td>
<td>National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPL</td>
<td>National Priorities List</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSR</td>
<td>Noise Study Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O₃</td>
<td>ozone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPR</td>
<td>Governor’s Office of Planning and Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSHA</td>
<td>Occupational Safety and Health Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Programmatic Agreement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pb  lead
PHV  peak-hour volume
PM  particulate matter
PM  post mile
PM$_{10}$  particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter
PM$_{2.5}$  particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in diameter
POAQC  Projects of Air Quality Concern
ppm  parts per million
PRC  Public Resources Code
PS&E  Plans, Specifications, and Estimate
PSR  Project Study Report
RAMP  Real Estate Acquisition Management Plan
RCRA  Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976
RECs  recognized environmental conditions
ROW  right-of-way
RTIP  Regional Transportation Improvement Program
RTP  Regional Transportation Plan
RWQCB  Regional Water Quality Control Board
SAFETEA-LU  Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users
SCAB  South Coast Air Basin
SCAG  Southern California Association of Governments
SCAQMD  South Coast Air Quality Management District
SCE  Southern California Edison
SEA  Significant Ecological Areas
SHPO  State Historic Preservation Officer
SO$_2$  sulfur dioxide
SO$_4^{2-}$  sulfates
SP  State Implementation Plan
SR 57  State Route 57
SR 60  State Route 60
SR 71  State Route 71
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SRA</td>
<td>source receptor area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAA</td>
<td>Surface Transportation Assistance Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP</td>
<td>State Transportation Improvement Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWDR</td>
<td>Storm Water Data Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWMP</td>
<td>Storm Water Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWPPP</td>
<td>Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWRCB</td>
<td>State Water Resources Control Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TACs</td>
<td>toxic air contaminants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASAS</td>
<td>Traffic Accident Surveillance and Analysis System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>temporary construction easement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDCs</td>
<td>targeted design constituents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDM</td>
<td>Transportation Demand Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TeNS</td>
<td>Technical Noise Supplement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMDL</td>
<td>total maximum daily load</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMP</td>
<td>Transportation Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOD</td>
<td>transit-oriented development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tpd</td>
<td>tons per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSCA</td>
<td>Toxic Substances Control Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSM</td>
<td>Traffic System Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBC</td>
<td>Uniform Building Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USACE</td>
<td>United States Army Corps of Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USFWS</td>
<td>United States Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USGS</td>
<td>United States Geological Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USTs</td>
<td>underground storage tanks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V/C</td>
<td>volume to capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMT</td>
<td>vehicle miles traveled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOCs</td>
<td>volatile organic compounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vpd</td>
<td>vehicles per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPCP</td>
<td>Water Pollution Control Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQV</td>
<td>water quality volume</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G  List of Technical Studies

GEOTECHNICAL
Geotechnical Investigation of the LA-10 HOV Project 1, LA-10 PM 28.0 to PM 42.4, Los Angeles County (Prepared by Caltrans, District 7, 1993; Segments 1A, 2 and 3).

WATER RESOURCES


AIR QUALITY
Qualitative PM$_{2.5}$ and PM$_{10}$ Hot-Spot Analysis (Prepared by Caltrans, District 7, August, 2009).


NOISE
Final Traffic Noise Impact Report Route 10 (San Bernardino Freeway) HOV Project Route 605 to Route 10/57/210/71 Freeway Interchange (Prepared by PBQ&D for Caltrans, District 7, October 25, 2001, Segments 1A, 2 and 3).


Traffic Noise Study Report (Environmental Re-Evaluation), Route 10 HOV Project, in Los Angeles County from Puente Avenue in Baldwin Park to State Route 57 in Pomona, 07-LA-10 PM 33.4/42.4, EA117081/119341 (Prepared by Caltrans, District 7, December 12, 2008).

Traffic Noise Analysis, Forest Lawn Memorial Park, I-10 HOV Project, 07-LA-10 PM 37.5/42.4 EA 119341 (Prepared by Caltrans, District 7, June 12, 2012).
RELOCATION
Relocation Impact Statement I-10 HOV Project (EA 1170U0) (Prepared by Caltrans, District 7, March 2010).

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES


NESR Reevaluation (Prepared by Caltrans, District 7, September 8, 2000, Segments 1A, 2 and 3).

Natural Environment Study – Minimal Impacts, Add One High Occupancy Vehicle Lane in Each Direction on the San Bernardino Freeway (Interstate 10) from Puente Avenue to State Routes 57/71 and Interstate 210 in Los Angeles County (Prepared by Parsons for Caltrans, August 2011).

LAND USE, AGRICULTURE, PARKS, UTILITIES AND SERVICES
Interstate 10 High Occupancy Vehicle Lane from Puente Avenue to the State Route 57/State Route 71/Interstate 210 Interchange, Community Impact Assessment (Prepared by Parsons, September 2008).

TRAFFIC
Interstate 10 High Occupancy Vehicle Lane from Puente Avenue to the State Route 57 / State Route 71 / Interstate Route 210 Interchange Non-Highway Transportation Technical Report (Prepared by Parsons, December 2008).

I-10 Proposed HOV Traffic Study from the Puente Ave Interchange (PM 33.4) to the SR-57/SR-71 Interchange (PM 42.4) (Prepared by Parsons, April 2009).

CULTURAL RESOURCES
Negative Archaeological Survey Report 07-LA-10 KP 31.2/42.4 (Prepared by Caltrans, District 7, September 28, 2000, Segments 1A, 2 and 3).

Supplemental Historic Property Survey Report for the I-10 HOV Lane Between I-605 and the SR-57/SR-71/I-210 Interchanged in the Cities of Los Angeles, Baldwin Park, West Covina, Covina, San Dimas and Pomona in Los Angeles County, CA (Prepared by Caltrans, District 7, May 2002, Segments 1, 2 and 3).

Negative Archaeological Survey Report 07-LA-10 KP 31.2/42.4 (Prepared by Caltrans, District 7, September 2, 2002).

**VISUAL RESOURCES**


I-10 High Occupancy Vehicle Lanes Project 07H003 Segment 3 (07-LA-10 37.5 to 42.4) Visual Impact Study (Prepared by P&D Technologies for Caltrans, District 7, January 1995, Segment 3).

**HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

Initial Site Assessment Report, Route 10 HOV Lane Improvement Project, 725 S. Orange Avenue, Doctors Hospital, West Covina, California. Assessor’s Parcel Number: 8474-001-012, Contract No. 07A2212. EA No 07-127221. Task Order No. 11 (Prepared by WorleyParsons, July 20, 2009).

Initial Site Assessment Report, Route 10 HOV Lane Improvement Project, West Covina, California. 100 South California Avenue, Assessor’s Parcel Number: 8474-007-030, Contract 07A2212 EA No. 1170U1. Task Order No. 11 (Prepared by WorleyParsons, September 4, 2009).

Initial Site Assessment Report, Route 10 HOV Lane Improvement Project, West Covina, California. 10 Fashion Plaza, Assessor’s Parcel Number: 8474-003-081, Contract 07A2212 EA No. 1170U1. Task Order No. 11 (Prepared by WorleyParsons, September 2009).


Initial Site Assessment Report, Route 10 HOV Lane Improvement Project, 1900 West Garvey Avenue South, West Covina, California. Assessor’s Parcel Number: 8474-007-037, Contract 07A2212 EA No. 1170U1. Task Order No. 11 (Prepared by WorleyParsons, November 16, 2009).


Initial Site Assessment Report, Route 10 HOV Lane Improvement Project, 110 South California Avenue, West Covina, California. Assessor’s Parcel Number: 8474-007-031,

Initial Site Assessment Summary for Parcel 79812 (APN# 8460-006-043, Wal-Mart) Located at 3250 Big Dalton Avenue, Baldwin Park, California, 91706 (Prepared by Caltrans, District 7, August 10, 2010).

Update on Initial Site Assessment (ISA) Summary for Parcel 79812 (APN# 8460-006-043, Wal-Mart Real Estate Business) Located at 3250 Big Dalton Avenue, Baldwin Park, California, 91706 (Prepared by Caltrans, District 7, April 14, 2011).
Appendix H Environmental Commitment Letters
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February 10, 2004

LETTER OF COMMITMENT

Dear Representatives of Forest Lawn Covina Hills Memorial Park:

This letter clarifies and documents the commitments being made by the Department of Transportation, District 7 (Department) regarding items of concern identified by Forest Lawn Covina Hills Memorial Park (Forest Lawn) and included in the Negative Declaration/Finding of No Significant Impact (ND/FONSI) for the proposed project to add one High Occupancy Vehicle Lane in each direction on Interstate Route 10 between Interstate Route 605 and State Route 57 (hereafter identified as the 10 HOV project).

This letter also addresses comments in a letters dated September 2, 2003 and December 8, 2003 submitted by Latham & Watkins, LLP on behalf of Forest Lawn, as well as issues raised at a meeting held October 21, 2003 with representatives of Forest Lawn.

Geological Issues

Department acknowledges the importance of maintaining slope stability along the Forest Lawn property. The 10 HOV project will be constructed consistent with applicable Department Design Criteria, as stated in the ND/FONSI, page 5-3. As specified in the design criteria, any type of retaining walls will be designed and constructed with a minimum Factor of Safety of 1.5, which will enhance the existing Factor of Safety of the slopes.

Because of the sensitive nature of the use of the Forest Lawn property, any retaining walls constructed by the Department on the south side of Interstate 10 between Freeway Centerline Stations 289 and 362 shall use the construction technique commonly referred to as a Cast in Drilled Hole (CIDH), or “soldier pile”, type wall. This type of wall construction technique entails drilling of holes (on the State R/W), casting of retaining “pillars”, then removing the excess soil on the down-slope side of the area. By using this construction method the existing factor of safety for these slopes will be maintained during construction. This method will also reduce the need to encroach onto Forest Lawn property and provide enhanced slope stability after completion of the 10 HOV project. Any construction methods requiring tunneling, boring or otherwise under Forest Lawn property will be avoided. Any exception involving potential work on the Forest Lawn property would be done pursuant to a lawfully obtained construction easement.

As requested at the October 21 meeting, we are providing for your reference a list showing a sample of retaining wall heights in the vicinity of Forest Lawn. The list also specifies the locations where the retaining wall will be at the right-of-way line. This data is based on preliminary plans.

The Department’s Geotechnical Specialist, Gustavo Ortega, has previously responded directly to Forest Lawn’s geotechnical consultants in a separate letter dated October 23, 2003 regarding concerns about historic slope stability issues and previous repairs that the Department had made to the slope.
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A detailed geotechnical investigation will be conducted as part of the project design phase. This geotechnical investigation will be completed by professionally qualified staff and will address all potential impacts on slopes south of Interstate 10 between Freeway Centerline Stations 289 and 362, including an evaluation of seismic hazards and the potential for liquefaction. The geotechnical investigation will be forwarded to Forest Lawn upon its completion. Based on this investigation, a design for the proposed walls will be developed to enhance the existing slope stability and ensure public safety. The Department will notify Forest Lawn prior to approval of the final plans and will provide an opportunity for a plan review meeting.

The Department will regularly maintain surface or subsurface drains we have installed on the south side of Interstate 10 between Freeway Centerline Stations 289 and 362.

**Noise Issues**

Representatives of Forest Lawn, including Latham & Watkins, have consistently stated its position that Forest Lawn should be designated as Category A under the Federal Noise Abatement Criteria (NAC). However, the Department and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), position is that cemeteries should be classified as Category B noise receptors (“Highway Traffic Noise Analyses for Cemeteries, Trails, and Trail Crossings”, FHWA Office of Environment and Planning Memo HEP-41, June 16, 1995). As noted in the memo, a Category A designation would be reserved for those cemeteries “possessing a special importance, e.g., the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier at Arlington National Cemetery”. The Department has not received documentation of “special importance” for the Forest Lawn property that would distinguish it from similar properties and warrant a Category A designation.

We acknowledge that the Final Traffic Noise Study Report and ND/FONSI did not identify the Forest Lawn property as a Category B property. Therefore, the Department has prepared a Supplemental Traffic Noise Study Report to address noise issues at the Forest Lawn property. The analysis focused on whether current noise levels and predicted noise levels with the 10 HOV project exceed the federal noise abatement criteria of 67 decibels (dBA) for Category B properties, and if so, whether the property qualifies for noise abatement measures under the “reasonable and feasible” criteria as outlined in the Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol. The Supplemental Traffic Noise Study Report is enclosed for your reference and is summarized below.

A total of 10 noise measurements have been conducted at various locations within the Forest Lawn property, including 6 short-term (10 minute duration) and 4 long-term measurements (9 a.m. to 3 p.m.). The existing measured hourly average noise levels (without the 10 HOV project) range from 56.7 to 77 dBA Leq, exceeding the NAC of 67 dBA at some locations. As indicated in the Final Traffic Noise Impact Technical Report, the 10 HOV lane project is generally predicted to increase noise levels by 1-2 dBA. Based on specific modeling conducted for the supplemental noise study, the project is predicted to increase noise levels by approximately 2-3 dBA along the Forest Lawn property. According to the Caltrans Technical Noise Supplement (TeNS), a 2 dBA increase is not perceivable by normal human ears and a 3 dBA increase is barely perceivable by normal human ears. As described in the ND/FONSI (p. 5-10), this increase is not considered a substantial noise increase. However, the Department incorporates noise abatement measures into projects where existing or predicted noise levels approach or exceed the NAC if it is determined to be reasonable and feasible.

According to the Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol, Section 2.8, Noise Abatement Reasonableness, noise abatement is considered where a frequent human use occurs (p. 9). To assist in determining the frequency of the use at the Forest Lawn property, the Department conducted 2 consecutive field surveys on November 13th and 14th between the hours of 8:30 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. The surveys were coordinated with Forest Lawn staff and were conducted on the 2 busiest days of the specific week based on the appointment schedule for that week.
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Based on our surveys, there were total of 8 funeral services, with 15 to 130 people and duration of 30 minutes to 2 hours each service. There were also total of 222 people visiting about 60 to 70 sites with durations of 10 to 40 minutes per visit. Additionally, this analysis shows that due to the topography along the Forest Lawn property, a soundwall along the property line would only benefit (result in a 5 dBA reduction) at most 300 feet behind the wall. All but one of the services and many of the visitations observed in the survey fell outside of this area.

Due to the small number of services and short duration of visitations in the study area adjacent to the freeway, the Department’s determination at this time is that the Forest Lawn property does not qualify as an area of frequent human use. Therefore, it is the Department’s position that the construction of soundwalls at the Forest Lawn property is not warranted because the reasonable and feasible criteria were not met.

However, the Department expects to conduct additional environmental documentation for this project due to projected delays in obtaining funding (see next section). During that future evaluation, the Department will conduct studies regarding noise impacts at the site, in consultation with Forest Lawn representatives and make determinations based on the outcome of those future studies.

**Project Status**

As you are aware, the proposed project has been divided into three separate segments to facilitate the design, right-of-way acquisition, environmental and construction activities. Segment 1 is from 605 to Puente Avenue, Segment 2 is from Puente Avenue to Citrus Avenue and Segment 3 is from Citrus Avenue to State Routes 57/71 and Interstate 210. The environmental analysis as presented in the ND/FONSI assumes the construction of the proposed I-10 HOV project would be done in phases.

The Department is currently hopeful that there will be sufficient funding available to proceed with design and right-of-way support activities of Segment 1 (605 to Puente). The Department is currently working with the Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) to secure the additional funding needed for right-of-way capital (necessary for acquisition purposes) in addition to construction capital and support. The tentative schedule calls for construction of Segment 1 to begin in late 2007.

Because there is a significant funding shortfall to complete Segment 1 of this proposed HOV project, there is no certainty as to when funding would become available to proceed with the final design and subsequently construction of Segments 2 and 3. The targeted date for starting construction for Segments 2 and 3 is late 2010, but given the financial situation the State is in, that date is far from being a concrete commitment.

Due to the extended time frame for the entire project, the Department will need to evaluate the significance of any changes in the project, environmental setting or relevant environmental regulations before proceeding with construction of Segments 2 and 3. This effort will be required pursuant to NEPA/CEQA requirements for an Environmental Reevaluation/Addendum. The Department is making a commitment at this time to consult with Forest Lawn representatives 6 to 12 months in advance of future project construction, as a part of this NEPA/CEQA consultation process. At that future time you will be provided with an additional opportunity to justify a soundwall as a part of Segment 3 construction.

The Department believes that we have responded as successfully as we can at this time to the issues raised by Forest Lawn Covina Hills Memorial Park. Please be mindful that detailed Plans, Specifications and Estimates (PS&E) for this project will be started only when construction funding is available. We are confident that your remaining issues can be resolved during this more detailed PS&E phase. During our previous discussion it was agreed that a document would be prepared to outline the Department’s commitments in regards to those issues.
Based on the continuing coordination effort, and the content of the ND/FONSI prepared for the project, the Department is of the opinion that this letter fulfills that agreement. Please be advised that this letter voids and supersedes our previous Letter of Commitment.

The Department is hereby notifying Forest Lawn Covina Hills Memorial Park that the 10 HOV project funding and filing of the Notice of Determination will be placed on the California Transportation Commission (CTC) Agenda for their meeting on February 25th and 26th. If the CTC takes positive action on these two Agenda Items, the CTC and the Department will be filing the Notice of Determination with the State Clearinghouse about March 1, 2004. As previously noted, these actions are necessary to secure funding for the design and right-of-way acquisition activities for Segment 1 (605 to Puente).

The Department wishes to thank you for your continued cooperation and interest in this vital transportation project. If you have any question or need additional information, please contact me at (213) 987-0703.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
RONALD KOSINSKI
Deputy District Director
California Department of Transportation, District 7
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August 6, 2003

Mr. Shannon Yauchzee,
Public Works Director/City Engineer
City of West Covina
P.O. Box 1440, Room 215
West Covina, CA 91793

LETTER OF COMMITMENT

Dear Shannon:

This letter clarifies the commitments by the Department of Transportation, District 7 (Department) regarding certain items of concern identified by the City of West Covina and included in the Negative Declaration/Finding of No Significant Impact (ND/FONSI) for the proposed project to add one High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lane in each direction on Interstate Route 10 between Interstate Route 605 and State Route 57 (hereafter identified as the 10 HOV project).

This letter is also in response to conversations that Department Staff (Ron Kosinski and Gary Iverson) had with you about the City of West Covina’s concern about these items. During our latest conversation you agreed to send a list of outstanding concerns. We received that list via email on June 23, 2003. Also during that conversation, Ron Kosinski agreed to respond to the City of West Covina prior to issuing the Notice of Determination for this project.

Below are the original City of West Covina comments sent to the Department on December 4, 2002, followed by the responses provided in the ND/FONSI prepared for this project. These are followed by the City of West Covina’s subsequent comments (received by email on June 23, 2003), and the Department’s commitment responses. The June 30, 2003 email from the City of West Covina did not include additional comments on previous items identified as R5-1, R5-4, R5-6, R5-8, R5-9, R5-12, R5-15, R5-16, R5-18, R5-19, R5-21, R5-22, R5-24, R5-25, R5-26, and R5-28, thus these items are not included in this correspondence).

#1. Original Comment (Identified as R5-2, R5-5, and R5-17 in response to the City of West Covina’s 12/4/02 Letter):

It also appears that the required right-of-way width as presented in the preliminary plans delivered to the City could be reduced in certain critical areas to reduce or eliminate negative impacts on adjacent properties and local streets. The City’s Redevelopment Agency will be responding separately since they have an interest in properties affected by this project.

Response from ND/FONSI:
The proposed project currently includes design considerations to avoid impacts in the City of West Covina. So much so that our federal partner, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), may be reluctant to adopt additional non-standard features. However, the Department will continue to work with the City of West Covina to visit strategies that would reduce right-of-way needs for the proposed project to the extent feasible, consistent with design standards and best professional practices.
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Revised Comment (6/23/03 Email):
R5-2: What should be considered is moving the CHP enforcement areas as we understand it is an area that would require additional right-of-way. Moving it would reduce the required right-of-way expansion.
R5-5: See R5-2.
R5-17: The proposed CHP area is in an area requiring widening of the ROW with dramatic impacts-the relocation of this CHP area could greatly mitigate the loss.
Response:
Extensive studies were undertaken to identify a California Highway Patrol (CHP) enforcement area in a location with the least amount of environmental impact to the surrounding community. The identified proposed location for the CHP enforcement area was specifically selected as the most environmentally sensitive because it does not require any additional right of way. The proposed CHP enforcement area location is achieved by reducing the median width, and utilizing existing Departmental right-of-way.

#2. Original Comment (Identified as R5-3 in response to the City of West Covina’s 12/4/02 Letter):
The City has significant concerns regarding a number of potential project impacts that have not been mitigated to a level of insignificance. Given that, the City Council and City staff are of the opinion, at this time, that an Environmental Impact Report needs to be prepared.
Response from ND/FONSI:
The Department undertook the preparation of an Initial Study/Environmental Assessment (IS/EA) for the proposed project. The IS/EA may have led to the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS) or to the preparation of a Negative Declaration/Finding of No Significant Impact (ND/FONSI). The project was designed to be as sensitive to community needs and reduce/mitigate impacts to the greatest extent possible. After examination, it was determined that the project does not contain elements that would significantly impact the communities within the City of West Covina, nor has the City identified issues that are not avoided, or minimized, or mitigated to a level less than significant by the determining agencies. Also refer to....

Revised Comment (6/23/03 Email):
This was the City’s position (EIR) but may change if these issues are resolved/mitigated based on these discussions.
Response:
The Department wishes to point out that this project design was formulated to provide a project with the least impact to the surrounding community, and still met the purpose and need for the project. The proposed project, as designed, contains as many non-standard design features as was acceptable to provide a safe facility, yet minimizes impacts to the surrounding communities.
Furthermore, based on an extensive review of the project impacts by the CEQA Lead Agency (the Department) and the NEPA Lead Agency (Federal Highway Administration) it was determined that the project did not contain significant impacts with the implementation of the identified mitigation, nor has the City of West Covina identified issues that could be considered significant impacts.
As a final note on this issue, the Department wants to assure the City of West Covina (as we have in the past) that the environmental documentation phase is only the first part of a continuous cooperative effort between the Department and the City of West Covina on this and other projects.
#3. **Original Comment (Identified as R5-7 in response to the City of West Covina’s 12/4/02 Letter):**

The loss of on-street parking and its impacts to the residents and community have not been studied, tabulated, or addressed.

**Response from ND/FONSI:**

Reduction in parking in the City of West Covina has been studied. Most areas affected by this project are currently designated as “No Public Parking Zones”. However, twenty spaces near the City of West Covina City Hall have been identified as being in areas designated for project use. Observations and investigations of these twenty spaces have indicated that they are rarely used, even during times of the year with heaviest use.

**Revised Comment (6/23/03 Email):**

We do not believe the potential loss of on-street parking along the frontage road (Garvey North and South) has been evaluated. Or are we being told that No on-street parking on Garvey other than specifically mentioned is to be lost.

**Response:**

The Department has conducted numerous studies, field reviews, and evaluations to consider the potential loss of on-street parking in the City of West Covina. After completing these extensive efforts our determination is that most of the on-street parking along the frontage roads (Garvey North and Garvey South) will not be impacted by the proposed project. Again, this project was designed to avoid impacts to the surrounding community, this is accomplished by reconfiguring the existing lanes to 11 foot widths, but only if found necessary during the final design phase. In either case, the Department has identified the possibility of retaining the on-street parking in those areas along the frontage roads identified above, with one exception. This exception is the on-street parking on Garvey South near the West Covina City Hall. As indicated in the final environmental document, the proposed project would impact twenty on-street parking spaces located near West Covina City Hall (this was again confirmed by the Caltrans Design Manager on June, 27, 2003). However, our continuous study of the area identified that these on-street parking areas went primarily unused, even during times of the year with the highest demand for parking in the area. The Department has ascertained that the loss of these unused spaces is not a significant impact. There are no other on-street parking losses in the City of West Covina as part of the proposed project, except those noted above.

#4. **Original Comment (Identified as R5-10 and R5-13 in response to the City of West Covina’s 12/4/02 Letter):**

To avoid leaving the impression of a “concrete jungle”, the City would like to see some theme for the design and articulation, artwork of soundwalls and the landscaping. The recent work through the Pomona Valley has resulted in a patchwork of different retaining walls and designs, with many looking like an afterthought and not matching adjacent wall designs. Additionally, what graffiti prevention measures will be in place for signs and soundwalls?

**Response from ND/FONSI:**

As stated in previous meeting with the City of West Covina, the Department will work with City Staff to identify aesthetic treatments to noise barriers to the extent reasonable and feasible. Coordination with the City on landscape design issues will also be conducted. Efforts to eradicate graffiti are a priority with the Department. As new technologies emerge, the Department examines each for viability. Several strategies exist for dealing with graffiti,
and the most applicable will be determined after consultation with the City on related issues such as noise barrier surfaces and landscape placement.

**Revised Comment (6/23/03 Email):**
It is preferred that vines be grown over walls as much as feasible—propose to add this to ED.

**Response:**
The ND/FONSI for this project states that landscaping will be conducted to the extent reasonable and feasible. The Department acknowledges that the City of West Covina has identified landscaping materials to grow on walls be made a priority, and the Department will make every reasonable and feasible effort to comply with that request.
Be further advised that on Pages 12 and 24 of the Project Report for 117080, and Page 18, 29, and 30 of the Project Report for 119340, it describes that artwork on retaining walls, vines, and landscaping will be part of the project, and that funds have been allocated to conduct this work.

#5. **Original Comment (Identified as R5-11 in response to the City of West Covina’s 12/4/02 Letter):**
No modification or upgrades to local streets, signals, on/off-ramps, etc., are considered for this project. The project will increase freeway capacity but not these ancillary capacities leaving local streets and access points to the freeways congested. These upgrades must occur prior to or as part of the project.

**Response from ND/FONSI:**
The traffic analysis for the proposed HOV lanes is described on pages 5-28 to 5-33 in the Draft ED. That analysis clearly indicates that peak hour traffic volumes on I-10 will increase substantially between 2001 and 2008/2011 and 2028/2031 (Tables 5-4 and 5-5) under the No Action/No Build Alternative. As shown in Table 5-6 and 5-7, the proposed HOV lanes would accommodate the same number of vehicle trips as forecast under the No Action/No Build Alternative, but would carry substantially more people. Because the volume of vehicles is assumed to be the same under the No Action/No Build Alternative and the proposed project, there will not be a substantial change in traffic volumes on local streets or at the interchanges of I-10. The Department has no jurisdiction over “ancillary” roadways not part of the state highway system. However, implementation of the project is anticipated to reduce congestion on local arterials.
As part of the proposed project improvements to signals will be identified and proposed for implementation. Signal improvements within State jurisdiction may be incorporated into this project. The Department will support efforts by local agencies to implement other signal changes, or improvements to “ancillary” routes.

**Revised Comment (6/23/03 Email):**
We have currently contacted Caltrans about these upgrades to on/off ramp signals under Caltrans jurisdiction. We are told they cannot be done because of budget cuts for traffic counting overtime. How will these upgrades ever be accomplished?

**Response:**
The need to upgrade the current on/off ramps are not part of the purpose and need for this project. However, the Department will prepare a Traffic Mitigation Plan as part of this project, and any needed ramp upgrades would be incorporated in this project if warranted. If the City of West Covina feels that other ramp upgrades are required above those identified in the Traffic Mitigation Plan, the Department will consider those improvements as a separate project after receiving a written request from the City of West Covina.
#6. Original Comment (Identified as R5-13 and R5-14 in response to the City of West Covina’s 12/4/02 Letter):

R5-13 = The loss of landscaping has not been quantified, nor has any mitigation to this been clearly detailed. The current corridor has green belts both on the freeway and frontage roads side. Quantify this loss, and how will it be mitigated?

R5-14 = The loss of trees has not been quantified. There are numerous large trees along the corridor that will have to be removed. Quantify the loss and how will it be mitigated?

Response from ND/FONSI:

Because the project is not in the final design phase, the exact impacts to landscape cannot be quantified at this time. However, as discussed previously with the City of West Covina, every effort will be made to replace vegetation as reasonable and feasible as mitigation. Additionally, the existing vegetation has reached its mature phase and will soon fail (die), requiring its eventual replacement. Given current budget limitations, any failed vegetation may not be replaced in a timely manner. By providing new, young plants as a part of this project, the community can look forward to an improving landscape, rather than one in decline.

Revised Comment (6/23/03 Email – Identified as R5-14):

It is proposed that trees be replaced at a one-to-one ratio.

Response: Several surveys were conducted to estimate the number of trees to be removed as part of the proposed project from City-owned right-of-way based on the preliminary design. These surveys found that within City of West Covina property, a total of 148 trees with diameter 12 inches of greater were identified (utilizing City of West Covina standards of important). Discussions with Departmental Landscape Design Staff members have identified that it is probable that all 148 trees can be replaced in the Departmental right-of-way (a replacement rate of one-to-one as requested by the City of West Covina). Therefore, the statement in the ND/FONSI that vegetation will be replaced as reasonable and feasible is still accurate.

#7. Original Comment (Identified as R5-20 in response to the City of West Covina’s 12/4/02 Letter):

The closing of both Azusa and Grand Avenue at the same time should be a mitigation measure as these are the only two major north/south routes through the City of West Covina.

Response from ND/FONSI:

It appears that this comment intends to request that the Azusa and Grand Avenue ramps not be closed at the same time because they are the two major north/south routes in the city. The Department’s general policy is to avoid closing two consecutive ramps at the same time during construction. Prior to and during construction, the Department and its contractors will work closely with the City, during the development and implementation of the project Traffic Management Plan (TMP), in determining the phasing of ramp closures, and developing and implementing a public information program for residents and businesses to ensure they are properly notified and kept informed of ramp closures during construction.

Revised Comment (6/23/03 Email):

Azusa and Grand are not consecutive ramps. We propose that only one or the other be closed at the same time as a mitigation.

Response:

The Department feels it is possible to not close the Azusa Avenue and Grand Avenue concurrently. This consideration will be included during the project design phase during the mandated preparation of the Staging Plans and Traffic Management Plan for this project.
#8. Original Comment (Identified as R5-23 in response to the City of West Covina’s 12/4/02 Letter):
The mitigation measure requiring the two consecutive on/off-ramps not be closed may not be sufficient. This mitigation measure could result in five or six closures drastically affecting the City. A limit or cap should be put on the total closures at any one time. Prior to the I-10 freeway, Garvey Avenue was the main street for West Covina. Due to the freeway construction, West Covina’s main street was lost to the freeway. Thus the freeway is crucial for east-west circulation throughout the City. The City is served by at least eleven freeway access points that are critical for circulation about and through the City. The closure of several of these points at once would impact the City drastically.

Response from ND/FONSI:
Strategies related to the closing of ramps will be coordinated with the City of West Covina and other local agencies. In addition refer to responses to comments 5-20, 5-21 and C-4, earlier in this appendix.

Revised Comment (6/23/03 Email):
There are 11 on/off ramps in the city- as mitigation, a maximum number may be closed at any one time, for example, no more than three at a time if feasible.

Response:
The Department is mandated to formulate Stage Construction Plans and a Traffic Management Plan. As part of those future efforts, we do not currently anticipate that more than 3 or 4 ramps would be closed at any one time. The Department will work with the City Engineer to ensure that as few ramps are closed at any one time as possible.

#9. Original Comment (Identified as R5-27 in response to the City of West Covina’s 12/4/02 Letter):
At the public meeting, Caltrans stated that Garvey Avenue would not be reduced; yet the information in the environmental document shows otherwise. The impacts to frontage roads, mainly Garvey Avenue, needs further study and clarification regarding the loss of street width, on-street parking, landscaping, and traffic capacity.

Response from ND/FONSI:
The Department’s current plans are not to reduce the width of Garvey Avenue in the area designated by the individual who made the comment at the Public Hearing. Again, during final design the Department will coordinate frontage road requirements with the City of West Covina. In addition, refer to response to comment R5-8, above.

Comment above read = As currently designed, the proposed project will not result in narrowing of the majority of existing frontage roads. At two location in the City of West Covina, just west of the Mall and at the South Glendora Avenue curve, the encroachment into the frontage road will result in minor narrowing of the frontage road. At the completion of construction, the frontage road will be a minimum of 32 feet (9.75 meters) wide which was the minimum width recommended by the city. Additional design work will be conducted for the areas near the frontage roads during final design. However, the initial designs have determined that the frontage road width travel way will not be reduced except in these two small spot locations and that this will not impact traffic circulation in these areas. Details to provide all applicable mitigation are included in this document.

Revised Comment (6/23/03 Email):
See also R5-7. It appears widening will result in the loss of parkways and parking along Garvey Avenue.

Response:
See response to item #3 above (in this letter), and to previous responses (above) for response to parking along Garvey Avenue. Also, the Department has always acknowledged that some
right-of-way (parkway) would be required from the City of West Covina. This includes some 
parkways located between Garvey Avenue and the existing state-owned right-of-way in a 
variety of areas (as identified on the maps given to the City of West Covina during the October 
30, 2002 meeting).

#10. Original Comment (Identified as R5-29 in response to the City of West Covina's 12/4/02 
Letter):
Based on the foregoing, the environmental impacts of the proposed project have not been 
mitigated to a level of non-significance and there is substantial evidence that the project may 
have a significant effect on the environment and that an Environmental Impact Report should 
be prepared.

Response from ND/FONSI:
Comment noted. Refer to response to comment R5-3, above. Item #2 in this letter.

Revised Comment (6/23/03 Email):
The above mitigation measures may help resolve this issue.

Response:
The Department has not seen anything new in the issues raised by the City of West Covina in 
the June 23, 2003 correspondence. All issues identified were addressed in the ND/FONSI 
prepared for this project, such that it was determined that the implementation of this project 
will not result in significant impacts.

This letter is just one of the many times the Department has discussed the project specifics with the 
City of West Covina. Other occasions include:
- April 30, 2001 - Meeting with the City of West Covina Staff.
- March 27, 2002 – Meeting with City of West Covina Staff.
- October 30, 2002 – Meeting with City of West Covina Staff (provided project layout sheets).
- November 21, 2002 – Public Hearing – City of West Covina Staff present.
- Not included above are the numerous phone conversations with City of West Covina Staff

The Department feels we have successfully responded to all of the issues the City of West Covina 
wished to have addressed. During our previous discussion it was agreed that a document would 
be prepared to outline the Department’s commitments in regards to City of West Covina concerns. Based 
on the continuing coordination effort, and the content of the ND/FONSI prepared for this project the 
Department is of the opinion that this letter fulfills that agreement. However, the Department is 
committed to continued coordination with the City of West Covina during subsequent project phases.

The Department is hereby notifying the City of West Covina that we will be filing a Notice of 
Determination with the State Clearinghouse in August 2003, so this project can proceed to other phases 
of project development. Once again, the Department wishes to thank you for your continued 
cooperation and interest in this vital transportation project. If you have any questions or need additional 
information, please contact either myself at (213) 897-0703, or Gary Iverson of my staff at (213) 897-
3818.

Sincerely,

Ron Kosinski
RON KOSINSKI
Deputy District Director
## Appendix I  Project Acquisitions and Easements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>APN</th>
<th>Area (sq ft)</th>
<th>Address/Location</th>
<th>Type*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Segment 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79812</td>
<td>8460-006-043</td>
<td>4,582</td>
<td>3250 Big Dalton Ave</td>
<td>TCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8460-006-029</td>
<td>2,590</td>
<td></td>
<td>FEE (Partial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79813</td>
<td>8474-001-012</td>
<td>1,119</td>
<td>725 S Orange Ave</td>
<td>TCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>498</td>
<td></td>
<td>FEE (Partial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79814</td>
<td>8474-003-081</td>
<td>13,685</td>
<td>No address</td>
<td>FEE (Partial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12,233</td>
<td></td>
<td>TCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79816</td>
<td>8474-007-929</td>
<td>5,551</td>
<td>No address</td>
<td>TCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24,238</td>
<td></td>
<td>FEE (Partial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>779</td>
<td></td>
<td>TCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79817</td>
<td>8474-007-030</td>
<td>11,258</td>
<td>100 S California Ave</td>
<td>FEE (Full)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79818</td>
<td>8474-007-031</td>
<td>2,848</td>
<td>110 S California Ave</td>
<td>FEE (Full)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,015</td>
<td></td>
<td>TCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,686</td>
<td></td>
<td>E (expires 11-15-16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79819</td>
<td>8474-011-028</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>950 Lakes Dr</td>
<td>TCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>FEE (Partial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79820</td>
<td>8474-011-942</td>
<td>7,718</td>
<td>1000 Lakes Dr</td>
<td>FEE (Partial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,297</td>
<td></td>
<td>TCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79822</td>
<td>8474-011-046</td>
<td>4,958</td>
<td>195 S Glendora Ave</td>
<td>TCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,551</td>
<td></td>
<td>FEE (Partial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79926</td>
<td>8456-031-001</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>112 N Toland Ave</td>
<td>TCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79927</td>
<td>8456-031-002</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>1222 E Mardina St</td>
<td>TCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79928</td>
<td>8456-031-003</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>1224 E Mardina St</td>
<td>TCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79929</td>
<td>8456-031-004</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>1230 E Mardina St</td>
<td>TCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79930</td>
<td>8456-031-005</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>1236 E Mardina St</td>
<td>TCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79931</td>
<td>8456-031-006</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>1242 E Mardina St</td>
<td>TCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79932</td>
<td>8456-031-007</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>1250 E Mardina St</td>
<td>TCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79933</td>
<td>8456-031-026</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>1302 E Mardina St</td>
<td>TCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79934</td>
<td>8456-032-023</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>101 N Lark Ellen Ave, Unit 101</td>
<td>TCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>TCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80160</td>
<td>8474-007-040</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>112 Fashion Plaza</td>
<td>TCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Segment 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80234</td>
<td>8451-012-040</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>West of Barranca</td>
<td>TCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80235</td>
<td>8451-012-047</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>West of Barranca</td>
<td>TCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79766</td>
<td>8277-008-034</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>East of Holt Ave.</td>
<td>TCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79824</td>
<td>8448-019-049</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>East of Holt Ave.</td>
<td>PFE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79824</td>
<td>8448-019-049</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>East of Holt Ave.</td>
<td>TCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79825</td>
<td>8448-019-039</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>East of Holt Ave.</td>
<td>PFE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79826</td>
<td>8448-019-040</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>East of Holt Ave.</td>
<td>PUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79826</td>
<td>8448-019-040</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>East of Holt Ave.</td>
<td>TCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79736</td>
<td>8448-019-020</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>East of Holt Ave.</td>
<td>PUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79736</td>
<td>8448-019-020</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>East of Holt Ave.</td>
<td>TCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79736</td>
<td>8448-019-020</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>Near Via Verde St.</td>
<td>PUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79737</td>
<td>8448-018-012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79738</td>
<td>8448-018-013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79736</td>
<td>8448-019-020</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>Near Via Verde St.</td>
<td>TCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79738</td>
<td>8448-018-013</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>Near Via Verde St.</td>
<td>TCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel</td>
<td>APN</td>
<td>Area (sq ft)</td>
<td>Address/Location</td>
<td>Type*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79739</td>
<td>8448-018-016</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>Hilly area west of Forest Lawn</td>
<td>PUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79740</td>
<td>8448-018-017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79739</td>
<td>8448-018-016</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>Hilly area west of Forest Lawn</td>
<td>TCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79740</td>
<td>8448-018-017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79739</td>
<td>8448-018-016</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>Hilly area before Forest Lawn</td>
<td>PFE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79740</td>
<td>8448-018-017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79768</td>
<td>8710-033-007</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>Hilly area west of Forest Lawn</td>
<td>TCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79769</td>
<td>8710-001-027</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79741</td>
<td>8448-018-021</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>Hilly area west of Forest Lawn</td>
<td>PUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79742</td>
<td>8448-018-022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79743</td>
<td>8448-018-023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79741</td>
<td>8448-018-021</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>Hilly area west of Forest Lawn</td>
<td>TCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79742</td>
<td>8448-018-022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79743</td>
<td>8448-018-023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79744</td>
<td>8448-029-063</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Hilly area west of Forest Lawn</td>
<td>TCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79745</td>
<td>8448-029-064</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Hilly area west of Forest Lawn</td>
<td>PFE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79745</td>
<td>8448-029-064</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Hilly area west of Forest Lawn</td>
<td>TCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79769</td>
<td>8710-001-027</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hilly area west of Forest Lawn</td>
<td>TCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79770</td>
<td>8710-001-054</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Hilly area west of Forest Lawn</td>
<td>TCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79746</td>
<td>8448-029-065</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Hilly area west of Forest Lawn</td>
<td>PFE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79747</td>
<td>8448-029-066</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>Hilly area west of Forest Lawn</td>
<td>PFE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79748</td>
<td>8448-029-062</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79749</td>
<td>8448-029-061</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79749</td>
<td>8448-029-061</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Hilly area west of Forest Lawn</td>
<td>PFE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79827</td>
<td>8710-001-031</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>Forest Lawn</td>
<td>PFE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79771</td>
<td>8710-001-911</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>Forest Lawn</td>
<td>PFE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79771</td>
<td>8710-001-911</td>
<td>2250</td>
<td>Forest Lawn</td>
<td>TCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80246</td>
<td>8448-010-900</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>Los Angeles County Park &amp; Ride Lot</td>
<td>TCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79771</td>
<td>8710-001-911</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>Hilly area east of Forest Lawn</td>
<td>TCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79751</td>
<td>8448-010-011</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Hilly area east of Forest Lawn</td>
<td>TCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79751</td>
<td>8448-010-011</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Hilly area east of Forest Lawn</td>
<td>PFE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79771</td>
<td>8710-001-911</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>Hilly area east of Forest Lawn</td>
<td>TCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79752</td>
<td>8448-010-021</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>Near E. Covina Hills Rd.</td>
<td>TCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79772</td>
<td>8710-003-916</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>East of E. Covina Hills Rd. area</td>
<td>TCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79772</td>
<td>8710-003-916</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>West of Cal Poly area</td>
<td>PFE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79772</td>
<td>8710-003-916</td>
<td>1750</td>
<td>West of Cal Poly area</td>
<td>PDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79772</td>
<td>8710-003-916</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>Cal Poly area</td>
<td>TCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79772</td>
<td>8710-003-916</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>Cal Poly area</td>
<td>PDE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Type of Acquisition:
E  Easement
FEE  Full or Partial Fee Acquisition
TCE  Temporary Construction Easement
PFE  Permanent Footing Easement
PDE  Permanent Drainage Easement
PUE  Permanent Utility Easement
### The Lakes

**All affected by temporary easement or permanent right of way BEFORE mitigation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parking Spaces along 1-10</th>
<th>Palm Tree adjacent to 10</th>
<th>Concrete Island with Palm Tree</th>
<th>Concrete Island with Reg. Tree</th>
<th>Concrete Island with Trop. Flowers</th>
<th>Concrete Island with light Post</th>
<th>Regular Tree adjacent to 10</th>
<th>Shrub or Large Weed</th>
<th>Landscape (grass/hedge)</th>
<th>Light Post on adjacent to 1-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>WEST</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rr garage</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handicap CP</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generator</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EAST-end</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Edwards

**All affected by temporary easement or permanent right of way BEFORE mitigation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parking Spaces along 1-10</th>
<th>Palm Tree adjacent to 10</th>
<th>Concrete Island with Palm Tree</th>
<th>Concrete Island with Reg. Tree</th>
<th>Concrete Island with Trop. Flowers</th>
<th>Concrete Island with light Post</th>
<th>Regular Tree adjacent to 10</th>
<th>Shrub or Large Weed</th>
<th>Landscape (grass/hedge)</th>
<th>Light Post on adjacent to 1-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>West</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nr smt sign</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EAST-end</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### The Lakes and Edwards

**GRAND TOTAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parking Spaces along 1-10</th>
<th>Palm Tree adjacent to 10</th>
<th>Concrete Island with Palm Tree</th>
<th>Concrete Island with Reg. Tree</th>
<th>Concrete Island with Trop. Flowers</th>
<th>Concrete Island with light Post</th>
<th>Regular Tree adjacent to 10</th>
<th>Shrub or Large Weed</th>
<th>Landscape (grass/hedge)</th>
<th>Light Post on adjacent to 1-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>135</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Parking Spaces:** 135
- **All Trees:** 38
- **Landscape/Scrub/Weeds:** 25
- **In square foot:** 2,450 (1225 feet x 2ft depth x 2ft height above ground average; therefore 4,900 in cubic area)
- **Light Poles:** 10
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## Appendix J Comments and Responses on the DEIR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Letter No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date of Letter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), Gregor Blackburn</td>
<td>November 21, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Native American Heritage Commission, Dave Singleton</td>
<td>January 18, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Department of Fish and Game, Jamie Jackson</td>
<td>February 10, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>County of Los Angeles Fire Department, John R. Todd</td>
<td>December 7, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>City of West Covina Public Works Department, Shannon A. Yauchzee</td>
<td>December 20, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>County of Los Angeles Sheriff's Department, Gary T. K. Tse</td>
<td>December 28, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County, Stephen R. Maguin</td>
<td>December 29, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Metro, Scott Hartwell</td>
<td>January 4, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Hank Fung, P.E.</td>
<td>January 3, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Forest Lawn Memorial Park, JMBM LLP, Sheri L. Bonstelle</td>
<td>January 6, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Westfield, Patrick A. Gibson, P.E., PTOE</td>
<td>January 6, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Jack in the Box, Mike Gribble</td>
<td>January 6, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Gateway Crescent, LLC, DLA Piper, Ryan M. Leaderman</td>
<td>January 12, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Gateway Crescent, LLC, DLA Piper, Ryan M. Leaderman</td>
<td>April 6, 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Email No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date of Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>City of West Covina Public Works Department, Shannon A. Yauchzee</td>
<td>January 12, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nohreen Villanueva</td>
<td>December 22, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Richard Ramage</td>
<td>December 27, 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Comment Sheet No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date of Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sharon Johnson</td>
<td>December 13, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Albert Bailar</td>
<td>December 13, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Joanne Anderson</td>
<td>December 13, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tom Brubaker</td>
<td>December 13, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Janice Kappmeyer</td>
<td>December 13, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sharon Johnson</td>
<td>December 13, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Nohreen Villanueva</td>
<td>January 5, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Richard Ramage</td>
<td>January 5, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Lily Martini</td>
<td>January 5, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Robert Sotelo</td>
<td>January 5, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Tom Brubaker</td>
<td>January 5, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ryan Leaderman</td>
<td>January 5, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Helen Blackburn</td>
<td>January 5, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Mario Luna</td>
<td>January 5, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Maria Rodriguez</td>
<td>January 5, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Althea de Pietro</td>
<td>January 5, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Elizabeth Moreno</td>
<td>January 5, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Dave and Laura Harder</td>
<td>January 5, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Meeting No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date of Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Public Hearing Transcript</td>
<td>December 13, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>March 14 Meeting</td>
<td>March 14, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Roberta Goldberg</td>
<td>January 5, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Michael Brubaker</td>
<td>January 5, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Paul Forgette</td>
<td>January 5, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Maria L. Lopez</td>
<td>January 5, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Giancarlo Massarotto</td>
<td>January 5, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Shereen Lau</td>
<td>January 5, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Paul Forgette</td>
<td>January 5, 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
November 21, 2011

Ronald J. Kosinski
Deputy District Director
Department of Transportation, District 7
100 South Main Street, MS-16A
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Mr. Kosinski:

This is in response to your request for comments on the Notice of Public Hearing and Availability of Environmental Impact Report 07-LA-10 (PM 33.2/42.4) EA 1170U1 and 119341 Add One High Occupancy Vehicle Lane in Each Direction on San Bernardino Freeway (Interstate 10) from Puente Avenue to State Route 57/71 in Los Angeles County.

Please review the current effective countywide Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) for the County of Los Angeles (065043), Maps revised September 26, 2008. Please note that the County of Los Angeles, California is a participant in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). The minimum, basic NFIP floodplain management building requirements are described in Vol. 44 Code of Federal Regulations (44 CFR), Sections 59 through 65.

A summary of these NFIP floodplain management building requirements are as follows:

- All buildings constructed within a riverine floodplain, (i.e., Flood Zones A, AO, AH, AE, and A1 through A30 as delineated on the FIRM), must be elevated so that the lowest floor is at or above the Base Flood Elevation level in accordance with the effective Flood Insurance Rate Map.

- If the area of construction is located within a Regulatory Floodway as delineated on the FIRM, any development must not increase base flood elevation levels. The term "development" means any man-made change to improved or unimproved real estate, including but not limited to buildings, other structures, mining, dredging, filling, grading, paving, excavation or drilling operations, and storage of equipment or materials. A hydrologic and hydraulic analysis must be performed prior to the start of development, and must demonstrate that the development would not cause any rise in base flood levels. No rise is permitted within regulatory floodways.
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- All buildings constructed within a coastal high hazard area, (any of the “V” Flood Zones as delineated on the FIRM), must be elevated on pilings and columns, so that the lowest horizontal structural member, (excluding the pilings and columns), is elevated to or above the base flood elevation level. In addition, the posts and pilings foundation and structure attached thereto, is anchored to resist flotation, collapse and lateral movement due to the effects of wind and water loads acting simultaneously on all building components.

- Upon completion of any development that changes existing Special Flood Hazard Areas, the NFIP directs all participating communities to submit the appropriate hydrologic and hydraulic data to FEMA for a FIRM revision. In accordance with 44 CFR, Section 65.3, as soon as practicable, but not later than six months after such data becomes available, a community shall notify FEMA of the changes by submitting technical data for a flood map revision. To obtain copies of FEMA’s Flood Map Revision Application Packages, please refer to the FEMA website at http://www.fema.gov/business/nfip/forms.shtml.

Please Note:

Many NFIP participating communities have adopted floodplain management building requirements which are more restrictive than the minimum federal standards described in 44 CFR. Please contact the local community’s floodplain manager for more information on local floodplain management building requirements. The Los Angeles County floodplain manager can be reached by calling George De La O, Senior Civil Engineer, at (626) 458-7155.

If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to call Cynthia McKenzie of the Mitigation staff at (510) 627-7190.

Sincerely,

Gregor Blackburn, CFM, Branch Chief  
Floodplain Management and Insurance Branch

cc:  
George De La O, Senior Civil Engineer, Los Angeles County  
Garret Tam Sing/Salomon Miranda, State of California, Department of Water Resources, Southern Region Office  
Cynthia McKenzie, Senior Floodplanner, CFM, DHS/FEMA Region IX  
Alessandro Amaglio, Environmental Officer, DHS/FEMA Region IX
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Response to Comment Letter No. 1 – Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)

#1 – There are no buildings proposed to be constructed as part of this project. Additionally, this project is an enhancement of an existing facility and that facility is not located within the 100-year floodplain. Adequate drainage has been provided as part of the existing facility and the new enhancement to address hydraulic water flows in the project area.

#2 – See #1 above.

#3 – This project is not located within the coastal high hazard area. The project is being designed to avoid post and piling flotation, horizontal and lateral movement, and is being designed according to current design practices for a facility of this type.

#4 – See #1 above. This project will not change Special Flood Hazard Areas, nor have any effect to area floodplain considerations.

#5 – Caltrans is designing this project to conform to all local, county, state, and federal floodplain management requirements.
January 19, 2012

Mr. Ron Kosinski

California Department of Transportation, District 7
100 South Main Street
Los Angeles, CA 90650

Re: SCH#2012011028 CEQA Notice of Preparation (NOP); draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the "10 HOV – Add One HOV lane in the Median in Each Direction from Puente Avenue to S.R. 57 Project;" located in Los Angeles County, California

Dear Mr. Kosinski:

The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) is the State of California ‘Trustee Agency’ for the protection and preservation of Native American cultural resources pursuant to California Public Resources Code §21070 and affirmed by the Third Appellate Court in the case of EPIC v. Johnson (1985: 170 Cal App. 3rd 604). The court held that the NAHC has jurisdiction and special expertise, as a state agency, over affected Native American resources, impacted by proposed projects including archaeological, places of religious significance to Native Americans and burial sites. The NAHC wishes to comment on the proposed project.

This letter includes state and federal statutes relating to Native American historic properties of religious and cultural significance to American Indian tribes and interested Native American individuals as ‘consulting parties’ under both state and federal law. State law also addresses the freedom of Native American Religious Expression in Public Resources Code §5097.9.

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA – CA Public Resources Code 21000-21177, amendments effective 3/18/2010) requires that any project that causes a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource, that includes archaeological resources, is a ‘significant effect’ requiring the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) per the CEQA Guidelines defines a significant impact on the environment as ‘a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of physical conditions within an area affected by the proposed project, including ... objects of historic or aesthetic significance.’ In order to comply with this provision, the lead agency is required to assess whether the project will have an adverse impact on these resources within the ‘area of potential effect (APE), and if so, to mitigate that effect.

The NAHC Sacred Lands File (SLF) search resulted as follows: Native American cultural resources were not identified within the project area identified. Also, the absence of archaeological resources does not preclude their existence. California Public Resources Code §§5097.94 (a) and 5097.96 authorize the NAHC to establish a Sacred Land Inventory to record Native American sacred sites and burial sites. These records are exempt from the provisions of the California Public Records Act pursuant to California Government Code §5254 (f). The purpose of this code is to protect such sites from vandalism, theft and destruction. The NAHC “Sacred Sites,” as defined by the Native American Heritage Commission and the California Legislature in California Public Resources Code §§5097.94(a) and 5097.96. Items in the NAHC
Sacred Lands Inventory are confidential and exempt from the Public Records Act pursuant to California Government Code §6254 (r).

Early consultation with Native American tribes in your area is the best way to avoid unanticipated discoveries of cultural resources or burial sites once a project is underway. Culturally affiliated tribes and individuals may have knowledge of the religious and cultural significance of the historic properties in the project area (e.g. APE). We strongly urge that you make contact with the list of Native American Contacts on the list of Native American contacts, to see if your proposed project might impact Native American cultural resources and to obtain their recommendations concerning the proposed project. Special reference is made to the Tribal Consultation requirements of the California 2008 Senate Bill 1059: enabling legislation to the federal Energy Policy Act of 2005 (P.L. 109-58), mandates consultation with Native American tribes (both federally recognized and non federally recognized) where electrically transmission lines are proposed. This is codified in the California Public Resources Code, Chapter 4.3 and §25330 to Division 15.

Furthermore, pursuant to CA Public Resources Code § 5097.95, the NAHC requests that the Native American consulting parties be provided pertinent project information. Consultation with Native American communities is also a matter of environmental justice as defined by California Government Code §65040,12(e). Pursuant to CA Public Resources Code §5097.95, the NAHC requests that pertinent project information be provided consulting tribal parties. The NAHC recommends avoidance as defined by CEQA Guidelines §15370(a) to pursuing a project that would damage or destroy Native American cultural resources and Section 2183.2 that requires documentation, data recovery of cultural resources.

Consultation with tribes and interested Native American consulting parties, on the NAHC list, if the project is under federal jurisdiction, should be conducted in compliance with the requirements of federal NEPA and Section 106 and 4(f) of federal NHPA (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq), 36 CFR Part 800.3 (f) (2) & .5, the President’s Council on Environmental Quality (CSQ, 42 U.S.C 4371 et seq. and NAGPRA (25 U.S.C. 3001-3013) as appropriate. The 1982 Secretary of the Interiors Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties were revised so that they could be applied to all historic resource types included in the National Register of Historic Places and including cultural landscapes. Also, federal Executive Orders Nos. 11593 (preservation of cultural environment), 13175 (coordination & consultation) and 13007 (Sacred Sites) are helpful, supportive guides for Section 106 consultation. The aforementioned Secretary of the Interior’s Standards include recommendations for all ‘lead agencies’ to consider the historic context of proposed projects and to “research the cultural landscape that might include the ‘area of potential effect.’”

Confidentiality of “historic properties of religious and cultural significance” should also be considered as protected by California Government Code §6254(r) and may also be protected under Section 304 of he NHPA or at the Secretary of the Interior discretion if not eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. The Secretary may also be advised by the federal Indian Religious Freedom Act (cf. 42 U.S.C., 1996) in issuing a decision on whether or not to disclose items of religious and/or cultural significance identified in or near the APEs and possibility threatened by proposed project activity.

Furthermore, Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, California Government Code §27491 and Health & Safety Code Section 7050.5 provide for provisions for accidentally discovered archaeological resources during construction and mandate the processes to be followed in the event of an accidental discovery of any human remains in a project location other than a ‘dedicated cemetery’.
To be effective, consultation on specific projects must be the result of an ongoing relationship between Native American tribes and lead agencies, project proponents and their contractors, in the opinion of the NAHC. Regarding tribal consultation, a relationship built around regular meetings and informal involvement with local tribes will lead to more qualitative consultation tribal input on specific projects.

If you have any questions about this response to your request, please do not hesitate to contact me at (916) 653-6251.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Dave Singleton
Program Analyst

Cc: State Clearinghouse

Attachment: Native American Contact List
California Native American Contacts
Los Angeles County
January 19, 2012

LA City/County Native American Indian Comm
Ron Andrade, Director
3175 West 5th St, Rm. 403
Los Angeles, CA 90020
randrade@css.lacounty.gov
(213) 351-5324
(213) 386-3995 FAX

Gabrielen Tongva Nation
Sam Dunlap, Chairperson
P.O. Box 86906
Los Angeles, CA 90008
samdunlap@earthlink.net
(909) 262-9351 - cell

Tii At Society/Inter-Tribal Council of Pimu
Cindi M. Alivitre, Chairwoman-Manisar
3098 Mace Avenue, Apt. D
Gabrielen Tongva
Costa Mesa, CA 92626
calivitre@yahoo.com
(714) 504-2468 Cell

Gabrielen Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council
Robert F. Dorne, Tribal Chair/Cultural Resources
P.O. Box 490
Bellflower, CA 90707
gtongva@verizon.net
562-761-6417 - voice
562-761-6417 - fax

Gabrielen Tongva Ancestral Tribal Nation
John Tommy Rosas, Tribal Admin.
Private Address
Gabrielen Tongva
	tattlaw@gmail.com
310-570-6567

Gabrielen Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission
Anthony Morales, Chairperson
PO Box 603
Gabrielen Tongva
San Gabriel, CA 91778
GTribalCounsel@aol.com
(626) 286-1632
(626) 286-1758 - Home
(626) 286-1262 - FAX

Gabrielen Tongva Tribe
Bernie Acuna
1975 Century Pk East #1500
Gabrielen Tongva
Los Angeles, CA 90067
(619) 294-6660 - work
(310) 428-5690 - cell
(310) 587-0170 - FAX
bacuna1@gabrielinotribe.org

Gabrielen Tongva Tribe
Linda Candelaria, Chairwoman
1875 Century Park East, Suite 1500
Los Angeles, CA 90067
Gabrielen Tongva
lcandelaria1@gabrielinotribe.org
626-676-1184 - cell
(310) 587-0170 - FAX
760-904-6533-home

This list is current only as of the date of this document.

Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of the statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 597.94 of the Public Resources Code and Section 597.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resources for the proposed SCH#2012011128: CEQA Notice of Preparation (NOD); draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the "10 HOV - Add One HOV Lane in the Median in Eac Direction, from Point Avenue to State Route 57 Project; located in Los Angeles County, California."
California Native American Contacts
Los Angeles County
January 19, 2012

Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians
Andrew Salas, Chairperson
P.O. Box 393
Covina, CA 91723
(626) 928-4131
gabrielenoindians@yahoo.com

This list is current only as of the date of this document.

Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of the statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 6997.94 of the Public Resources Code and Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resources for the proposed SCH#312011028; CEQA Notice of Preparation (NOP); draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the "10 HOV - Add One HOV Lane in the Median in Each Direction, from Puente Avenue to State Route 57 Project, located in Los Angeles County, California."
Response to Comment Letter No. 2 - Native American Heritage Commission

#1 – Native American consultation was conducted by the Caltrans District Native American Coordinator and individuals on the attached list were contacted and their input solicited. Information on the project was included in this coordination effort. None of the Native American contacts listed had comments on the project.

#2 – See #1 above.

#3 – A description of Native American consultation efforts has been included in Section 3.6.1.3 in order to comply with all federal and state regulations.
February 10, 2012

Mr. Ron Kosinski
Department of Transportation, District 7 (Caltrans)
100 South Main Street, MS-16A
Los Angeles, California 90850
Phone (213) 897-3818
Fax (213) 897-0885

Subject: Notice of Preparation of a Supplemental/Subsequent Environmental Impact Report for I-10 HOV Lane from Puente Avenue to State Route 57 Project, SCH # 2012011028, in Los Angeles County

Dear Mr. Kosinski:

The Department of Fish and Game (Department) has reviewed the above-referenced Notice of Preparation (NOP) for above mentioned project relative to impacts to biological resources. The project proposes to construct in the Median in each direction of Interstate -10 (I-10) a High Occupancy Vehicle lane (HOV) from Puente Avenue to State Route - 57 (SR-57).

To enable Department staff to adequately review and comment on the proposed project we recommend the following information, where applicable, be included in the Supplemental/Subsequent Environmental Impact Report:

1. The Department opposes the elimination of watercourses (including concrete channels) and/or the canalization of natural and manmade drainages or conversion to subsurface drains. All wetlands and watercourses, whether intermittent, ephemeral, or perennial, must be retained and provided with substantial setbacks which preserve the riparian and aquatic habitat values and maintain their value to on-site and off-site wildlife populations. The Department recommends a minimum natural buffer of 100 feet from the outside edge of the riparian zone on each side of a streambed.

   a. The Department requires a Streambed Alteration Agreement (Agreement), pursuant to Section 1600 et seq. of the Fish and Game Code, with the applicant prior to any direct or indirect impact to stream bed, bank or channel or associated riparian resources. The Department’s issuance of a Agreement may be a project that is subject to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). To facilitate our issuance of the Agreement when CEQA applies, the Department as a responsible agency under CEQA may

   Conserving California’s Wildlife Since 1870
consider the local jurisdiction's (lead agency) document for the project. To minimize additional requirements by the Department under CEQA the document should fully identify the potential impacts to the lake, stream or riparian resources and provide adequate avoidance, mitigation, monitoring and reporting commitments for issuance of the Agreement. Early consultation is recommended, since modification of the proposed project may be required to avoid or reduce impacts to fish and wildlife resources.

2. A complete, recent assessment of flora and fauna within and adjacent to the project area, with particular emphasis upon identifying endangered, threatened, and locally unique species and sensitive habitats (Attachment 1).

   a. A thorough recent assessment of rare plants and rare natural communities, following the Department's Guidelines for Assessing Impacts to Rare Plants and Rare Natural Communities (Attachment 2).

      i. There appears to be inconsistency in the number and species of native plants to be permanently impacted. In the Summary of Impacts (S6) it is stated three black walnuts, a member of rare plant community, will be removed. In the proposed mitigation for this impact it states that black walnut and toyon will be replaced. However, there is no mention of impacts to toyon. This discrepancy should be clarified.

   b. A complete, recent assessment of sensitive fish, wildlife, reptile, and amphibian species. Seasonal variations in use of the project area should also be addressed.

      i. Coastal California gnatcatchers (CCGN) were present in suitable habitat on the south side of the San Jose Hills during surveys completed between 2001 and 2003. Adjacent to the proposed project is CCGN designated critical habitat and a Significant Ecological Area (SEA), both in the vicinity of Kellogg Hill and the proposed project footprint. Recent, focused, species-specific surveys, conducted at the appropriate time of year and time of day when the sensitive species are active or otherwise identifiable, are required. Acceptable species-specific survey procedures should be developed in consultation with the Department and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

   c. Rare, threatened, and endangered species to be addressed should include all those which meet the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) definition (see CEQA Guidelines, Section 15380).

   d. The Department's Wildlife Habitat Data Analysis Branch in Sacramento should be contacted at (916) 322-2463 to obtain current information on...
any previously reported sensitive species and habitats, including
Significant Natural Areas identified under Chapter 12 of the Fish and
Game Code. Also, any Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs) or
Environmentally Sensitive Habitats (ESHs) or any areas that are
considered sensitive by the local jurisdiction that are located in or adjacent
to the project area must be addressed.

3. A thorough discussion of direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts expected to
adversely affect biological resources, with specific measures to offset such impacts.
This discussion should focus on maximizing avoidance, and minimizing impacts.

   a. CEQA Guidelines, Section 15125(a), direct that knowledge of the regional
setting is critical to an assessment of environmental impacts and that
special emphasis should be placed on resources that are rare or unique to
the region.

   b. Project impacts should also be analyzed relative to their effects on off-site
habitats and populations. Specifically, this should include nearby public
lands, open space, adjacent natural habitats, and riparian ecosystems.
Impacts to and maintenance of wildlife corridor/movement areas, including
access to undisturbed habitat in adjacent areas are of concern to the
Department and should be fully evaluated and provided. The analysis
should also include a discussion of the potential for impacts resulting from
such effects as increased vehicle traffic, outdoor artificial lighting, noise
and vibration.

   c. A cumulative effects analysis should be developed as described under
CEQA Guidelines, Section 15130. General and specific plans, as well as
past, present, and anticipated future projects, should be analyzed relative
to their impacts on similar plant communities and wildlife habitats.

   d. Impacts to migratory wildlife affected by the project should be fully
evaluated including proposals to remove/disturb native and ornamental
landscaping and other nesting habitat for native birds. Impact evaluation
may also include such elements as migratory butterfly roost sites and neo-
tropical bird and waterfowl stop-over and staging sites. All migratory
nongame native bird species are protected by international treaty under
the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) of 1918 (50 C.F.R. Section
10.13). Sections 3503, 3503.5 and 3513 of the California Fish and Game
Code prohibit take of birds and their active nests, including raptors and
other migratory nongame birds as listed under the MBTA.

   e. Impacts to all habitats from City or County required Fuel Modification
Zones (FMZ). Areas slated as mitigation for loss of habitat shall not occur
within the FMZ.
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f. Proposed project activities (including disturbances to vegetation) should take place outside of the breeding bird season (February 1- September 1) to avoid take (including disturbances which would cause abandonment of active nests containing eggs and/or young). If project activities cannot avoid the breeding bird season, nest surveys should be conducted and active nests should be avoided and provided with a minimum buffer as determined by a biological monitor (the Department recommends a minimum 500-foot buffer for all active raptor nests).

4. A range of alternatives should be analyzed to ensure that alternatives to the proposed project are fully considered and evaluated. A range of alternatives which avoid or otherwise minimize impacts to sensitive biological resources including wetlands/riparian habitats, alluvial scrub, coastal sage scrub, etc. should be included. Specific alternative locations should also be evaluated in areas with lower resource sensitivity where appropriate.

a. Mitigation measures for project impacts to sensitive plants, animals, and habitats should emphasize evaluation and selection of alternatives which avoid or otherwise minimize project impacts. Compensation for unavoidable impacts through acquisition and protection of high quality habitat elsewhere should be addressed with offsite mitigation locations clearly identified.

b. The Department considers Rare Natural Communities as threatened habitats having both regional and local significance. Thus, these communities should be fully avoided and otherwise protected from project-related impacts (Attachment 2).

c. The Department generally does not support the use of relocation, salvage, and/or transplantation as mitigation for impacts to rare, threatened, or endangered species. Department studies have shown that these efforts are experimental in nature and largely unsuccessful.

5. A California Endangered Species Act (CESA) Permit must be obtained, if the project has the potential to result in “take” of species of plants or animals listed under CESA, either during construction or over the life of the project. CESA Permits are issued to conserve, protect, enhance, and restore State-listed threatened or endangered species and their habitats. Early consultation is encouraged, as significant modification to the proposed project and mitigation measures may be required in order to obtain a CESA Permit. Revisions to the Fish and Game Code, effective January 1998, require that the Department issue a separate CEQA document for the issuance of a CESA permit unless the project CEQA document addresses all project impacts to listed species and specifies a mitigation monitoring and reporting program that will meet the requirements of a CESA permit. For these reasons, the following information is requested:
Mr. Ron Kosinski  
February 10, 2012  
Page 6 of 6

a. Biological mitigation monitoring and reporting proposals should be of sufficient detail and resolution to satisfy the requirements for a CESA Permit.

b. A Department-approved Mitigation Agreement and Mitigation Plan are required for plants listed as rare under the Native Plant Protection Act.

Thank you for this opportunity to provide comment. Please contact Ms. Jamie Jackson, Staff Environmental Scientist, at (805) 382-6906 or j.jackson@dfg.ca.gov if you should have any questions and for further coordination on the proposed project.

Sincerely,

Jamie Jackson  
Staff Environmental Scientist  
South Coast Region

Attachments

cc: Ms. Leslie S. MacNair, Los Alamitos  
Ms. Terri Dickerson, Laguna Niguel

HabCon-Chron  
Department of Fish and Game  
State Clearinghouse, Sacramento

JLJ; JJJ  
JJackson/Caltrans/I-10HOVLanesProject/NOP 2012
Response to Comment Letter No. 3 - State of California Department of Fish and Game

#1 – The proposed project will not eliminate any watercourses, nor will the proposed project channelize any natural or manmade drainage. This project will not impact wetlands.

#2 – No Streambed Alteration Agreement permits will be required for this project.

#3 – Via 9 June 2011 letter correspondence from USFWS, Caltrans received a list of species which possibly inhabit undisturbed and undeveloped lands near I-10. A complete and recent assessment of the natural flora and fauna or their habitat, including a seasonal analysis of rare plants or rare natural communities, has been conducted for this project following the guidelines provided. Caltrans has been working with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), with the result that no rare, threatened, endangered, or locally unique species (or habitat) will be affected by this project.

The toyon tree(s) that may be removed as part of this project are mentioned in the Natural Environmental Study Report (as are the black walnut tree(s) which may be removed as part of the project). Toyon are cited among other native species in the EIR Section 3.5.1.4 to convey a sense of existing conditions. As addressed in Section 3.5.4.2 (Bio-7) and in Section 3.5.5, the toyon and black walnut trees which may be removed as part of this project will be replaced (as mitigation) at a rate of three to one. Again, the final removal of the toyon and walnut trees will be determined during the project’s final design, but any of these trees which may be removed will be mitigated at a three to one ratio.

Additional surveys, analysis, and coordination with the FWS have found that this project will not have an effect on the Coastal California Gnatcatcher or suitable habitat for that species. These impacts are described in Section 3.5.4.2 of the EIR. Those same studies have indicated that the project will not have any impact to rare, threatened, or endangered species (utilizing the California Natural Diversity Database, field studies by qualified Natural Resource Specialists, and coordination with the DFG). A Significant Ecological Area, as designated by the County of Los Angeles and located in the project vicinity will also not be affected as described in Section 3.5.4.2, BIO-5.

#4 – The discussion of direct (none), indirect (none), or cumulative impacts (none) is included in this project environmental documentation. See Section 3.5.3 for a list of significance criteria used as a basis for weighing likely impacts; Section 3.5.4. presents the evaluation of impacts for both No Build and Proposed Project alternatives. Cumulative impacts associated with biological resources are evaluated in Section 4.2.2.1 of the EIR.

#5 – The Natural Resource Specialists preparing the project impact analysis (both Caltrans staff and its consultant) are recognized experts in the local flora and fauna, and are particularly knowledgeable about local rare and unique habitat and species. The studies,
surveys, and analyses conducted for this project did emphasize local rare and unique habitat and species.

#6 – See above responses-to-comments about where in the EIR impacts to offsite habitats and their populations are addressed. Section 3.5.1.7 of the EIR includes a discussion of the stream course on the western side of Kellogg Hill as the only geomorphic feature within the project area where dispersion of wildlife species might still occur. Construction of HOV lanes would alter the very northern-most tip of this feature, but would not its character. No change in ability to migrate along this stream course would occur.

Temporary noise, vibration, and manmade lighting effects during construction would be confined to the heavily used freeway corridor. It is not unreasonable to describe all biological features of the freeway’s margins west of Grand Avenue as entirely horticultural landscaping. East of Grand Avenue, construction machinery would operate mostly along the existing median. Where designs require building retaining walls, all mechanical disturbance would occur at the toe of existing embankments. Biological resources susceptible to noise and vibration, or whose behavior could be influenced by artificial lighting for night construction do not inhabit these embankments. In summary, existing biological conditions are either horticultural in nature, disturbed embankment, or are biological features (e.g., black walnut and toyon) that would not be affected by temporary construction needs.

#7 – The natural resource analyses conducted for this project included the applicable and reasonably foreseeable project impacts within the project study area. It is impossible to predict impacts from future projects that have not been approved, but no approved future projects were identified during the natural resource study preparation within the project study area. The area General Plans were studied as part of the project impact analysis.

#8 – Project impacts to migrating wildlife were incorporated into the Natural Environmental Survey Report study, survey, and analysis conducted for this project. No such impacts were identified to occur as part of this project.

#9 – No impacts to City or County Fuel Modification Zones (FMZ) are proposed as part of this project.

#10 – A mitigation measure incorporated into the project (see Section 3.5.5) addresses the removal of trees by either avoiding the breeding season (January 15 to September 15), or complying with specific conditions if tree removal must occur within the season.

#11 – This project exists along an existing route. A full range of alternatives were considered, and the successful avoidance of significant impacts to rare, threatened, endangered, or locally unique species was accomplished by one alternative. The walnut trees are listed as species of special concern but the potential removal of these trees will be mitigated (if it is determined in the final design that any of these trees need to be removed) at
a three to one replacement rate. This avoidance alternative is one alternative being considered to become the “locally preferred alternative” for this project once the environmental documentation process is completed.

#12 – A complete and thorough list of proposed mitigation and enhancements are included in this project environmental documentation.

#13 – See #11 above.

#14 – No relocation, salvage and/or transportation of natural resources are proposed as part of this project.

#15 – This project does not have the potential to remove any species of plant or animals listed in the California Endangered Species Act (CESA). As such, no CESA permit is required for this project.

#16 – A project Environmental Commitment Record (ECR) that identifies mitigation measures for impacts associated with this project is mandated by Caltrans. This ECR includes avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures. The ECR is prepared in sufficient detail and resolution that mitigation can be implemented.

#17 – Should the final project design indicate that walnut trees need to be removed as part of the project, despite efforts to avoid removing these trees, a mitigation agreement and mitigation plan would be formulated in cooperation with the California Department of Fish and Game to comply with the Native Plant Protection Act.

Note: The attachments to the letter from the California Department of Fish and Game were a copy of the “Species Survey Calendar” and a copy of the “Protocols for Surveying and Evaluating Impacts to Special Status Native Plant Populations and Natural Communities”. These attachments are available for review upon request, but were not included in this response as they were provided by the California Department of Fish and Game to Caltrans for reference purposes only.
December 7, 2011

Ronald J. Kosinski, Deputy District Director
Department of Transportation, District 7
Division of Environmental Planning
100 South Main Street MS-16A
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Mr. Kosinski:

AVAILABILITY OF A DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT, FOR THE ADDITION OF ONE HIGH-OCCUPANCY VEHICLE LANE IN THE CENTER MEDIAN IN EACH DIRECTION ON INTERSTATE ROUTE 10 BETWEEN PUENTE AVENUE AND STATE ROUTE 57, LOS ANGELES COUNTY, (FFER #201100187)

The Availability of a Draft Environmental Impact Report has been reviewed by the Planning Division, Land Development Unit, Forestry Division, and Health Hazardous Materials Division of the County of Los Angeles Fire Department. The following are their comments:

PLANNING DIVISION:

3.12 Public Services and Utilities

3.12.1.1 Police and Fire Protection

1. Paragraphs 3, 9, 12, 15, 18 and 21 should be revised to state, “Emergency services (i.e., ambulance and paramedics) within the study area are provided by the Los Angeles County Fire Department and private transport providers.”

2. Paragraph 20 should be revised to state, “Fire protection in unincorporated Los Angeles County in the vicinity of I-10 is provided by the Los Angeles County Fire Department, Fire Station 146 (20604 E. Loyalton Drive).”

3. We have no other comments at this time.

SERVING THE UNINCORPORATED AREAS OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY AND THE CITIES OF:

ACORO HILLS ARTESIA AZUSA BALDWIN PARK BELL BELL GARDENS BELLEFLOWER BRADBURY CALABASAS CARSON CERRITOS CLAREMONT COMMERCE CUDAHY HAWTHORNE HIDDEN HILLS HUNTINGTON PARK INGLEWOOD IRVINGDALE LACasad LAMONT LAXAFORD LA MIRADA LA PUENTE LAKewood LANDASTER LANCASTER LEBANON LYNWOOD MALIBU MANHATTAN BEACH MANSIONE PARKS MARIPOSA MARYSVILLE MORGAN HILL NARVISON NORMAN OCEANSIDE PALmdale PICO RIVERA POMONA RANCHO PALOS VERDES ROLLING HILLS ROLLING HILLS ESTATES ROSERIMAN SANTA CRUZ SANTA CLARITA SIGNAL HILL SOUTH EL MONTE SOUTH GATE TEMPLE CITY WALKIRI WEST HOLLYWOOD WESTLAKE VILLAGE WHITTIER

June 2012
LAND DEVELOPMENT UNIT:

1. The Fire Prevention Division, Land Development Unit has no comments regarding this project.

2. The County of Los Angeles Fire Department, Land Development Unit appreciates the opportunity to comment on this project.

FORESTRY DIVISION – OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS:

1. The statutory responsibilities of the County of Los Angeles Fire Department, Forestry Division include erosion control, watershed management, rare and endangered species, vegetation, fuel modification for Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones or Fire Zone 4, archeological and cultural resources, and the County Oak Tree Ordinance.

2. The areas germane to the statutory responsibilities of the County of Los Angeles Fire Department, Forestry Division have been addressed.

HEALTH HAZARDOUS MATERIALS DIVISION:

1. The Health Hazardous Materials Division has no objection to the proposed project.

If you have any additional questions, please contact this office at (323) 890-4330.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

JOHN R. TODD, CHIEF, FORESTRY DIVISION
PREVENTION SERVICES BUREAU

JRT:ij
Response to Comment Letter No. 4 - County of Los Angeles Fire Department

#1 - The text has been revised to reflect the requested changes.

#2 - The text has been revised to reflect the requested changes.
December 20, 2011

Mr. Ronald Kosinsky, Deputy District Director  
CalTrans, District 7, Division of Environmental Planning  
100 South Main Street, Suite 100  
Los Angeles, CA 90012-3712

RE: INTERSTATE 10 HOV LANES

Dear Mr. Kosinsky:

Thank you for responding to some of the City’s concerns on your letter dated August 25, 2010. In that letter, you were able to address several of our concerns; however, a number of issues remain as well as some additional concerns due to the extensive revisions from the 2002 plans. Since the revised plans are not very detailed nor complete, there may be additional cause for concerns in the future. This information was given to Caltrans in 2002, and since then no formal response was returned.

We have the following questions/issues for further discussion and follow up.

1. We recommend continuous entry/exit points as used in other California highways. According to CalTrans, this system is safer and is the trend of the future. The 95% plans do not have continuous entry / exit points.

2. We understand that the HOV lanes will be limited to vehicles with two or more occupants. We recommend that occupants per vehicle restrictions only be enforced during peak travel times for each direction. This program is used very successfully and safely in other part of California. The 95% plans do not have time restrictions on the for the HOV lanes.

3. Please provide plans that reflect the extensive changes to the Westfield Plaza since 2002. It is not acceptable to reduce the improvements made to the circulation road. Addition of any parking directly off this circulation road is prohibited. The 95% plans have not been updated to show the current conditions on the circulation road.

4. We object to the changes proposed to the Vincent off ramp without additional mitigation. This change increased the traffic congestion on City streets. An off ramp directly to California Avenue or other mitigation is required. As it is, vehicles going south and turning west on to Plaza Drive back up into and through the off ramp intersection during the peak traffic periods. The City continues to object to some of the elements regarding this intersection that as shown on the 95% plans.
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5. Remove soundwalls obstructing views to existing business districts and/or negotiate directly with the adjacent owners.

Sound wall at the Audi Dealership or the motels has not been resolved.

6. The EB on/off ramps at West Covina Parkway warrant some changes to the turning movements as well as the addition of left turn signal phasing. In addition, we request a no right turn on red for SB West Covina Parkway to the EB on-ramp be implemented.

7. On the on-ramp from Pacific Avenue to Eastbound I-10, a) the stacking of metered vehicles has been reduced. Justify that vehicles will not back up from the meter onto City streets as they currently do. b) Provide meter signal controls that eliminate the backing up of stacking onto the City streets. c) Add no right turn on red from Southbound Pacific Avenue to the on-ramp to avoid intersection gridlock. d) On westbound Garvey Avenue South, the lanes should consist of a left turn, a through lane, and a combination right/through lane. e) Add left turn phasing for the intersection of Garvey Avenue South off ramp and Pacific Avenue.

8. More detailed information and access to the traffic study is required for the narrowing and possible lane width of Garvey Avenue South in front of the Civic Center. Recently proposed future developments were likely not considered in the CEQA document. We request that three lanes be maintained as well as room for future off street parking.

9. Installation of sidewalk access is requested for the section of Garvey Avenue South in front of the Civic center.

Sheets L-6 and L-7 seem to indicate there is a sidewalk and retaining wall. However, they are not labeled as such and there are no details for sidewalks, drive approaches, or retaining walls in the plans.

10. More details are required on exactly how CalTrans will comply with current clean water regulations as currently trash, litter, and contamination flow to the City streets and storm drains during rainstorms.

There is nothing found on the plans that addresses this issue.

11. Preserve both right turn pockets from eastbound Garvey Avenue South to the Civic Center.

The western turn pocket has been eliminated. The eastern turn pocket (into parking structure) has been preserved.

12. Eliminate the 34 parallel parking stalls at Westfield Plaza along the circulation road. The circulation road shall be preserved or rebuilt with one eastbound lane, one westbound lane, and one center turn lane. All turn pockets shall also be preserved.

The plan needs to be updated showing the current circulation road conditions.

We are thankful that many of these have been currently answered (shown as strikeout), however, a number of them still need further discussion and resolution. As mentioned, a number of items are currently proposed that were never considered in the initial CEQA document. Please refer to Attachment A for our comments on the CEQA document.
City of West Covina  
Public Works Department  
Comments on Draft Initial Study/Environmental Assessment  
For the addition of HOV Lanes on Interstate 10  
December 2012

The following items are comments, concerns, and questions of the city, community, business owners, and residents of West Covina, which need further study, answers, and/or mitigation. Since CalTrans had told us that these issues would be resolved during the design period, we would like to start discussing them again.

1. The changes to the intersection at Vincent will transfer the congestion from the mainline to the City streets and results in a lower, unacceptable level of service. We do not believe this has been fully mitigated.

2. Soundwalls in residential areas are fully supported, however, the installation of soundwalls in front of current or future commercial properties drastically impacts businesses and the City. Caltrans has been working with the City to remove the walls from in front of auto row and the motels however they still remain in the documents. How will this be mitigated?

3. The plans in the document are unclear and lack clarity to evaluate the project.

4. The importance of the parking at Westfield Shoppingtown is downplayed in the report. This parking is vital to the retail center, to the City, and to the Redevelopment Agency. Even prior to the peak-shopping season, these spaces are already full on a recent Sunday evening. The proposed plans and the EIR reflect the conditions from 2002 and not 2012. We need to see the proposed design based on actual conditions. The two lanes each way with a center turn lane must remain as this was a condition of approval for the Best Buy store to mitigate traffic congestion. We have been asking for this for almost two years now.

5. The closing of on/off-ramps at Azusa Avenue and Grand Avenue should not occur at the same time, as these are the only two north/south connectors from the City to the 60 Freeway.

6. Serving retail centers must occur during the holiday shopping season (November and December) when a very large percentage of sales occur. This access is vital to the economic being of the retail businesses and of the City.

7. As a mitigation measure, detour and construction signs should clearly indicate that local businesses are open during construction.

8. Based on the foregoing, the environmental impacts of the proposed project have not been mitigated to a level of non-significance.

9. We have been told that the queuing on the off ramps has been increased to help with congestion on City streets. We do not believe this has been mitigated and we would like to see the before and after counts for queuing.

10. The existing walls on the north side near Lark Ellen Avenue and Azusa Avenue should be removed and rebuilt with new wall in consultation with the residents there. In addition, there is a large open area on the north side near Lark Ellen Avenue. How will this be landscaped and secured so that the area is not inhabited by vagrants?

11. Graffiti needs to be addressed during construction. Merely stating that Caltrans will work with the City does not describe the problem or the needed mitigation measures. Specific mitigation measures need to be provided. The current lack of graffiti removal in the Baldwin Park segment would not be acceptable to the leaders of West Covina.

12. Page 1-15 of the ED does not mention that City Permits are required.
13. More details are required on exactly how Caltrans will comply with current clean water regulations as currently trash, litter, and contamination flow to the City streets and storm drains during rainstorms. There is nothing found on the plans that addresses this issue.
Thank you for working with us on these issues and we look forward to further cooperation in resolving these comments. We still believe some impacts could be further mitigated prior to final designs. Please feel free to contact me should you have any questions or wish to meet again.

Sincerely,

Shannon A. Yauchzee
Public Works Director/City Engineer

cce: Zareh Shabbazian - PE, PMP
Senior Transportation Engineer
Division of Program/Project Management, Central

Mr. Gary Iverson, Senior Environmental Planner
CalTrans, District 7, Division of Environmental Planning
100 South Main Street, Suite 100
Los Angeles, CA 90012-3712

Chris Freelander, Deputy City Manager
Chris Ching, Community Development Commission Director
Jeff Anderson, Planning Director
Response to Comment Letter No. 5 - City of West Covina Public Works Department

#1 – The current Caltrans policy for Los Angeles County is to provide a buffer and identified ingress/egress points for High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes. However, studies are currently underway by the University of California, Berkeley to understand the potential benefits/disbenefits of “open access” versus a buffer at HOV lanes. One of their studies concluded that there is no significant difference between the two systems with regards to safety. The current practice in District 7 (Los Angeles Area) is to use a buffer to be consistent with the other HOV's in the area. While these studies are not yet completed, several observations have become apparent, including the fact that some areas of “open access” HOV lanes are being changed back to a controlled ingress/egress system for the following reasons:

First, it is currently observed that the use of “open access” HOV lanes may cause confusion to the motoring public because the “broken line pattern” used in “open access” HOV lanes is similar to the lane delineation used for mixed flow lanes. Drivers in these areas have experienced a greater rate of traffic violations, and have stated that they didn’t know the lane they were entering was an HOV lane (despite signs and delineation to the contrary).

Second, the “broken lane” delineation allows multiple passenger vehicles to constantly weave in and out of the HOV lanes. Observations have been made that continual ingress into and egress out of HOV lanes results in greater congestion because of the added weaving in and out of the HOV lane. It has also been observed that because “open access” HOV lanes allow for multiple rider vehicles to enter the HOV lanes at multiple points, this causes the HOV traffic to slow down to accommodate the vehicles entering the lane at multiple points and therefore results in an overall slower speed in the HOV lanes.

Third, the “open access” ingress and egress pattern is not consistently used throughout Los Angeles County. Changes to one HOV lane on one route in Los Angeles County is likely to add to driver confusion, and result in less than positive conditions. A policy change would need to be applied throughout the HOV system.

Finally, sufficient ingress/egress points and signs are being included in this project to assure that drivers can safely exit and enter the HOV to access any exit they desire. It was, therefore, decided that the HOV lanes in this project would adhere to the current policy of buffer and constrained ingress/egress points because this “system” is of benefit to the motoring public.

#2 – Caltrans has, in the past, changed the lane designation from HOV operational use to certain portions of the day and mixed flow use for the remainder, as the City of West Covina suggests. However, these past Caltrans projects have since been changed back to the traditional use of HOV lanes because of confusion to the motoring public as to the lane use...
designation and a far greater rate of traffic violations being issued when the lane designation was changed twice daily than with a fixed lane designation.

#3 – The requested plans were provided to the City of West Covina at meetings subsequent to the Public Hearing for this project. In addition, project plans can be viewed at the District 7 Caltrans office at 100 S. Main Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012.

Extensive planning has occurred to develop a design that minimizes the amount of off-street parking that would be affected by freeway widening next to the mall. This includes incorporation of non-standard design features into the project. The final design for the project will reflect this objective.

#4 – The project design does not change the existing condition for the traffic traveling south on Vincent Avenue and into the mall; there is an existing traffic signal that controls southbound traffic on Vincent Avenue. The new modification only adds the left turn movement at this traffic signal. The new modification, which will remove the eastbound I-10 off-ramp to northbound Vincent Avenue will eliminate the existing weaving along northbound Vincent Avenue between the existing eastbound I-10 off-ramp to northbound Vincent Avenue and westbound I-10 on-ramp from northbound Vincent Avenue. Also, this modification will eliminate the weaving along eastbound I-10 between eastbound I-10 on-ramp from southbound Vincent Avenue and the existing eastbound I-10 off-ramp to northbound Vincent Avenue. Another improvement is the reconfiguration of northbound Vincent Avenue to include four lanes south of the intersection with the eastbound I-10 on-ramp. At this location, Vincent Avenue will have two dedicated right turn lanes and two through lanes.

#5 – Noise barriers are to be constructed as shown in the revised aerial exhibits (see Appendix E). Caltrans has worked diligently with the City of West Covina and local businesses to design the noise barriers to a minimum level in the commercial area, but Caltrans still must provide the effective noise mitigation required by law.

The noise barrier specifically mentioned in this letter adjacent to the Audi dealer may be able to be shortened further (reduced length not shown on Appendix E), but only if the Audi dealer constructs the alternative wall between the eastern edge of their property and the adjacent residential home as proposed and agreed to in previous negotiation meetings. This alternative noise barrier between the Audi dealer and the residential home will provide the required noise mitigation. However, if this alternative wall is not constructed prior to the end of project construction, Caltrans will be compelled to construct the wall as shown on the aerial exhibits, in order to provide the required noise mitigation.

To address the noise barriers proposed adjacent to the motels, Caltrans has sent correspondence to the motel owners asking for their input on the noise barriers. To date only two motels have responded, both indicating that they did not want the required mitigation
noise barriers constructed. Those two noise barriers have been adjusted to reflect those two requests (revised length shown on Appendix E). Numerous attempts have been made to solicit a response from the other motel owners, but none have responded. Thus the noise barriers are to be constructed as identified in the aerial exhibit Appendix E.

#6 – The Office of Traffic Investigations conducted an investigation in response to this comment. The investigation involved field visits and review of the accident history at the intersection. Based on this investigation and traffic data prepared by Caltrans for this project, the current proposed intersection configuration was determined not to warrant changes to the signal staging at the eastbound I-10 offramp to West Covina Parkway (note: Pacific Avenue turns into West Covina Parkway). Another investigation was conducted to see if the eastbound off-ramp to West Covina Parkway meets the criteria to warrant a left turn phase per MUTCD, Ch. 4, Sec. 4D.19, 2012 ed. Based on the investigation, neither the eastbound off-ramp nor Garvey Avenue South warrants a left turn phase.

#7 – a) The existing configuration of the on-ramp is one HOV bypass lane and one mixed flow lane; the project design provides two metered mixed flow lanes, which will improve the existing “stacking” condition referred to in the comment.

b) See #7-a) above.

c) See #6 above.

d) Based on traffic data, no deficiency was found with the existing lane configuration.

e) See #6 above.

#8 – The future projects identified in the comment have not yet been approved or funded and therefore have not been included in our analysis. Only approved projects have been incorporated into the studies prepared for this Environmental Impact Report.

#9 – There will be a sidewalk on the south side of Garvey Avenue along the City Hall, as discussed with the City. This feature will be shown on the final design engineering drawings.

#10 – This project will contain Special Provisions to ensure Best Management Practices are implemented in accordance with Caltrans Stormwater Water Quality Handbook, Project Planning and Design Guide, July 2010. These Special Provisions, along with Standard Specifications and Standard Plans are designed to ensure that the project does not produce a significant adverse effect to water quality after project implementation. The details of the Special Provisions are formulated during the final design stage of the project, and are therefore not finalized at this point in time.

Additionally, this project will require the contractor to develop and carry out a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to ensure water quality is not adversely affected by the
project during project construction. The SWPPP will be prepared when the project construction contract is awarded.

The implementation of the Special Provisions and the SWPPP will be continually monitored for compliance by the Caltrans Resident Engineer.

#11 – The eastern turn pocket (into the parking structure) has been preserved. In regards to the western right turn pocket, unfortunately, there is not sufficient room in the roadway to allow this turn pocket to remain.

#12 – The existing project design configuration at the Westfield Mall does not show parking along the freeway side. In regards to the project design of the circulation road along the freeway, one lane in each direction will be maintained as well as a center turn lane. The existing configuration along the project design does not show right turn pockets.

#13 – See #4 above.

#14 – See #5 above.

#15 – Numerous meetings have been conducted over the last several years (including many meetings in the last six months) with the City of West Covina, in addition to the two Public Hearings conducted for this project, which were also attended by representatives from the City of West Covina. At each of those meetings project plans were reviewed and discussed in detail. Additionally, updates to project plans under design have been provided to the City of West Covina. Many more meetings are planned with the City of West Covina prior to the approval of the Environmental Impact Report, and further clarification of project plans can be made at those meetings. Project plans are available for review at the District 7 Caltrans office at 100 S. Main Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012.

#16 – Caltrans fully understands the importance of parking supply to the economic success of Westfield Shoppingtown. Nonstandard design features, including reduced median shoulders, have been included in the current design of the proposed project to minimize the amount of off-street parking that would be affected. The final design for the project reflects this objective. Project plans are available for review at the District 7 Caltrans office at 100 S. Main Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012. Please also see the answer to #12 above.

#17 – As stated in the Environmental Impact Report, no two consecutive ramps will be closed during project construction. This stipulation has also been included in the Environmental Commitment Record (ECR) for this project.

#18 – As stated in the Environmental Impact Report Section 3.2.5, Mitigation Measures, no ramps will be closed directly adjacent to the Westfield (West Covina) Mall or the Eastland Mall during the time period between Thanksgiving and Christmas (i.e., from the Monday preceding Thanksgiving to January 9th).
I-10 HOV LANE PROJECT
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

#19 – The appropriate detour and construction signs will be provided as per Caltrans policy during project construction.

#20 – Project design elements and mitigation measures have been incorporated into this project to the extent possible to avoid, minimize, or mitigate impacts resulting from this project. Some impacts, despite best efforts, cannot be reduced to a level less than significant; these are identified in the document.

#21 – As is pointed out in Section 1.2 of the environmental document, the intent of the proposed project is to improve travel capacity and reduce congestion within the I-10 corridor. This would also assist in relieving congestion at access points into the corridor. Of the five freeway interchanges to I-10 located within the City of West Covina (Pacific, Vincent, Azusa, Citrus, Grand and Holt Avenues), Vincent Avenue has been specifically identified for analysis of traffic conditions, due to the fact that Caltrans is proposing a reconfiguration of the geometrics at that location.

Currently, the Vincent Avenue/I-10 eastbound ramps interchange operates at LOS A, with an average of 7.1 seconds of delay. As is noted in section 3.2.4.2 of the EIR (Traffic Impacts – Proposed Project Alternative – Impact TRAF-2 [page 3.2-12]), traffic operations at this location were analyzed for Buildout (2015) and Future (2030) conditions using the Synchro/Simtraffic model. The results indicate that, in the post-project condition, the Vincent Avenue/eastbound I-10 ramps interchange would operate at LOS E in 2015 (64.6 seconds of delay) and LOS F in 2030 (84.3 seconds of delay), with the movement on northbound Vincent Avenue to eastbound I-10 being the most affected movement at the interchange. The shared through and right turn lane is noted as a likely contributing factor to this situation. It is further noted that the proposed realignment of the on-ramp, coupled with the signalization of the right turn movements, appear to offset the queuing and spillback issues currently being experienced at that location.

At the Vincent Avenue and Plaza/Lakes Drive intersection, currently, traffic operates at LOS C, with 30.9 seconds of delay. As shown in Table 3.2-4 of the EIR, in the post-project condition for 2015, it is expected the LOS C would be maintained, with an estimated 30.3 seconds of delay, essentially unchanged from present conditions. However, by 2030, conditions are expected to become LOS D with 46.8 seconds of delay.

Caltrans recognizes that the impact at these two nearby intersections require treatment and has proposed mitigation. On northbound Vincent Avenue at the eastbound I-10 ramps, by 2015 the existing shared (through/right) will be converted to an exclusive through lane and a right turn deceleration lane of approximately 250 feet in length will be added (see mitigation measure in Section 3.2.5 of the EIR). Also, the proposed crosswalk at this location would be removed from the design consideration. This would result in a LOS B, with an estimated 13.6 seconds of delay at that intersection.
By 2030, additional mitigation is planned. At the eastbound I-10 on-ramp from northbound Vincent Avenue, the capacity would be increased by adding a lane at the ramp terminal of 600-650 feet in length and relocating the proposed ramp meter approximately 250 feet to the east. This improvement would result in operation of the Vincent Avenue/eastbound I-10 ramps intersection at LOS C (26.5 seconds of delay) and the Vincent Avenue and Plaza/Lakes Drive intersection at LOS D (47.4 seconds of delay).

With signal optimization included, it is expected that these mitigation measures would allow both intersections to operate at an acceptable level of service.

#22 – The goal of the environmental process is to avoid or minimize community impacts. In an attempt to achieve that goal Caltrans considered a range of potential solutions to the community concerns related to the 4-ft space proposed to remain between the existing property walls and the new soundwall. This review took into consideration project costs, legal constraints, procedural complexities, estimated timeframes, and the potential for successful negotiations with all of the adjacent property owners.

Caltrans considered the following build options:

1. **Proceed as recommended leaving the dual walls and 4-ft gap as planned.** This option would have the lowest cost, no legal constraints, minimal procedural complexities and the shortest timeframe. Negotiations with the adjacent property owners cannot be qualified.

2. **Proceed as recommended leaving the dual walls but offer to sell the 4 ft area as excess to the adjacent property owners after decertifying these 4 ft areas under Right of Way “finding A”.** This option would be infeasible because legal mandates and procedures require that any excess property be offered in a public sale at market value and not at any "discounted rate". Also, if the property owners were to acquire these excess properties, then these transactions would potentially increase the tax burdens on each property owner, and may affect any Proposition 13 tax advantage the property owners currently enjoy. Finally, it is foreseeable that some owners may want to acquire the parcel adjacent to their properties, while others may not, resulting in potential conflicts between owners and a complicated maintenance scenario.

3. **Proceed as recommended leaving the dual walls but offer the 4 ft area to the adjacent property owners as individual easements (not a sale).** This option would be infeasible because legal mandates and procedures require that any excess property be offered in a public sale.

4. **Proceed as recommended leaving the dual walls but offer to transfer the entire 4 ft area to the City of West Covina as a local easement (not a sale).** It is most probable that the City would not want to obtain such an easement, which would be of little or no value, yet the City would incur all costs for future maintenance.
5. Direct a redesign to replace the existing walls with the new soundwall using temporary construction easements. While this option is feasible and still under consideration by Caltrans, it would have increased construction and right-of-way costs over Option 1, as well as more procedural complexities and potential construction schedule implications. This option would have the advantage of eliminating the need for long-term maintenance of the 4-ft gap between walls.

After much deliberation and considering all options, it has been determined that Option 1 would be the best approach. This option is currently part of the Proposed Project Alternative. Implementation of Option 5 in lieu of Option 1 will be considered during final design.

We would anticipate and encourage further discussions on specific measures that address individual property owners’ concerns during the development of the final plans for the project. Heightened maintenance and security features will be fully considered for the 4-ft gap area. This would be a joint responsibility of the Caltrans Design, Right of Way and Construction staff.

#23 – Funds have been provided in the proposed contract to address graffiti removal during project construction.

#24 – City of West Covina will be added to Table 1-3 under Regional and Local Agency. City of West Covina confirmed (3/5/2012 e-mail) that permit fees will be waived for work related to the Rte 10 HOV project being performed by Caltrans Contractors within the City of West Covina right of way.

#25 – See #10 above.
December 28, 2011

Mr. Ronald J. Kosinski
Deputy District Director
Division of Environmental Planning
Department of Transportation, District 7
100 South Main Street, MS-16A
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Mr. Kosinski:

REVIEW COMMENTS
NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING AND AVAILABILITY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE ADDITION OF HIGH-OCCUPANCY VEHICLE LANES ON THE SAN BERNARDINO FREEWAY (INTERSTATE 10) FROM PUENTE AVENUE TO STATE ROUTES 57/71 (07-LA-10; PM 33.242.4)

The Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department (Department) submits the following review comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR), dated November 2011, for the addition of high-occupancy vehicle lanes on the San Bernardino Freeway (Interstate 10) from Puente Avenue to State Routes 57/71 (Project). The proposed Project adds one lane in each direction of Interstate 10 from the Puente Avenue interchange in the City of Baldwin Park to the State Route 57/71 interchange in the City of Pomona. The Project site traverses the cities of West Covina, Covina, and San Dimas, and unincorporated Los Angeles County territory.

The proposed Project is not expected to significantly impact the Department’s operations or resources. However, emergency access for Department personnel, vehicles, and equipment must be maintained through the Project site during all phases of construction activities. As discussed in the DEIR, a Transportation Management Plan (TMP) should be prepared for the proposed Project and reviewed by the Department and other agencies that provide emergency response services to the Project site and vicinity (see Section 3.12.4.2; see also Log No. 2-1 of the Environmental Commitment Record in Appendix D). The TMP should then be implemented during the construction activities to reduce construction-related traffic impacts to a level of insignificance.

A Tradition of Service Since 1859
The Department has no other comments to submit at this time, but reserves the right to further address this matter in subsequent reviews of the proposed Project.

Thank you for including the Department in the environmental review process for the proposed Project. Should you have any questions of the Department regarding this matter, please contact Lester Miyoshi, of my staff, at (626) 300-3012 and refer to Facilities Planning Bureau Tracking Number 11-088. You may also contact Mr. Miyoshi, via e-mail, at Lhmiyosh@lasd.org.

Sincerely,

LEROY D. BACA, SHERIFF

Gary T.K. Tse, Director
Facilities Planning Bureau
Response to Comment Letter No. 6 - County of Los Angeles Sheriff’s Department

#1 – The Draft Traffic Management Plan (TMP) is being formulated for this project and has been sent to the County of Los Angeles Sheriff’s Department for its review and comment. The final TMP will be furnished to the Los Angeles Sheriff’s Department and implemented during project construction.
December 29, 2011

File No: 15-00.04-00
21-00.04-00
22-00.04-00

Mr. Ron Kosinski, Deputy District Director
Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation, District 7
100 South Main Street, Mail Stop 16A
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Mr. Kosinski:

The San Bernardino Freeway High Occupancy Vehicle Lane Project

The County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County (Districts) received a Draft Environmental Impact Report for the subject project on November 17, 2011. We offer the following comments regarding sewerage service:

- The proposed project may impact existing and/or proposed Districts’ trunk sewers over which it will be constructed. Existing and proposed Districts’ trunk sewers are located directly under and/or cross directly beneath the proposed project alignment. The Districts cannot issue a detailed response to or permit construction of the proposed project until project plans and specifications that incorporate Districts’ sewer lines are submitted. In order to prepare these plans, you will need to submit a map of the proposed project alignment, when available, to the attention of Ms. Martha Tremblay of the Districts’ Sewer Design Section at the address shown above. The Districts will then provide you with the plans for all Districts’ facilities that will be impacted by the proposed project. Then, when revised plans that incorporate our sewers have been prepared, please submit copies of the same for our review and comment.

If you have any questions, please contact the undersigned at (562) 908-4288, extension 2717.

Very truly yours,

Stephen R. Maguin

Adriana Raza
Customer Service Specialist
Facilities Planning Department

AR: ar
C: M. Tremblay
Response to Comment Letter No. 7 - County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County

#1 – Sewer lines are affected as part of the freeway widening projects. Caltrans will submit proposed relocation plans to the Sanitation Districts for review and approval when such plans are ready for review.
January 4, 2012

Ronald J. Kosinski
Deputy District Director
Division of Environmental Planning
Department of Transportation, District 7
100 S. Main Street MS-16A
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Mr. Kosinski:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the I-10 HOV Lane Project. Although the proposed project is not expected to result in any long-term impacts on transit:

Several transit corridors with Metro bus service could be impacted by the project. Metro Bus Operations Control Special Events Coordinator should be contacted at 213-922-4632 regarding construction activities that may impact Metro bus lines. Other Municipal Bus Service Operators may also be impacted and therefore should be included in construction outreach efforts.

MTA looks forward to reviewing the Final EIR. If you have any questions regarding this response, please call me at 213-922-2836 or by email at hawells@metro.net. Please send the Final EIR to the following address:

MTA CEQA Review Coordination
One Gateway Plaza MS 99-23-2
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952
Attn: Scott Hartwell

Sincerely,

Scott Hartwell
CEQA Review Coordinator, Long Range Planning
Response to Comment Letter No. 8 - Metro

#1 – Currently a Traffic Mitigation Plan (TMP) is being prepared for this project. The TMP addresses construction activities that would influence how Metro and other area transit service providers (and emergency service providers) in the area operate. Copies of that TMP have been circulated to Metro and other area transit service providers (and emergency service providers) for consultation and review purposes. The following is included in the Environmental Commitment Record for the project:

Caltrans has a commitment to periodically coordinate with the transit companies to discuss changes in the construction operations and potential impacts to the transit providers. Caltrans will coordinate all street, connector, and ramp closures with the transit service. Wherever possible, these closures will not take place during the peak commute hours. In addition, consecutive ramp and street closures will be avoided.
576 Lincoln Avenue  
Pomona, CA 91767

Mr. Ron Kosinski  
Deputy District Director  
California Department of Transportation  
Division of Environmental Planning  
100 South Main Street MS 16A  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Mr. Kosinski:

The following are comments made for the Interstate 10 High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) project between Puente Avenue and SR-57/SR-71, and are made in my own capacity and not on behalf of any organization or agency I may be affiliated with.

**Outreach/Public Communication:** Outreach on this project is typical of Caltrans widening projects, but is not comparable to Metro or OCTA-led projects in the region. There have been no presentations to local city councils, the public meeting was poorly publicized and at a location not centrally located to the project site, and no online or even email submission of comments was available. (Therefore, I am mailing these comments in order so that they may be included in the record.) It appears that the document has been mailed to local agencies but no description of recent coordination (not letters from seven years ago) is included. Nor is there evidence that mailings were made to residents within the immediate vicinity of the project.

The UStream streaming was not interactive. In addition, the 2003 IS/EA, referenced in Section 7.3.1, is not available online, although the draft version is available. Nor is it still available at the depository libraries listed. It is an imposition on the public to review the document at Caltrans’s offices, especially since an appointment must be made with Caltrans staff due to building security. Therefore, some comments below may refer to the Draft 2002 IS/EA for the project as it is the only version readily accessible. I request that the 2003 Final IS/EA for the project also be placed online.

**Project definition:** The 2002 IS/EA included an additional HOV climbing lane on I-10 in areas with severe grade, such as Kellogg Hill. Climbing lanes are essential in order to make the HOV lane usable by transit vehicles. As is evident from observation of traffic on I-10, buses climb Kellogg Hill at speeds below the prevailing speed of traffic, even in rush hour. I have observed buses both in a following vehicle and onboard and they generally average about 35-45 mph eastbound past Holt Avenue, and westbound past Kellogg Drive.

Without including the HOV climbing lane, buses will cause a traffic obstruction when carpools back up, and some may be tempted to cross the HOV/regular lane buffer to avoid slow moving buses. This could increase the accident rate. However restricting the HOV lane to ban buses would negatively impact transit in situations where the regular lanes are not free flowing, but the HOV lanes are.

Although the document briefly mentions climbing lanes, neither cross section nor limits are included.

**Consideration of open access HOV lanes:** Because of the prevalence of the Silver Streak, a major Bus Rapid Transit line by Foothill Transit, there is the possibility of significant weaving back and forth as
buses attempt to take advantage of the HOV lane in order to meet their schedule. The Silver Streak currently has freeway stops at Puente Avenue and Azusa Avenue, and exits the freeway at West Covina Parkway and re-enters the freeway at Vincent Avenue. This weaving can reduce traffic speeds significantly and cause accidents. In addition, the bus is limited in accessing HOV lanes only at designated openings. Thus the lanes near these openings have an increased amount of congestion.

The Bay Area and now Orange County have successfully implemented open access HOV lanes, where drivers can enter the HOV lane at any location instead of specific locations. This would facilitate transit use of the HOV lanes since drivers could use the lanes when traffic congestion warranted, without trying to guess whether the HOV lane or regular lane would be better or having to merge to the right in too short of a distance.

Open access HOV lanes should be evaluated and possibly implemented on this project.

Consideration of transit: Unfortunately the I-10 HOV project severely disadvantages the Silver Streak as a means of transport. In the current HOV configuration BRT buses cannot use the HOV lane east of El Monte Station, unless they weave through four to five lanes of traffic near Santa Anita Avenue and Puente Avenue. They cannot use the HOV lane at all from Puente Avenue to Azusa Avenue because of the freeway stops, and use of the HOV lane east of Azusa Avenue is potentially dangerous because the bus will slow to 35-45 mph as it ascends Kellogg Hill. These impacts should be disclosed in the IS/EA and be mitigated to the greatest extent possible. Reconsideration should be made for HOV drop ramps at Vincent Avenue and West Covina Parkway to accommodate BRT, especially as it did not exist in the 2002 study. (Median stations at Puente Avenue and Azusa Avenue may be unnecessary as those are low ridership stops.)

In addition, buses use the auxiliary lanes and former bus turnouts at Vincent Avenue and West Covina Parkway to bypass auto traffic. This is in effect a de facto HOV lane for commuter express buses that do not stop at El Monte Station. Using these lanes saves an additional five to ten minutes over the time savings on the El Monte Busway in the westbound direction. This "bus bypass" through use of the exit-only auxiliary lanes, onramp merge lanes, and bus only lanes between onramps and offramps provide a significant time advantage to transit, and should be maintained. In the eastbound direction, the former "bypass" at West Covina Parkway should be reopened as part of this project, to allow transit to use a continuous auxiliary lane from Puente Avenue to Citrus Avenue.

Also, to accommodate transit, a second HOV-only left turn lane from West Covina Parkway to the westbound I-10 and a HOV bypass lane from northbound Vincent Avenue to eastbound I-10 needs to be considered. Currently, with Vincent Avenue congestion and the ramp meter at Vincent Avenue and eastbound I-10, the Silver Streak BRT can be delayed more than 10 minutes (beyond travel time of the deviation to serve the West Covina Plaza). Similarly left turn vehicles onto westbound I-10 can be delayed two or three light cycles in order to get on the freeway. A proposed configuration could create a third right turn lane onto I-10 just past the Chase Bank parking lot, and could be made for buses only and serve in other instances as a shoulder, similar to the configuration on the southbound US-101 onramp at Ventura Boulevard.

In addition, because the demographics of transit riders and carpoolers may be different, environmental justice and Title VI analysis should be done to ensure that transit riders are not negatively impacted when they cannot take advantage of an improvement available to carpoolers.
Bypass lanes: Bypass lanes are proposed at Citrus Street, Holt Avenue, and Kellogg Drive. It is unclear if these are new bypass lanes or these will be the only existing bypass lanes remaining.

To accommodate existing transit lines, HOV bypass lanes should be placed in the westbound direction at Via Verde, Grand Avenue, Barranca Avenue (SB), Citrus Street, and West Covina Parkway. In the eastbound direction they should be placed at Vincent Avenue (NB and SB) and Barranca Avenue. The onramps could be lengthened to accommodate the longer queues, or a striped “buses only” area could be placed where shoulders ordinarily would be in place, similar to the configuration on the southbound US-101 ramp at Ventura Boulevard. Otherwise transit gets disadvantaged further as buses already have to deviate to serve stops off the freeway mainline, and now have to wait at meters.

Cumulative impacts: This should be updated to incorporate present status of projects (i.e., some of the projects listed as in the planning or construction stages are completed).

In addition, the California High Speed Rail Authority has proposed to use the Interstate 10 corridor, including the section through West Covina, as its alignment for the Los Angeles-San Diego via the Inland Empire route. Although this segment of the project is highly speculative, the alignment is in the planning stages and may impact this project.

Aesthetics: No viewpoints in the eastbound direction were evaluated. Specifically, there is an important distant view of Mount Baldy and the San Bernardino Mountains eastbound on I-10, near the Via Verde interchange. The development in this area is semi-rural and includes some vegetation, but not enough to block this view. (See attached photo from Google Street View.) Unfortunately that view will now be blocked by a sound wall. The sound wall is likely unnecessary due to the low population that the wall would serve and the high cost due to the fact that the roadway is on an embankment. The impacts on this view should be evaluated and the soundwall on the north side of the freeway potentially eliminated.

Compatibility with tolling: Currently Metro has indicated the Interstate 10 corridor as a possible corridor for conversion to high occupancy toll (HOT) lanes. The existing I-10 HOV lanes from Downtown Los Angeles to I-605 are in the process of being converted. In addition, if the process is successful, the lanes from I-605 to Puente Avenue might be converted. However, no indication is made in this document of possible tolling or conversion to HOT lanes. Please confirm that any modification of the HOV lanes to a HOT or toll lane will require a separate environmental study.

I ask to be placed on the mailing list for all future notifications for this project.

Sincerely,

Hank Fung, P.E.
Via Verde viewpoint (eastbound I-10 just south of Via Verde park and ride lot)
Response to Comment Letter No. 9 - Hank Fung, P.E.

#1 – Please see Chapter 7 (Comments and Coordination) and Chapter 8 (Distribution List) sections of this document for the extensive list of elected officials, agencies, and individuals (including property owners) contacted as part of the Environmental Documentation preparation.

#2 – Both Ustream and Twitter were interactive the evening of the Public Hearing on December 13, 2011 at Cal Poly Pomona. That evening there were 49 viewers, but no one posed a question through Ustream or Twitter.

#3 – The 2003 Initial Study/Environmental Assessment and the Negative Declaration/Finding of No Significant Impact have been placed on the Caltrans website per your request. The address is - http://www.dot.ca.gov/dist07/resources/envdocs/docs/I-10%20HOV%20Lane%202003%20MND-FONSI.pdf.

#4 – Climbing lanes were part of the original freeway widening project as shown on the January 2003 ND/FONSI. However, due to environmental constraints it was decided to include climbing lanes as part of a potential future project. Should the truck climbing lanes be made part of this project the result would have been a much greater number of significant impacts to residential home owners, Forest Lawn, the biological community, and the California State Polytechnic University at Pomona than the project as currently proposed. For these reasons, the truck climbing lane is not included as part of the present project.

Additionally, transit buses owned by Foothill Transit (lines 480, 499, 699, and Silver Streak) do not use the inside lane. Specifically, Foothill Transit lines 480 and 499 will continue to use the outside lanes before the Kellogg grade to exit at Via Verde. The other Foothill transit lines currently use the outside lane and plans are for them to continue to use those outside lanes when the project is completed.

#5 – Please see the response to City of West Covina, comment #1.

#6 – Foothill Transit (the operator of the Silver Streak) transit users who access that service from the “El Monte Station” may use the proposed HOV lanes provided as part of this project. There is no change proposed to the existing transit systems or transit system users, except that the bus transit operators might choose to use the proposed HOV lanes provided as part of this project. Any difficulties in freeway navigation by transit vehicles that are currently being encountered would not be made worse by the proposed project, and therefore, there are no impacts to be discussed in the environmental document.

Providing a bus drop ramp at Vincent Avenue and West Covina Parkway would have a potentially substantial impact on the community because of the amount of right-of-way that would be required.
#7 – Project design maintains the existing auxiliary lanes and former bus turnouts at Vincent Avenue and West Covina Parkway, and therefore, the ability for drivers to use them as described in the comment would remain.

#8 – Additional lanes were considered for this project area. The lane configuration and number of lanes was determined by the traffic counts and projections (traffic data) prepared by Caltrans for this project. A second left turn HOV lane was not warranted by the traffic data and was not included in this project. Similarly, the third right turn lane was not warranted by the same traffic data and was not included in this project.

#9 – Carpool vehicles may use the proposed HOV lanes provided they meet the identified two passenger (plus) per vehicle criteria; therefore, there would be no adverse effect on such users of the HOV lane, irrespective of income level. There is no change proposed to the existing transit systems or transit system users. Caltrans has done all it can to ensure that there would be no impact to those individuals considered part of an environmental justice community or subject to Title 6.

#10 – The existing “bus bypass lanes” mentioned in your comment letter will be replaced in kind on the ramps proposed to be reconstructed as part of the project. The addition of new, or construction of longer existing “bus bypass lanes”, was found not to be necessary because the existing facilities are adequate to serve the existing transit services, and also, none of the current transit providers have requested additional or longer “bus bypass lanes”. Also, the addition of new “bus bypass lanes” would result in significant impacts due to the need for substantial right-of-way required to construct them.

#11 – Approved area projects were taken into consideration during the planning for this project, including those that were in the planning or construction phase while this documentation was being prepared. No additional major projects are known to be approved for the project study area.

#12 – Caltrans is currently involved with the California High Speed Rail project. Caltrans has committed to continue our work with the California High Speed Rail Authority to identify a viable route. To date the California High Speed Rail project has not identified any preferred alignment, and thus cannot be studied as part of this project. It is also noted that multiple other alignments for the California High Speed Rail project are being considered, and use of Interstate Route 10 in the project area does not have strong support at this time. Should this change, Caltrans will study the impacts of that project on this vital transportation corridor.

#13 – Caltrans has studied the placement and appearance of noise barriers (soundwalls). In fact, Caltrans continues to work with the City of Covina, the County of Los Angeles, and Forest Lawn Memorial Park (Covina Hills) on the proposed noise barrier (soundwalls) location and appearance.
Caltrans has also conducted Public Hearings for this project, at which residents in the area were asked about the viewshed and noise barrier issue. To date, none of the residents we have talked to in the Via Verde area have expressed concerns over the viewshed issue mentioned. In fact, all of the residents that Caltrans has worked with have strongly supported the construction of noise barriers (soundwalls) as part of this project. In addition, the visual analysis for the proposed project fully studied the project area and the landscape architect did not identify a viewpoint at this location.

Finally, residents on the north side of Interstate Route 10 will not have their view obstructed by the construction of a soundwall because the view of Mount Baldy in the Via Verde area is north of (away from) where the noise barriers are to be constructed as part of this project. The San Bernardino Mountains are directly northeast of Via Verde in the project area, and would not similarly be obstructed by the noise barriers proposed as part of this project.

#14 – The conversion of the HOV lanes to High Occupancy Toll (HOT) lanes in the proposed project area is not currently under study by Caltrans. Should a conversion of the HOV to HOT lanes be considered and studied in the future, separate environmental documentation will be required. Nowhere in the Purpose and Need for this project are HOT lanes mentioned, and thus are not part of this project environmental documentation.

#15 – Comment noted.
January 6, 2012

Mr. Ronald Kosinski
Deputy District Director
California Department of Transportation
Division of Environmental Planning
100 South Main Street MS 16A
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: Comments to the Draft Environmental Impact Report for Caltrans I-10 HOV Project

Dear Mr. Kosinski:

We represent Forest Lawn Memorial-Park Association and Forest Lawn Mortuary (together “Forest Lawn”) with respect to their Covina Hills property (the “Forest Lawn Property”). The Forest Lawn Property is located directly adjacent to Interstate-10 on the south side within Segment 3 of the California Department of Transportation’s (“Caltrans”) I-10 HOV Project (the “HOV Project”). Therefore, Forest Lawn will be significantly impacted during construction and after completion of the HOV Project. We submit the following comments to the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Caltrans I-10 HOV Project (“DEIR”). These include comments prepared by Forest Lawn’s geotechnical consultant, Petra Geotechnical, Inc., and acoustical consultant, Acoustical Engineering Services.

Caltrans representatives and Forest Lawn have been working together to identify the scope and to schedule the additional required studies set forth below. Forest Lawn does not intend to unnecessarily delay the commencement of construction of the initial segments of the HOV Project, but requests that the DEIR require certification of a supplemental environmental review that includes the studies identified below prior to commencement of work on the segment of the HOV Project that includes the Forest Lawn Property.

I. NO DEFERRAL OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

In this letter, Forest Lawn identifies significant environmental analyses of noise and geotechnical impacts on the Forest Lawn Property, which must be completed prior to certification of the EIR for the section of the HOV Project that includes the Forest Lawn Property. An EIR must provide the necessary environmental analysis to allow an informed decision on a project. This includes actions required to reduce or avoid significant impacts, and deferral of analysis or mitigation is normally improper. See 14 Cal. Code Regs.

Therefore, a subsequent or supplemental EIR must be prepared for the segment of the HOV Project adjacent to the Forest Lawn Property prior to commencement of work on that segment.

II. ADDITIONAL NOISE ANALYSIS REQUIRED

The Forest Lawn Property is located directly adjacent to the I-10, and will be significantly impacted by an increase in noise during construction and after expansion of the freeway. The DEIR has failed to fully evaluate the noise impacts of the HOV Project on the Forest Lawn Property by (i) utilizing an outdated baseline that differs from the baseline for other sections of the DEIR, (ii) relying on a 2004 sound study that uses outdated modeling methods, (iii) not evaluating sound reflection from soundwalls on the north side of the I-10, and (iv) not producing a new sound study as required by the 2004 Letter of Agreement.

A. Outdated Baseline

The Caltrans noise impact analysis and conclusions with respect to the Forest Lawn Property is entirely based on the 2004 study including the baseline noise readings. The existing ambient noise levels reported in the Caltrans 2011 Draft EIR were based on measurements conducted in 2011 for all the Project sensitive receptors with the exception of the Forest Lawn Property which were based on measurements conducted in October and November 2003 (Table 1 of the Supplemental Noise Study Report). Use of the outdated baseline noise data (2003 measurements) is in conflict with requirements of the Caltrans Noise Analysis Protocol, May 2011 “Approach to Assessing CEQA Noise Impacts”, which says in part; a description of the physical environmental condition in the vicinity of the project must represent the condition existed on the date the Notice of Preparation (NOP) was published or if no NOP is published, the date that the environmental analysis (i.e., 2011) was begun.

JMBM  
Jeffrey Mangels  
Bauer & Hamilton
Ronald Kosinski
January 6, 2012
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Nowhere in the EIR or the noise study does the analysis compare the various operational characteristics of the HOV Project to the conditions that physically existed during the publication of the NOP. Rather, the noise analysis uses a baseline of 2004, when substantially different conditions obtained in the Project vicinity (e.g., the lack of sound walls, different freeway segment traffic volumes). Therefore, the analysis proposes no mitigation measures for noise impacts that would occur with respect to the existing conditions at the time of circulation of the NOP. However, "[a]n EIR must focus on impacts to the existing environment, not hypothetical situations." City of Carmel-by-the-Sea v. Board of Supervisors, 183 Cal. App. 3d 229, 246-47 (1986); County of Amador v. El Dorado County Water Agency, 76 Cal. App. 4th 931, 952 (1999) ("It is only against this baseline that any significant environmental effects can be determined."); 14 Cal. Code Regs. ("CCR") § 15125(a) ("environmental setting will normally constitute the baseline physical conditions by which a lead agency determines whether an impact is significant"). Comparisons to hypothetical situations mislead the public and decision makers as to the true effects of a project. Communities for a Better Environment v. South Coast Air Quality Management District, 48 Cal. 4th 310, 322 (2010). Thus, the EIR fails to satisfy the requirement of CEQA to evaluate the effects of the Project on the environment. See, e.g., Cal. Pub. Res. Code. §§ 21060.3 (defining the "environment" as "the physical conditions which exist within the area ..."), 21151(d) (significant effects on the environment are "limited to ... adverse changes in physical conditions which exist within the area as defined in Section 21060.5"); 14 CCR § 15126.2 ("lead agency should normally limit its examination to changes in the existing physical conditions in the affected areas as they exist at the time the [NOP] is published").

Although a lead agency retains some discretion as to how to measure existing conditions most accurately, it may only provide an alternative baseline for analysis under narrow circumstances, such as modification of a previously existing use that requires only minimal review under CEQA. See Communities for a Better Environment, supra, at 326. Substantial evidence must support the choice of an alternative baseline. Save Our Peninsula, supra, at 120. However, a lead agency cannot simply use an alternative baseline any time some substantial evidence may support doing so. Rather, a lead agency may only use an alternative baseline when physical conditions that exist at the time of the NOP do not represent "generally existing conditions." Sunnyvale, supra, at 30. Here, however, Caltrans provides no evidence at all for its use of a past baseline, rather than existing conditions, and different from the baseline used for other analyses throughout the EIR.

"[A] straightforward assessment of the impacts produced by the project on the exiting environment is the foundational information of [the] EIR." Sunnyvale West Neighborhood Assn. v. City of Sunnyvale City Council, 190 Cal.App.4th 1351, 1385 (2010). The use of a 2004 baseline for the noise analysis therefore does not properly inform the public of the consequences of denying the Project. See 14 CCR § 15126.6. These failures deprive the public and decision makers of the information necessary for informed decision-making regarding the project, and necessitates revision and recirculation of the EIR.

JMBM
Numerous court decisions make clear that the use of an erroneous legal standard—such as the incorrect baseline for a CEQA analysis—represents a "failure to proceed in a manner required by law" with respect to this EIR. See Laurel Heights Improvement Assn v. Regents of the Univ. of California, 47 Cal.3d 376, 392 (1988). This failure represents a prejudicial abuse of discretion by Caltrans, rendering the EIR invalid. CEQA § 21168.5; Communities for a Better Environment, 48 Cal. 4th at 310; No Oil, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles, 13 Cal. 3d 68, 88 (1974).

B. Outdated Modeling

The Caltrans traffic noise prediction methodology (2004 Supplemental Noise Study Report) used in connection with the projection of the Project noise impact analysis for the Forest Lawn Property is inconsistent with the methodology used to prepare the 2011 Draft EIR. Caltrans 2004 Supplemental Traffic Noise Study Report was based on SOUND32/SOUND2000 computer prediction model. Caltrans current approved noise prediction methodology is the FHWA Traffic Noise Model ("TNM"). The TNM Noise Model provides enhancements in traffic noise modeling over the outdated SOUND32/2000 modeling program. The TNM incorporates state-of-the-art sound propagation and shielding algorithms as well as computations in octave-bands for increased accuracy (FHWA TNM Technical Manual, 1998). In addition, the TNM modeling program includes a multiple-reflection module that computes a degradation of the performance of one reflective barrier in the presence of another reflective barrier, which the outdated SOUND32/SOUND2000 modeling program does not perform.

The TNM program constitutes new information under CEQA that must be utilized and evaluated in the DEIR (14 Cal. Code Regs. § 15162 (a)). A new sound study must consider the three dimensional impact of both the new noise generated from the HOV Project as well as the additional noise reflected from the proposed soundwalls and other surfaces.

C. Evaluation of Sound Reflection from New Retaining Walls

The Caltrans noise analysis and the conclusions does not address the potential noise impacts on the Forest Lawn Property due to the possible sound reflection from the proposed soundwalls planned for the existing residential development located north of the Forest Lawn Property. (Appendix E, page 11) Previous Caltrans research report suggests that a single barrier wall can potentially reflect the noise from highway traffic to the opposite side of freeway, impacting the existing noise environment. Study has shown that the noise reflected off the barriers to the opposite side can impact the neighboring property by as much as 3 dBA.

D. Additional Comments

(1) Caltrans Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol. Pursuant to Caltrans Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol (May 2011), Caltrans must count one receptor for each area of a formalized memorial gathering facility in a cemetery when evaluating highway traffic noise. Caltrans 2011 DEIR Chapter 3 Section 4 Page 3.4-12 says in part that the cemetery (e.g., Forest Lawn Property) is not considered as a frequent human use area that would benefit from lowered noise.
levels. This conclusion is in conflict with the description of Frequent Human Use provided by the Caltrans Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol (May 2011) for the activity category “C”, which applies to the Forest Lawn Property.

(2) Additional Receptors Required. In the DEIR, the future I-10 freeway traffic noise levels (from the proposed project) were analyzed by Caltrans at a total of six selected locations within the Forest Lawn Property (Table 3 of the Supplemental Noise Study Report). However, only four of the six analyzed locations are valid per Caltrans noise prediction protocol. The number of the analyzed receptor locations (total of four sites) is insufficient to reach accurate traffic noise impact assessments, given the Forest Lawn Property’s extensive border with the I-10 Freeway, almost 1.5 miles.

(3) Consistency With Other Sensitive Receptors Required. Caltrans noise study with respect to the Forest Lawn Property is inconsistent with the study performed for the other sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the project. The Project DEIR noise analysis provides predicted noise levels for the Year 2038 with and without the proposed project (Caltrans 2011 DEIR Table 3.4-1 on Page 3.4-2). However, no such information is provided for the Forest Lawn Property.

(4) 2011 Traffic Data Required. It is not clear if the same traffic data (i.e., traffic volume, road profiles, etc.) that was used in connection with the Caltrans 2011 DEIR noise analysis was also utilized for the 2004 Supplemental Traffic Noise Study.

E. Prior Letter Agreement

Forest Lawn entered a Letter of Commitment with Caltrans, dated February 10, 2004, and included as part of the DEIR (“Letter of Commitment”). This Letter of Commitment states that “the Department expects to conduct additional environmental documentation for this project due to projected delays in obtaining funding. During that future evaluation, the Department will conduct studies regarding noise impacts at the site, in consultation with Forest Lawn representatives and make determinations based on the outcome of those future studies.” Caltrans has not yet completed the future sound study referenced in the Letter of Commitment. Caltrans must complete these studies prior to certification of the environmental review for this segment of the HOV Project.

III. ADDITIONAL GEOTECHNICAL ANALYSIS REQUIRED

As stated in the 2004 Letter of Commitment, Caltrans acknowledges the importance of maintaining slope stability along the Forest Lawn Property. Caltrans has commenced geotechnical borings, but has not yet performed all the field studies or obtained all the detailed information necessary to design the retaining walls and drainage to support the north facing slopes on the Forest Lawn Property. This information must be obtained and thoroughly analyzed prior to approval of the design for this segment and for certification of the environmental review for this segment of the HOV Project.
A. History of Caltrans Work at Forest Lawn

Over the past 40 years, Caltrans has a history of failing to adequately provide slope support on Forest Lawn's Property as part of highway construction, and failing to properly repair slopes after slides caused by the construction. In the 1970s, Caltrans widened the 10 freeway, and identified four potential areas of subsidence on Forest Lawn's Property. In March 1978, two slides occurred in Areas 1 and 2, which are located west of the Via Verde entrance. In 1979/1980, a third slide occurred. In 1981 and 1982, Caltrans performed corrective work on Area 1 and Area 2, but did not restore the surrounding area as requested by Forest Lawn. In early 1983, additional slides occurred on Areas 1 and 2, where the slopes had been repaired at a 2:1 ratio. On August 29, 2003, GeoSoils prepared a report that identified that horizontal drains installed by Caltrans in 1981 and 1983 were blocked by mineralization and abandoned. The report concludes that the subsequent landslides were caused in part by built up soil pressure due to lack of drainage.

Both Caltrans and Forest Lawn agree that measures should be taken in Caltrans' design, construction and maintenance of the retaining structures and drainage as part of the HOV Project to fully evaluate and construct long-standing structures and to avoid past consequences. The following comments identify additional information necessary for this design.

B. Additional Studies Necessary for Design of Retaining Walls and Drainage

All geologic and geotechnical issues must be addressed during design of the HOV Project and the design of the proposed retaining walls that are subjacent to the Forest Lawn Property. The most important issue is the stability of the northerly facing slopes. These slopes were constructed/graded as part of the development of the I-10 Freeway and there has been a long history of instability over the intervening years. The stability of these slopes is dependent upon the height and inclination of the overall slope geometry as well as the physical and structural characteristics of the underlying soil and bedrock materials. Subsurface investigations have been conducted by Caltrans on portions of the slope areas. The data collected from these studies, as well as information provided by Forest Lawn's consultants, must be analyzed and used in the slope analysis. Additional field studies and laboratory testing will be required as design issues are evaluated. Sufficient investigation of the prior landslide areas must also be a part of the design studies.

C. Criteria For Slope Stability Factors

In order to design a sufficient retaining wall system, Caltrans must establish minimum criteria for slope stability factors of safety that apply to both surficial stability and gross stability. Stability analysis of all slopes should include evaluation of rotational failures analysis as well as translational failures. Therefore, it will be necessary to define both the strength parameters of the geologic materials and the structural characteristics (e.g. bedding/fracture plane orientations, landslide geometry, fault geometry).
Slope mitigation, if deemed necessary, must account for temporary stability issues and at no time should it reduce the “temporary” factor of safety of slopes adjacent to Forest Lawn properties below a minimum value of 1.25. Additionally, it may not be possible to use tieback-type systems that extend beneath the Forest Lawn Property. All proposed slope mitigation measures must be reviewed and approved by Forest Lawn prior to implementation.

D. Maintenance of Retaining Walls and Drainage

Caltrans must satisfactorily maintain the slopes, retaining walls and drainage after completion of the freeway widening and construction of the retaining walls. Maintenance must include, but not be limited to, repair of surficial failures (if necessary), cleaning/repair of terrace drains, upkeep of groundwater drain outlets, and on-going comprehensive vector control. It may also require replacement of deteriorated tie backs, if utilized. The scope and breadth of the maintenance schedules should be outlined in the design documents and should be reviewed by Forest Lawn and their consultants.

E. Review and Approval by Forest Lawn

During the design process, Forest Lawn geotechnical consultants must have the opportunity to review and comment on the design plans and documents. Forest Lawn’s consultants will provide valuable information regarding existing conditions and future use of various areas of the Forest Lawn Property, which will be necessary to properly design the slope retention. Caltrans has provided recent boring samples and logs to Forest Lawn consultants, which they are currently evaluating. Caltrans representatives have already initiated meetings regarding the design of retaining features, and have indicated an intent to involve Forest Lawn during the entire design and construction process.

IV. CONSTRUCTION PHASING

A. No Ramp Closure

The DEIR (Sections 1.43, 1.44) identifies both bridge widening and street underpass lowering, as well as modification to the existing ramp facilities at Via Verde Street. The north and southbound ramps on Via Verde Street, connected by the underpass, are the sole means of ingress and egress to the Forest Lawn Property. The nearest exits are several miles away through residential areas, which will render the Forest Lawn Property virtually inaccessible during any ramp or underpass closures. Although Caltrans proposes closing only alternating ramps, this will not suffice for access to Forest Lawn. Therefore, we request a mitigation measure stating that at least one lane shall be open on both the northbound and southbound ramps and in the underpass for both directions of travel at the Via Verde Street exit at all times during construction.
B. Notice of Construction Work – Construction Management Plan

Forest Lawn also requests that Caltrans provide sufficient notice to Forest Lawn of any lane closures and of any work performed within the segment adjacent to the Forest Lawn Property. Forest Lawn must be able to coordinate the schedule of services, funeral processions, and other events to avoid times during construction or significant lane closures. Finally, Forest Lawn requests that Caltrans prepare and distribute a construction management plan to allow for coordination.

Forest Lawn seeks to cooperate with Caltrans during the HOV Project. We have held several productive meetings and discussions with Caltrans representatives during the review process, and we do not intend to delay the work on the initial segments of the HOV Project. We request that Caltrans agree to perform and certify subsequent environmental review for the third segment of the HOV Project to sufficiently address Forest Lawn’s concerns.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

SHERI L. BONSTELLE for
Jeffer Mangels Butler & Mitchell LLP

SLB:slb:pjo-
cc: Gary Overland
    Mehdi Salehini
Response to Comment Letter No. 10 - Forest Lawn Memorial Park

#1 – The original Traffic Noise Impact Technical Report performed by Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas, Inc. (PBQ&D) in 2001 was based on the 1998 Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol (TNAP). According to the 1998 TNAP, cemeteries were not considered noise sensitive land uses. Despite that fact, a Supplemental Traffic Noise Study Report (STNSR, 2004) was prepared for Forest Lawn Memorial Park to determine the acoustical feasibility and reasonableness of soundwalls along the freeway edge of shoulder and state right of way line, even though the cemetery did not qualify for abatement under the TNAP. The 2004 STNSR concluded that overall the soundwalls were not reasonable as they provided very little benefit to the cemetery, and they were not cost-effective.

Then, in 2008 as part of re-evaluation efforts, another Traffic Noise Study Report (Environmental Re-evaluation) was performed for the entire project. By this time, a new Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol (August 2006) was in effect, although, the cemeteries continued not to be considered noise sensitive land uses. Therefore, the finding/conclusion of the 2004 STNSR was documented in the 2008 TNSR (Environmental Re-evaluation.).

Effective May 2011, there is another new TNAP in place. The 2011 TNAP does list cemeteries as noise sensitive land uses, however, there must be exterior "formalized gathering areas" that need to be benefited by lowered noise levels. Based on a meeting with the Forest Lawn Memorial Park representatives and a recent review/assessment of the cemetery, there are no formalized gathering areas that were identified.

In addition to the above examination, new noise level testing has been undertaken in consultation with Forest Lawn Memorial Park (Covina Hills) representatives, at specified locations determined by the Park. The new noise analysis identified projected noise levels and evaluated the potential need for noise abatement for the Forest Lawn Memorial Park (Covina Hills) property. Based on the technical noise analysis, it is concluded that since there is no exterior area of frequent human use that would benefit from a lowered noise level, and that the predicted interior noise levels at both chapels do not exceed the required 52 dB noise levels, this cemetery does not qualify for noise abatement consideration. Furthermore, a range of soundwall heights along the state right of way was analyzed in order to determine how much of the cemetery presently in use would benefit (provide 5 dB noise reduction). The results indicate very little area benefits (approximately 10-15 percent). Therefore, noise abatement (soundwalls) is not proposed to be included in the area adjacent to the Forest Lawn property.

#2 – Current design details have been developed to a level sufficient to ascertain the potential impacts to the Forest Lawn Memorial Park (Covina Hills) property, and those impacts have been evaluated in this document. Additionally, Caltrans staff members have met with Forest Lawn representatives and their consultants to discuss the project elements that would affect...
the Forest Lawn Memorial Park (Covina Hills) property. Current and anticipated project
design details in Segment 3 of the project have been provided and discussed at those
meetings. Caltrans is of the opinion that at all meetings participants have had a good
understanding of the project and its design details.

As the design process continues, Caltrans design and geological engineers will continue to
meet with Forest Lawn representatives and their consultants to further refine both design
details and potential warranted mitigation. This consultation is intended to result in a project
that fulfills the Purpose and Need for this project while having minimal project impacts to the
Forest Lawn Memorial Park (Covina Hills) property as feasible. Future substantial revisions
to the project design, if any, will be subject to Caltrans CEQA reevaluation process. If that
project leads to a determination that these revisions warrant a Supplemental Environmental
Impact Report, one would be prepared for Segment 3 of this project.

#3 – A new baseline for the existing worst-case noise levels was established as part of the
new noise analysis recently prepared for the Forest Lawn Memorial Park (Covina Hills)
property (see #1 above). A copy of this new noise analysis will be provided to Forest Lawn
representatives.

#4 – The new noise analysis mentioned in #1 above was conducted using the TNM 2.5
modeling software. The Noise section (Section 3.4) of the FEIR was revised to reflect the
new noise study analysis on pages 3.4-2 and 3.4-12.

#5 – Based on extensive research by Caltrans, it has been shown that reflective noise only
contributes 1-2dBA to the overall noise environment. 1-2dBA is not a perceptible change.
The potential effects of reflection were taken into consideration by Caltrans when the noise
analysis was conducted.

#6 – The Caltrans DEIR noise section is based on the noise study performed in December
2008. At the time that study was performed the noise protocol in place did not consider
cemeteries to be noise sensitive land uses. Therefore, as mentioned in the response #1 above,
a new noise analysis was conducted for the Forest Lawn Memorial Park (Covina Hills)
property that will utilized the May 2011 noise protocol guidelines. Also, see #1 above.

#7 – The new noise analysis included the 17 monitoring locations as concurred to by Forest
Lawn representatives. These 17 monitoring locations were identified by Caltrans and Forest
Lawn representatives to sufficiently represent the Forest Lawn Memorial Park (Covina Hills)
property. Also, see #1 above.

#8 – The new noise analysis is consistent with the rest of the project area and will include
noise projections for the year 2038. Also, see #1 above.
#9 – The traffic volumes near Via Verde for the receivers along the westbound portion of Interstate Route 10 as part of the 2011 DEIR noise analysis are slightly higher than the volumes used for the 2004 Supplemental Traffic Noise Study for the Forest Lawn Memorial Park (Covina Hills) property. The road profiles are identical for all the noise studies. This slight difference in traffic volumes did not have a bearing on the results of the noise analysis.

#10 – Caltrans, in consultation with Forest Lawn representatives, conducted an additional noise analysis for the Forest Lawn Memorial Park (Covina Hills). Results of this analysis are located in the Noise section (Section 3.4) of the FEIR on pages 3.4-2 and 3.4-12. For further response to this comment, see #1, #2, and #6 above.

#11 – This topic was discussed during previous meetings held with Forest Lawn representatives. Caltrans has sufficient information to proceed with the retaining walls and drainage plans that will provide the required slope stability in the Forest Lawn Memorial Park (Covina Hills) property area adjacent to Segment 3 of this project. For further response to this comment, see #13 and #14 below.

#12 – Caltrans has conducted soil borings and additional soil borings may be taken in conjunction with the request from Forest Lawn representatives. These soil borings are being used to construct structures that will augment slope stability. Caltrans continues to meet with Forest Lawn representatives on this (and other) issues as part of the continuing design process.

#13 – Caltrans follows FHWA, AASHTO, and Caltrans' design guidelines for global and local stability analysis and design for retaining system and slope. As such, rotational and transitional stability of slopes will be evaluated following FHWA, AASHTO, and Caltrans design guidelines. Be advised that it is the current Caltrans practice to require a minimum factor of safety of 1.1 for temporary shoring systems. However, for this project we have identified the temporary factor of safety to be at least 1.25 within Forest Lawn Memorial Park (Covina Hills) property area directly adjacent to Segment Three of this project if a shoring system is planned.

#14 – The retaining walls adjacent to Forest Lawn Memorial Park (Covina Hills) property will be designed with horizontal drains installed. The horizontal drains are initially identified to be at least 40 feet long, but exact length and placement will be determined during the final design phase of the project.

All structures will be inspected every two years. Caltrans will maintain the retaining wall system, including surficial failures, cleaning/repairing terrace drains, maintenance, cleaning of groundwater drain outlets, and the maintenance and repair of all structures built as part of this project. Maintenance, repairs, or replacements will be conducted on an as-needed basis.
Any structural need that may require repairs beyond the capability of Caltrans Maintenance Forces will generate a separate project to correct that situation.

Vector control is a constant on-going effort by Caltrans Maintenance forces, and this effort will continue with project implementation.

To date, Caltrans has not had any tie-back system deteriorate. However, should such systems deteriorate, those system elements would be repaired or replaced as needed.

Caltrans representatives have met and provided documents in cooperation with Forest Lawn representatives and Forest Lawn consultants. This cooperative effort on the part of Caltrans will continue through the design and construction phases of project development.

#15 – Caltrans has met with Forest Lawn representatives and their consultants on numerous occasions to discuss geotechnical and other Forest Lawn concerns. Caltrans fully intends to participate in further meetings with Forest Lawn representatives and its consultants to discuss geotechnical information. Comments from Forest Lawn representatives or its consultants will continue to be given serious consideration while Caltrans project design continues for Segment 3 of the proposed project.

#16 – Caltrans is currently working on project staging that would allow one lane of the Via Verde undercrossing to remain open during project construction to lower Via Verde and widen the existing bridge at Via Verde. Caltrans is also working on a retaining wall strategy that would allow one lane of the Via Verde on- and off-ramps to remain open during project construction.

Both of these design strategies are being considered to ensure access to the Forest Lawn Memorial Park (Covina Hills) property during the construction period. Caltrans will continue to meet with Forest Lawn representatives to keep Forest Lawn updated as project design strategies are developed and finalized.

#17 – Caltrans will continue to meet with Forest Lawn representatives to keep Forest Lawn updated as project design strategies are developed and finalized. Should closure of either the Via Verde underpass or the on- and off-ramps to Via Verde be required to facilitate project construction, detours will be implemented to provide access to the Forest Lawn Memorial Park (Covina Hills) facility. Impacts associated with bridge and ramp construction, including the use of detours or temporary ramps, are discussed in Section 3.2.4.2 of the EIR, under Traf-2. Section 3.2.6 of the EIR describes how a Traffic Management Plan will be prepared for this project to offset the effects of traffic congestion and access during construction.
January 6, 2012

Mr. Ron Kosinski
Deputy District Director
California Department of Transportation
Division of Environmental Planning
100 South Main Street MS 16A
Los Angeles, Ca 90012

Dear Mr. Kosinski:

We are the operator of the Jack in the Box Restaurant located at the Puente East bound off ramp and Interstate 10 on the South side of the freeway. We are highly visible to the East bound traffic of the Freeway and are very concerned about the following issues:

1. According to the Draft Environmental Impact Report a 20 foot noise screen wall will completely remove the visibility of the restaurant from the East and West bound traffic. It is noted that directly to the East of the exit and the Jack in the Box no screen wall is planned. Had a wall been located there it would have removed the visibility of a hotel which is on the same street but on the other side of the street from the restaurant. In addition, on the other side of the freeway no screen wall is planned for the retailers from the Wal Mart going East and past the restaurants East of Puente. I believe this is a severe economic hardship for the Jack in the Box restaurant and hopefully an alternative plan can be created. Would it be possible to cut back the length of the screen wall so the restaurant is visible or reduce the height so that the restaurant would be visible to the traffic?

2. When the current Puente off ramp is closed for construction could one of the two lanes be left open during the work? If they are both closed it will reduce the traffic in front of the restaurant to almost zero in effect putting us out of business.

3. The report also states that the Puente undercrossing will be lowered several inches. If Puente were to be closed during this work and the Puente off ramp was closed at the
same time there would be no traffic for the restaurant. Could that be coordinated so that both projects don’t conflict with each other?

4. Currently a bus stop is located at the island of the off ramp and in front of the restaurant. I have not been able to see what the plan for the bus stop is and wonder what plans are being implemented to continue the service.

Please consider my requests and respond in a timely manner. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely:

Mike Gribble
President
Response to Comment Letter No. 12 - Jack in the Box

#1 – The proposed soundwall is required for mitigation for noise related impacts to the nearby 11 residential properties south of Garvey Avenue. The length of the soundwall in front of the Jack in the Box can only be reduced by 40 feet from the easterly end. However, the height of the soundwall will need to be increased from 12 feet to 14 feet. Any further reduction will result in the soundwall not being effective to the 11 affected residences. A soundwall is effective when it reduces the future predicted noise level by the required minimum of five (5) decibels. In lieu of these findings, and since the soundwall cannot be completely eliminated or the height of the soundwall reduced, the original configuration of the soundwall will remain.

#2 – It is currently planned to close the Puente Avenue off-ramp for four weeks. This short time period is necessary to ensure the safety of the motoring public and construction crews. The possibility of trying to keep one lane open was considered. However, this resulted in a much longer construction time, complex traffic handling movements, and extensive detours and signing which would potentially deter motorists from the area and not be as safe as the current minimal 4 week closure. The longer construction period would also have a more detrimental effect on local business access. Detours and signs will be placed to direct motorists to alternative routes.

#3 – The Puente undercrossing bridge will not be lowered. However, Puente Avenue will be lowered to provide for an increased vertical clearance. One lane in each direction will be provided during the project construction period, with the exception of the few limited time closures to erect the new bridge girders over Puente. These limited time closures (a few hours over a few days) are required to safely construct the widened bridge structure.

#4 – The current bus stop is currently planned to be reconstructed as part of this project, and will continue to be utilized for its existing transit purpose. During the reconstruction of the bus stop, however, it may be necessary to temporarily detour the existing service. Caltrans is coordinating with the area transit operators to facilitate transit user needs as part of the Traffic Management Plan (TMP).
January 6, 2012

VIA FACSIMILE AND E-MAIL

Mr. Ronald J. Kosinski
Deputy District Director
Division of Environmental Planning
Department of Transportation, District 7
100 S. Main Street, MS-16A
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: Draft EIR for the addition of High-Occupancy Vehicle Lanes on Interstate Route 10 between Puente Avenue and State Route 57 in Los Angeles County

Dear Mr. Kosinski:

We have preliminarily reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Report released in November 2011 (the “DEIR”) for the addition of High-Occupancy Vehicle Lanes on Interstate Route 10 between Puente Avenue and State Route 57 in Los Angeles County (the “Project”). Plaza West Covina, LP, Eastland Shopping Center, LLC and Westfield, LLC own and/or manage two shopping centers along the Project route that could be significantly impacted by this Project (Westfield Eastland, located on the north side of I-10 between Citrus Avenue and Barranca Street and Westfield West Covina, located on the south side of I-10 between Sunset Avenue and Vincent Avenue). Westfield Eastland is a regional shopping center with over 800,000 square feet of gross leasable area and more than 3,700 parking spaces located on approximately 45 acres. Westfield West Covina is a larger regional shopping center with over 1.2 million square feet of gross leasable area and 5,900 parking spaces located on over 70 acres, which was redeveloped in collaboration with the City of West Covina to promote economic development and to maintain the site’s status as a critical sales tax generator for the City.

We would like to start off by saying that we are not opposed to the development of the Project. However, because of our proximity to the subject property and the magnitude of the proposed development, it is important that the DEIR provide a comprehensive analysis of the environmental impacts. Given the importance of these two centers to the economic vitality of the City of West Covina and the region in general, we are asking that Caltrans do its utmost to disclose Project impacts fully and ensure that any new construction or operations related to the Project minimize and/or eliminate impacts and protect operations at these two existing shopping centers.

Westfield’s two centers will be greatly impacted by the design, construction and operation of the Project, particularly during the lengthy demolition and construction period. This letter contains our preliminary comments that must be addressed prior to any further action on the Project.

N:\_documents\HEALY\Eastland\DOT\120106 R Kosinski re DEIR.doc
1. The DEIR Must Include Specific Information on the Project Impacts to Westfield West Covina and Westfield Eastland.

The DEIR is too general in its description of Project impacts to the two Westfield centers and we request that more specific information be provided. The general descriptions in the DEIR need to be supplemented to allow Westfield and the public to fully comprehend Project impacts. For example, Section 1.4.3 of the Project Description purports to describe various freeway ramp modifications that are proposed to be undertaken proximate to the Westfield centers. However, no specific information about the nature and extent of these modifications is included in the discussion. In addition, Section 1.4.4 of the Project Description purports to describe various modifications to existing bridges and other facilities that are proposed to be undertaken proximate to the Westfield centers. However, no specific information about the nature and extent of these modifications, except for the Vincent Avenue interchange, is included in the discussion. A complete and accurate description of the Project is essential to allow the public an opportunity to effectively participate in the environmental review process. Here, the description of the Project is too general that a meaningful analysis of the Project’s impacts is not possible.

Furthermore, the DEIR makes numerous references to deferred plans that may be prepared in the future, ostensibly to address adverse impacts of the Project. These plans include the Traffic Management Plan and Construction Staging Plan referenced in Section 3.2.4.2, the Stormwater Management Plan referenced in Section 3.7.4.2, and the Real Estate Acquisition Management Plan referenced in Section 3.10.5. These plans must be prepared and made available now, concurrent with the review of the DEIR. Without having these plans available now, there is no way to determine whether the measures included in such future plans would be effective in reducing or avoiding Project impacts.

As far as we can tell, the Project will have the greatest impacts upon Westfield West Covina as a result of the contemplated acquisition of property and buildings that are apparently required in connection with improvements to the eastbound I-10 offramp at Vincent Avenue. The DEIR references a 2010 Relocation Impact Statement prepared for the Project and states that “sufficient replacement properties are available,” yet no specific information is included in the DEIR. The DEIR concludes that this proposed acquisition would not result in a significant impact, but the DEIR contains no analysis to support this conclusion. Furthermore, the DEIR indicates that a Real Estate Acquisition Management Plan will be developed at some point in the future for the purpose of “minimizing impacts associated with relocations.” This Plan must be prepared and made available now, in order to assess whether there are effective measures to actually address the impacts resulting from the contemplated acquisitions, as indicated by the DEIR.

The DEIR further indicates that construction activities associated with the Project could negatively affect businesses resulting from impaired access to businesses from road and ramp closures or detours. However, the DEIR offers no specifics as to the extent and duration of such impacts, and states that affected businesses would be “fairly compensated for relocation...
assistance and associated payments.” It is unclear how relocation assistance would benefit an operating business that is adversely impacted by road or ramp closures and detours, or what the “associated payments” are related to; if they relate only to businesses that must be relocated as a result of acquisition, then that would not mitigate impacts upon businesses that remain open but are adversely affected by the Project. The DEIR must include a specific discussion of the nature, extent and duration of road and ramp closures and detours, and offer more information on what measures will be taken to avoid adverse impacts upon businesses that continue to operate during the construction of the Project.

In addition, we were previously informed by Caltrans of the following items that were not reflected in the DEIR and should be added as enforceable Project features or mitigation measures:

- Vincent Avenue will remain open at all times during the Project construction. At least one lane in each direction will be open at all times.

- All of the Vincent Avenue ramps will remain open at all times, except for a limited duration closure of the eastbound off-ramp. The limited closure of the eastbound off-ramp shall be discussed and agreed with Westfield in advance and limited to non-peak periods.

- Two consecutive on/off ramps will not be closed at the same time. For example, any necessary ramp closures at West Covina Parkway will not occur at the same time as the limited closure of the eastbound off-ramp at Vincent Avenue.

- No ramps and roadways used for the Westfield centers will be closed during the holiday period (from Thanksgiving to the New Year). All closure of ramps and roadways in the vicinity of the Westfield centers shall be coordinated in advance with Westfield.

- West Garvey Avenue, the roadway that runs parallel to the I-10 freeway on the northern border of Westfield West Covina, shall remain open at all times with at least one lane in each direction, except during the holiday period (from Thanksgiving to the New Year) when the center left-turn lane shall also remain open.

- Exclusive of the AT&T, Bob’s Big Boy and California Pizza Kitchen pads, there will not be any loss of parking spaces at Westfield West Covina as a result of the Project work either during construction or after the completion of the Project.

All of the measures described above should be incorporated into the Project as enforceable features or mitigation measures.
2. The DEIR Must Identify Temporary Construction Easement Areas and Disclose Associated Impacts.

The DEIR contains only a passing reference to temporary construction easements (TCEs) that will be required during construction of the Project. TCEs may result in adverse impacts upon adjoining properties, including impacts on parking and circulation, and Westfield requests that specific information on the locations and extent of all TCEs adjoining Westfield West Covina and Westfield Eastland be provided. Furthermore, the DEIR must disclose all impacts associated with such TCEs in order to provide a full and adequate analysis of the impacts of all of the Project components.

3. The DEIR Must Include Construction Measures Required to Minimize Impacts upon Westfield West Covina and Westfield Eastland.

Besides the adverse impacts to businesses resulting from road/ramp closures and detours, the Project will result in numerous other impacts that could be significant and will adversely affect businesses within Westfield West Covina and Westfield Eastland, and their employees and customers. These impacts would occur during construction of the Project, and include impacts from increased traffic, noise, vibration, dust emissions, glare, and construction worker and vehicle parking. In order to ensure that construction impacts of the Project are as least disruptive as possible, a number of measures must be employed throughout the construction period. Attachment 1 to this letter identifies a number of measures that have been identified by Westfield’s experts, including Gibson Transportation Consulting, Inc., that would reduce Project impacts in these areas, and Westfield requests that they be included as Project requirements. See Attachment 2 to this letter for the technical review from Gibson Transportation Consulting.


The DEIR identifies three full property acquisitions at Westfield West Covina in Table 3.10-2 on page 3.10-13. Also, we understand that Caltrans will require a number of TCEs along the northern frontage of Westfield West Covina. We were informed previously that offers from Caltrans would be forthcoming for the necessary acquisitions and negotiations would occur. However, we have yet to receive any such offers. We have worked closely and cooperatively with a few different representatives from Caltrans in answering questions and granting access, as requested. Thus, we are confused that there have been no efforts made at negotiating for the acquisition of the property interests owned by Westfield that are impacted by the Project. This runs counter to the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisitions Policies Act and Caltrans’ mandatory procedures requiring that Caltrans make every effort to acquire real property expeditiously by negotiation to avoid the costly and time-consuming process of eminent domain. We share with Caltrans the goal of using resources judiciously, to work together and address any issues without spending precious time and resources on legal proceedings and attorneys’ fees. Therefore, we are respectfully requesting that before any further consideration of the DEIR, that Caltrans bring together all of the necessary Westfield West Covina property interests and engage in good faith negotiations to acquire all of the impacted properties together in an amicable manner and not in any piecemeal fashion.
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We appreciate your consideration of the foregoing, and request that all of the issues identified above be addressed in a thorough and comprehensive manner prior to further consideration of the Project. Furthermore, Westfield requests that the construction measures identified in this letter, or other similarly effective measures, be included as mandatory elements of the Project. We are also requesting that Westfield be provided with copies of all public notices relating to this development. We look forward to our continued participation in the preparation of the EIR.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

John M. Healy
Vice President Development

Attachments
ATTACHMENT 1

Construction Measures

1. Construction Coordination

1.1.1 Caltrans shall keep Westfield reasonably informed as to the Project construction schedule to enable Westfield to inform its tenants and employees of upcoming construction activities. Without limiting the foregoing, Caltrans shall (a) meet with Westfield at least monthly to discuss progress and upcoming construction activities, and (b) provide Westfield with a reasonably detailed construction schedule for the Project, updated at least monthly, to enable Westfield to monitor construction progress.

2. Noise

2.1. Construction Noise

2.1.1. During construction, an eight-foot-high temporary sound barrier (e.g. solid wood fence) shall be erected between the construction activity from the Project and the Westfield center; and a lining shall be affixed to the exterior scaffolding apparatus such that, to the greatest extent feasible, the line of sight between the Westfield center and the site of the Project’s construction activity is blocked.

2.1.2. Caltrans and Westfield representatives shall meet periodically to schedule the most potentially disruptive construction activities (i.e., pile driving) outside the hours of sensitive operation of Westfield tenants, to the extent reasonably feasible.

2.1.3. All construction equipment engines shall be properly tuned and muffled according to manufacturer’s specifications.

2.1.4. The Project contractor shall use power construction equipment with state-of-the-art noise shielding and muffling devices, where feasible.

2.1.5. Noise construction activities whose specific location on the site may be flexible (e.g., operation of compressors and generators, cement mixing, general truck idling) shall be conducted as far as possible from the Westfield center, and natural and/or manmade barriers (e.g., intervening construction trailers) shall be used to screen propagation noise from such activities towards the Westfield center to the maximum extent feasible.

2.1.6. The use of pieces of equipment or construction methods with the greatest peak noise generation potential shall be minimized to the extent feasible. Examples include use of drills, jackhammers, and pile drivers.

2.1.7. Caltrans shall use best efforts to have all pile driving conducted with equipment such as a high frequency vibrohammer with pre-drilling as required, or similar type of equipment, to limit the maximum recorded vibration to a peak particle velocity of 0.5" per second at a reference distance of 50 feet.
2.1.8. Loading and staging areas for construction shall be located behind the barricade or fencing and shall not be conducted on the roadways within the Westfield centers.

2.1.9. Construction vehicles shall be prohibited from idling in excess of five minutes, both on- and off-site.

2.1.10. To the extent feasible, construction activities shall be scheduled so as to avoid operating several pieces of heavy machinery simultaneously, which results in high noise levels.

2.1.11. During construction, a 24-hour hotline shall be established for Westfield tenants to register complaints regarding noise and inquire about the construction process. Upon receipt of complaint, the construction relations officer shall determine the cause of the complaint and what reasonable measures can be taken to resolve it.

3. Air Quality

3.1. Dust

3.1.1. Water three times daily or non-toxic soil stabilizers shall be applied, according to manufacturer’s specifications, as needed to reduce off-site transport of fugitive dust from all unpaved staging areas and unpaved surfaces.

3.1.2. On the last day of operations prior to a weekend, or when the next day is a nonworking day such as a holiday, water or chemical stabilizers shall be applied to maintain a stabilized surface.

3.1.3. Streets shall be swept as needed during construction, but not more frequently than hourly, if visible soil material has been carried onto adjacent public or private paved roads.

3.1.4. All access points shall be swept daily, as needed.

3.1.5. Construction equipment shall be visually inspected prior to leaving the site and loose dirt shall be washed off with water washers as necessary.

3.1.6. Suspend all mass grading operations when wind speed (as instantaneous gusts) exceeds 25 miles per hour over a 30 minute period.

3.1.7. All loads transported off-site shall be securely covered to prevent excessive amounts of dust.

3.2. Generally
3.2.1. On-site mobile construction equipment shall be powered by alternative fuel sources (e.g. methanol, natural gas, propane, or butane) that are less polluting, as feasible.

3.2.2. To the extent feasible, petroleum powered construction equipment shall utilize electricity from power poles rather than temporary diesel power generators and/or gasoline power generators.

3.2.3. General contractors shall maintain and operate construction equipment so as to minimize exhaust emissions. During construction, trucks and vehicles in loading and unloading queues shall have their engines turned off when not in use to reduce vehicle emissions. Construction activities shall be phased and scheduled to avoid emissions peaks and discontinued during second-stage smog alerts.

3.2.4. All equipment shall be properly tuned and maintained in accordance with manufacturers' specifications.

3.2.5. Caltrans shall secure any necessary permits from the SCAQMD.

3.2.6. During construction, dumpsters shall be covered and maintained to the extent feasible.

4. Traffic/Parking

4.1.1. Trucks and construction equipment shall be located behind the barricade or fencing and construction activities and/or support shall not be conducted on the roadways within the Westfield centers.

4.1.2. At least one flag person, and where appropriate more, shall be utilized at the construction site to assist the truck operators in and out of the Project site in order to minimize conflicts with pedestrians and motorists.

4.1.3. A construction worker ridesharing plan shall be implemented in order to reduce construction related trips and parking demand. Incentives shall be created for carpooling.

4.1.4. Parking by construction workers at the Westfield centers or neighborhood streets shall be prohibited unless previously agreed to by Westfield;

4.1.5. The Project shall provide off-street parking for construction workers, with shuttle service as necessary.

4.1.6. Deliveries shall be scheduled to avoid peak traffic hours.

5. Other
5.1.1. Caltrans shall at all times keep the Project site reasonably clean and free of debris and trash.

5.1.2. Caltrans shall implement additional measures, as reasonably requested by Westfield, to minimize or eliminate construction impacts to the Westfield centers to the extent feasible.
Attachment 2

Technical Review Letter from Gibson Transportation Consulting
January 6, 2012

Mr. Ronald J. Kosinski
Deputy District Director
Division of Environmental Planning
Department of Transportation, District 7
100 S. Main Street, MS-16A
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: INTERSTATE ROUTE 10 HOV LANE DEIR REVIEW Ref: J1050

Dear Mr. Kosinski:

On behalf of Westfield, LLC, we have completed a preliminary review of the traffic section of the Draft Environmental Impact Report released in November 2011 (the DEIR) for the addition of High-Occupancy Vehicle Lanes on Interstate Route 10 between Puente Avenue and State Route 57 in Los Angeles County (the Project). When it comes to the identification and mitigation of temporary traffic and parking impacts related to construction, it is our opinion that the EIR would greatly benefit from a more comprehensive and definitive impact and mitigation summary.

As you know, Plaza West Covina, LP, Eastland Shopping Center LLC and Westfield LLC own and/or manage two shopping centers in West Covina adjoining Interstate 10 that will be affected by the Project. Westfield Eastland, located on the north side of I-10 between Citrus Avenue and Barranca Street, is a regional shopping center with over 600,000 square feet of gross leasable area (sf GLA) and more than 3,700 parking spaces located on approximately 48 acres. Westfield West Covina, located on the south side of I-10 between Sunset Avenue and Vincent Avenue, is a larger regional shopping center with over 1.2 million sf GLA and 5,900 parking spaces located on over 70 acres.

While we understand the regional significance of the Project, we believe that both of these centers will be impacted during the lengthy demolition and construction period. As such, we have prepared the following list of preferred temporary mitigation and construction management measures for inclusion in the EIR. It is our understanding that most of these mitigation and construction management measures were previously agreed to by Caltrans, despite being excluded from the DEIR.

Traffic and Parking

The following temporary mitigation measures shall be included in the EIR, and ultimately included in a comprehensive Construction Management Plan:

- Vincent Avenue will remain open at all times during the Project construction. At least one lane in each direction will be open at all times.
All of the Vincent Avenue ramps will remain open at all times, except for a limited duration closure of the eastbound off-ramp. The limited closure of the eastbound off-ramp shall be discussed and agreed with Westfield in advance and limited to non-peak periods.

Two consecutive on/off ramps will not be closed at the same time. For example, any necessary ramp closures at West Covina Parkway will not occur at the same time as the limited closure of the eastbound off-ramp at Vincent Avenue.

No ramps and roadways used for the Westfield centers will be closed during the holiday period (from Thanksgiving to the New Year). All closure of ramps and roadways in the vicinity of the Westfield centers shall be coordinated in advance with Westfield.

West Garvey Avenue, the roadway that runs parallel to the I-10 freeway on the northern border of Westfield West Covina, shall remain open at all times with at least one lane in each direction, except during the holiday period (from Thanksgiving to the New Year) when the center left-turn lane shall also remain open.

Exclusive of the California Pizza Kitchen, AT&T, and Bob's Big Boy pads, there will not be any loss of parking spaces at Westfield West Covina as a result of this work either during construction or after the completion of the Project.

**Construction Management**

The following construction management measures shall be included in the EIR, and ultimately included in a comprehensive Construction Management Plan:

- Trucks and construction equipment shall be located behind the barricade or fencing and construction activities and/or support shall not be conducted on the roadways within the Westfield centers.
- At least one flag person, and where appropriate more, shall be utilized at the construction site to assist the truck operators in and out of the Project site in order to minimize conflicts with pedestrians and motorists.
- A construction worker ridesharing plan shall be implemented in order to reduce construction related trips and parking demand. Incentives shall be created for carpooling.
- Parking by construction workers at the Westfield centers or neighborhood streets shall be prohibited unless previously agreed to by Westfield.
- The Project shall provide off-street parking for construction workers, with shuttle service as necessary.
- Deliveries shall be scheduled to avoid peak traffic hours.
As previously stated, we believe that the EIR would greatly benefit by including an enhanced discussion of temporary impacts and the aforementioned temporary mitigation and construction management measures.

Sincerely,

Patrick A. Gibson, P.E., PTOE
President

Sean Mohn
Principal
Response to Comment Letter No. 11 - Westfield

#1 – Caltrans has met with Westfield Mall representatives and discussed the project design with them. Included in this discussion were the ramps and proposed ramp configuration. Impacts associated with project implementation at the Westfield Mall property were also discussed, and the potential impacts are included in this Environmental Impact Report. Project plans are available for review at the District 7 Caltrans office at 100 S. Main Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012.

#2 – See #1 above. Additionally, the alteration of structures is being studied and the exact nature of changes to those structures will not be determined until the final design stage. Based on initial design preparations, it has been determined that alteration(s) to structures in the Westfield Mall area can be conducted to avoid or minimize property impacts.

The proposed project will be designed to avoid constructing additional on- and off-ramps lanes that would require additional property losses. The project includes minimal buffer areas to reduce the project footprint, thus requiring less property acquisition from the Westfield Mall for right-of-way purposes. The implementation of Standard Provisions to minimize construction-related impacts and safety barriers adjacent to the Westfield Mall property are also part of the proposed project.

#3 – The reports mentioned cannot be prepared until a project alternative is selected. A preferred alternative cannot be selected until the environmental documentation phase is completed. Each of the reports referred to in the document will incorporate mitigation measures already mentioned in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report. Such items are (but not limited to) staging plans which identify that no two consecutive ramps will be closed; staging plans that identify that no ramps will be closed in the Westfield Mall and Eastland Shopping Center from the Monday preceding Thanksgiving to January 9th; and that the project right-of-way process will be conducted in compliance with the Uniform Relocation and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act.

#4 – Caltrans has right-of-way specialists that can help displaced property owners with relocation assistance. This assistance is given on a case-by-case basis with each displaced property owner. Business owners to be displaced will be assigned to a relocation advisor, who will work closely with each displacee in order to see that all payments and benefits are fully utilized and that all regulations are observed. According to the Relocation Impact Statement (2010) prepared for this project, the current property vacancy rate is adequate to find such relocation sites.

Caltrans has met with Westfield Mall representatives and discussed the potential for the relocation of the three businesses (now two businesses because one business closed) that could potentially be displaced by the proposed project. At that time the Westfield Mall
representatives indicated that they would be willing to help with relocating the displaced businesses within the area of the Westfield Mall under construction.

Again, studies indicate that the current vacancy rate in the nearby area is sufficient to relocate any displaced property owners. Displaced or directly affected property owners by the proposed project are subject to the Uniform Relocation and Real Property Acquisition Policy Act compensation measures. Based on the provisions of this act, the aforementioned measures in place to offset losses due to property acquisition, and the availability of comparable nearby properties for establishment of similar uses, it is concluded that socioeconomic impacts associated with the proposed project would not be significant.

#5 – Property owners and existing business right-of-way impacts as part of this project are subject to the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Act of 1970 (Uniform Act). The Uniform Act provides important protections and assistance for people affected by federally funded projects. This law was enacted by Congress to ensure that people whose real property is acquired, or who must move as a result of projects receiving federal funds, will be treated fairly and equitably and will receive assistance in moving from the property they occupy. The project will be constructed to minimize impacts to those property owners who remain, including the implementation of a Traffic Mitigation Plan to provide detours and appropriate signage to facilitate traffic circulation near existing businesses. Also, see #3 above.

#6 – See #3 and #4 above.

#7 – Project stage of construction plans and specifications show that:

1. At least one lane of Vincent Avenue will remain open in each direction.
2. The eastbound I-10 off-ramp to northbound Vincent Avenue is proposed to be closed permanently as part of the project. However, the construction of an intersection and improvements to existing ramps at Vincent Avenue will ensure that all traffic movements are maintained. The eastbound I-10 off-ramp to southbound Vincent Avenue will remain open, except for two brief 55 hour closures. The other ramps at Vincent Avenue will each be closed for an eight week period for safety reasons. Detours will be provided and clearly marked during those required temporary closures.
3. No two consecutive ramps will be closed at the same time.
4. Project stage of construction specification shows that Vincent Avenue ramps may not be closed continuously from the Monday preceding Thanksgiving to January 9th.
5. The travel way that runs parallel to Interstate Route 10 on the northern border of the Westfield West Covina Center (identified in the January 6, 2012 Westfield letter as West Garvey Avenue) will have one lane open in each direction during project construction.
6. It is not anticipated that any parking spaces will be lost as a result of project implementation in the Westfield West Covina Center, except those in the vicinity of the buildings that are currently occupied by AT&T and the California Pizza Kitchen.

#8 – Temporary Construction Easements (TCE’s) were included in the Draft EIR to the extent they were identified at the time that document was prepared (which was almost all of the project TCEs). However, a small number of additional TCE’s might be identified during the final project design phase.

All TCE’s will be identified, and negotiations conducted with the property owner, during the Right-of-Way Acquisition phase. Any impact resultant from the use of property as a TCE will be mitigated through the right-of-way compensation process. Because the very minor disruption associated with TCE’s are temporary in nature and compensation would be provided for the temporary use, Caltrans considers those impacts to be less than significant.

#9 – Caltrans acknowledges that the commenter has submitted a list of measures to be considered for mitigation of potential impacts to Westfield Mall. We note that numerous design features and other measures to minimize impacts to the Westfield Mall (West Covina) and Eastland Mall are incorporated into this project, including Best Management Practices contained in the Standard Specifications (http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/esc/oe/specifications/std_specifications/2010_StdSpecs/2010_StdSpecs.pdf, as identified in the Special Provisions prepared for this project). More specifically, see the following sections of the EIR for a description of offset measures that cover the issue areas listed in Attachment 1 of your letter: Traffic (Sections 3.2.4.2 and 3.2.5), Air Quality (Section 3.3.4.2), Noise and Vibration (Section 3.4.4.2), and Water Quality (Section 3.9.5).

#10 – At the time the January 6, 2012 letter was sent by the Westfield Mall representative (Patrick A. Gibson) all of the affected property owners in Segment 2 of the proposed project had not been contacted. Since that time the Westfield Mall has been contacted, offers on all Westfield Mall parcels have been made by Caltrans, and Caltrans is in negotiations with the Westfield West Covina Center to reach an agreement under the Uniform Relocation and Real Property Acquisition Policy Act.

Caltrans continues to meet frequently with Westfield West Covina Center representatives related to right-of-way and other concerns that they might have.

#11 – Caltrans has met with, and will continue to meet with, representatives of the Westfield West Covina Center. Additionally, the Caltrans Resident Engineer (RE), or his/her designated representative, will be available for the entire length of the project to assist in comment/concerns about project construction issues. This is the practice on all Caltrans projects, and is part of this project.
#12 – A visual barrier will be erected between the construction area and the Westfield West Covina Center. See standard specifications included as part of this project (http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/esc/oe/specifications/std_specs/2010_StdSpecs/2010_StdSpecs.pdf).

#13 – Caltrans has met with, and will continue to meet with, representatives of the Westfield West Covina Center. Additionally, the Caltrans RE, or his/her designated representative, will be available for the entire length of the project to assist in comment/concerns about project construction issues. This is the practice on all Caltrans projects, and is part of this project.

#14 – Caltrans projects utilize Best Management Practices (BMPs) as part of the Standard Specifications prepared for projects (see http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/oppd/stormwtr/constssp.htm). These Standard Specifications, which will be used to formulate the Special Provisions for this project, incorporate the Best Management Practices into this project. This includes the use and maintenance of the quietest type of equipment available that will meet the needs of construction activities. The contractors will be required to meet this requirement as part of this project implementation. The implementation of the BMP measures, and the fact that construction impacts are temporary in nature, will assure that there are no significant impacts related to construction activities.

#15 – See #14 above.

#16 – See #14 above. Additionally, Caltrans will attempt to have the contractor stage those noise generating activities away from the Westfield Center to the greatest extent possible. Caltrans also plans to erect temporary “screens” between the Westfield Center and the construction area. See standard specifications included as part of this project (http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/esc/oe/specifications/std_specs/2010_StdSpecs/2010_StdSpecs.pdf).

#17 – See #14 above. Additionally, the use of equipment that generates the most noise will attempt to be scheduled to be used simultaneously to limit the area from prolonged noise exposure to the largest extent possible. This minimization measure can be found in the Noise section (Section 3.4) and in the Environmental Commitments Record (ECR).

#18 – See #14 above. Additionally, the current plans indicate that no piles are planned to be driven in the Westfield Center area. See standard specifications included as part of this project (http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/esc/oe/specifications/std_specs/2010_StdSpecs/2010_StdSpecs.pdf).

#19 – Current plans do not call for the use of the Westfield Center property for loading or equipment staging areas. Caltrans also plans to erect temporary “screens” between the
Westfield Center and the construction area. See standard specifications included as part of this project (http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/esc/oe/specifications/std_specs/2010_StdSpecs/2010_StdSpecs.pdf).

#20 – See #14 above. Additionally, equipment idling will be limited to only the time needed for construction activities as outlined in the BMPs (Special Provisions) for air quality measures made part of this project. See standard specifications included as part of this project (http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/esc/oe/specifications/std_specs/2010_StdSpecs/2010_StdSpecs.pdf).

#21 – See #14 and #17 above. See standard specifications included as part of this project (http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/esc/oe/specifications/std_specs/2010_StdSpecs/2010_StdSpecs.pdf).

#22 – The Caltrans Resident Engineer (or his designated representative) will be available for the entire length of the project to assist in resolving project construction issues. This is the practice on all Caltrans projects, and is part of this project. See standard specifications included as part of this project (http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/esc/oe/specifications/std_specs/2010_StdSpecs/2010_StdSpecs.pdf).

#23 – Dust palliative measures (measures to control fugitive dust) are incorporated into the BMP measures in this project as outlined in the Standard Specifications and Special Provisions prepared for this project. The Standard Specifications/Special Provisions for this project will include watering measures, street sweeping measures, and construction haul measures. This minimization measure can be found in the Air Quality section (Section 3.3) and in the ECR.

#24 – The measures outlined in your letter are also incorporated into the Standard Specifications/Special Provisions for this project. See standard specifications included as part of this project (http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/esc/oe/specifications/std_specs/2010_StdSpecs/2010_StdSpecs.pdf). Additionally, the project is included in the RTIP and FTIP and has been determined “not to be a project of air quality concern” by the SCAQMD and FHWA. No additional permits are expected to be required from the SCAQMD. See #14 above.

#25 – Project construction needs are being discussed with the Westfield Center as part of the right-of-way process. However, temporary use of the Westfield Center property will be limited to the minimum needed to construct the project. Current plans do not identify the need to use the roadways within the Westfield center for project construction. See standard specifications included as part of this project.
#26 – The Standard Specifications/Special Provisions for this project include measures to address project site cleanliness. See standard specifications included as part of this project (http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/esc/oe/specifications/std_specs/2010_StdSpecs/2010_StdSpecs.pdf).

#27 – Again, the project RE, or his/her designated representative, will be available throughout the entire length of the project to discuss concerns/comments from the Westfield Center. See standard specifications included as part of this project (http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/esc/oe/specifications/std_specs/2010_StdSpecs/2010_StdSpecs.pdf).

#28 – See #7 above.

#29 – See #25 above.
January 12, 2012
VIA E-MAIL: GA4Y_ISSON@DOT.CA.GOV

Mr. Ron Kosinski
Deputy District Director, Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation ("Caltrans")
100 S. Main Street
Los Angeles, California 90012

Mr. Gary Iverson
Senior Environmental Planner, Division of Environmental Planning
Caltrans
100 S. Main Street
Los Angeles, California 90012

Re: Comments on the Legal Inadequacies of the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the One High Occupancy Vehicle Lane in Each Direction on the San Bernardino Freeway (Interstate 10) from Puente Avenue to State Routes 57/71 in Los Angeles County

Dear Mr. Kosinski and Mr. Iverson:

This office represents the Los Angeles County Employees Retirement Association, the owner (the "Owner") of Gateway Crescent, LLC, the owner of the office buildings located at 1000 and 1050 Lakes Drive, West Covina, California, 91790 (the "Property"). On behalf of the Owner, this letter constitutes comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the One High Occupancy Vehicle Lane in Each Direction on the San Bernardino Freeway (Interstate 10) from Puente Avenue to State Routes 57/71 in Los Angeles County (the "Draft EIR").

The Property consists of two 93,400 square feet existing four-story office buildings with medical uses, abundant landscaping and water features on nearly two acres east of Vincent Avenue and immediately south of Interstate 10. Abutting the Property to the north, east and west are surface parking lots (the "Impacted Parking") and farther to the east and west are parking structures. Through various legal agreements with the Community Development Commission of the City of West Covina, the owner of the surface parking lots, the Impacted Parking satisfies the parking demand of the Property's uses, as well as the City of West Covina's parking requirements.

1 Pursuant to the December 28, 2011 e-mail from Gary Iverson, Caltrans Senior Environmental Planner, the public comment period on the Draft EIR has been extended to January 13, 2012. See attached. According to Public Resources Code Section 21177(a) comments on the Project may occur during the public comment period or prior to the close of the public hearing.

2 On-site medical uses include rehabilitative/orthopedic medical uses, dental and eye care uses. Further, the rehabilitative uses include frequent and regular outdoor areas of the Property.
We have conducted a thorough review of the Draft EIR, including technical appendices, such as the traffic, noise and air quality studies. Although the Owner supports improvements that would improve access and traffic conditions in the area, the scope and size of the project (the “Project”) to increase the number of lanes on the freeway by 25 percent in each direction and change the Vincent Avenue ramps, especially on the east side of Vincent Avenue, have not been adequately disclosed or analyzed.

The Draft EIR understates the Project proposed and does not accurately describe the one that Caltrans unveiled to the public at the January 5, 2012 Town Hall meeting at the West Covina City Hall. According to the Draft EIR, the Property and Impacted Parking are immediately adjacent to the Project. There is no information anywhere in the Draft EIR that Caltrans proposes to permanently condemn 15 feet of the Impacted Parking and temporarily take an additional 10 foot wide temporary construction easement (“TCE”) that Caltrans Design Manager for District 7, Mr. Nader Gobran, P.E. revealed to us at the January 5, 2012 West Covina Town Hall meeting. For example, the Draft EIR Project Description describes the totality of property acquisitions as follows:

“The proposed project would require the acquisition of ROW (right-of-way) as follows:

Construction Phase 1. Temporary construction easements (TCEs) would be required for this construction phase to build soundwalls and retaining walls. Construction may also result in encroachments into existing frontage roads. Encroachment Permits would be required from the cities of Baldwin Park and West Covina for construction adjacent to frontage roads. Two full nonresidential acquisitions would be required near the Vincent Avenue eastbound onramp in the City of West Covina, including one restaurant and one restaurant/retail store.

Construction Phase 2. TCEs would be required for this construction phase to build soundwalls and retaining walls, as well as for utilities work. Construction may also result in encroachments into existing frontage roads. Encroachment Permits would be required from the cities of West Covina and Covina for construction adjacent to frontage roads.”

Draft EIR, pp. 1-13 to 1-14.

The Project that Caltrans proposes would condemn portions of the Impacted Parking and permanently force the removal of up to approximately 80 required parking spaces utilized by the Property; it would create new parking, access and emergency access significant impacts that have not been analyzed or disclosed. It would create new air pollution and noise impacts in close proximity to sensitive receptors, such as the medical patients who are already on the Property. It would create a new safety hazard to workers, visitors and patients at the Property that has not been analyzed, both for construction and

3 None of the technical studies for the Draft EIR have been made available to the public on-line.

4 The Impacted Parking area does not constitute a “frontage road” nor is it adjacent to one.
operations. It would create new aesthetic impacts by bringing the freeway that much closer to sensitive receptors and without a new sound wall, landscaping and/or barriers to mitigate the significant aesthetic impacts. None of these new significant environmental impacts that would occur at the Property has been disclosed, analyzed or mitigated in the Draft EIR as required by the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). Since Caltrans has not made a good faith effort to describe the Project and the environmental impacts as they relate to the Property and Impacted Parking, we suspect that there will be other properties along the entire length of the Project that will be similarly impacted, but without the disclosure and analysis that CEQA requires.

The approval process for the Project must comply with CEQA which requires an applicant not only to disclose environmental impacts to the public, but also to mitigate the significant impacts and consider alternatives that can reduce or eliminate the significant environmental impacts. As a general matter, in several areas critically important to the Owner, Project impacts have not been adequately analyzed or mitigated in the Draft EIR. In fact, the negative environmental impacts would be significantly more severe than disclosed in the Draft EIR.

1. Recirculation of the Draft EIR is Required

The negative environmental impacts would be significantly more severe than disclosed in the Draft EIR and many of the undisclosed effects are significant and unavoidable. Consequently, the Owner requests recirculation of the Draft EIR pursuant to § 15088.6 of the California Code of Regulations ("CCR") because it is impossible for the public and decision makers to understand the true environmental impacts of the Project. These impacts must be adequately analyzed, disclosed and mitigated in a recirculated Draft EIR.

a. New Information

CEQA requires a lead agency to "recirculate an EIR when significant new information is added to the EIR after public notice is given of the availability of the Draft EIR for public review . . . but before certification." CCR § 15088.6(a); see also California Public Resources Code ("PRC") § 21092.1; Laurel Heights Improvement Ass'n of San Francisco v. Regents of Univ. of Cal., 6 Cal.4th 1112, 1129 (1993). New information is significant when it changes the EIR in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful

---

5 As recently as last month a car flew off the freeway and into the impacted Parking area. Bringing the freeway 15 feet closer to the Property will increase the risk, severity and danger to sensitive receptors and to the Property. The increased risk, severity and the increased likelihood of danger creates a new significant impact that has not been disclosed, analyzed or mitigated.
opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project or a feasible alternative or mitigation measure. See *Laurel Heights* at 1126. The omission of the key elements of the up to 25 foot takings (15 feet permanently and 10 feet of TCE) affecting the Property recently revealed prior to the end of the public comment period (see footnote 1) is just such significant new information. Its late disclosure has deprived the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the Project. This alone requires recirculation.

b. Cannot Chop The Project Into Bite Size Pieces

An EIR must describe the entirety of a project, including reasonably foreseeable future actions that are part of a project, and must analyze those reasonably foreseeable actions. See CCR § 15378(a); *Laurel Heights Improvement Ass'n v. Regents of Univ. of Cal.* 47 Cal.3d 376, 385 (1988). CEQA prohibits the segmentation of a project into bite sized pieces in order to avoid environmental review. See *Orinda Ass'n v. Board of Supervisors* 182 Cal.App.3d 1145, 1171 (1986). Here, the omission of all of the partial takings from analysis in the EIR constitutes unlawful segmentation.

The acquisition of the Impacted Parking's land is a fundamental and indispensable component of the Project; it was included in the design boards presented at the January 5, 2012 Town Hall meeting in West Covina and was also described by Caltrans' Mr. Gobran as a part of the Project to the Property Manager of the Property, Mrs. Nunes, and me, even though these acquisitions and the harmful environmental impacts that they will create are not analyzed in the Draft EIR. While a limited number of full acquisitions were described in the Draft EIR, the partial acquisitions affecting the Impacted Parking and the Property were not listed. Partial acquisitions are an integral part of the Project and may create new significant and unavoidable impacts, such as here, where they will exacerbate noise, air quality and safety impacts by bringing the freeway closer to sensitive receptors. As such, Caltrans has unlawfully segmented the Project and CEQA requires recirculation to describe and analyze the partial acquisitions.

c. Public Notices Inadequate

There have been prior environmental reviews for previous efforts to improve I-10 along this corridor, but this is a new EIR for a different project. There is nothing indicating anywhere that the EIR is a Supplemental or Subsequent EIR and there is nothing indicating the changes in this EIR compared to
prior environmental review.\textsuperscript{9} As stated in the Draft EIR, since the time of the previous environmental reviews on the different projects, there have been many changes, both to the Project and to circumstances that necessitate new environmental analysis.

"Since January 2003, several changes to the project have occurred, as well as changes to circumstances surrounding the project. Refined engineering development of the proposed project has resulted in changes to several arterial ramp interchanges, soundwall modifications, right-of-way (ROW) acquisitions, and retaining wall locations. Eight years of time passage has also resulted in changes to the surrounding land uses and businesses."


Thus, the Draft EIR does not indicate that it is a Subsequent or Supplemental Draft EIR pursuant to PRC § 21166 and CCR §§ 15162 and 15183. As such, the law requires the scrupulous adherence to all of the procedural requirements for a new Project EIR.

Despite the fact that this is a new Draft EIR, the State Clearinghouse has not received the required Draft EIR's Notice of Preparation (CCR § 15062(a)); Notice of Completion (CCR §§ 15085(a) and 15087); there is no evidence of any required consultation with agencies (CCR § 15086(a)), including consultation with the California Air Resources Board (CCR § 15086(a)(6)), scoping meeting (CCR § 15082(c)) and there are no scoping comments.\textsuperscript{7} According to Anthony Deng of the State Clearinghouse on January 9, 2012, "I don't think we have received this project yet." Further, there is no required State Clearinghouse number for this Draft EIR. It is troubling that there is no evidence that Caltrans has consulted or scoped the Project with other governmental agencies and the public as the law requires. As the Project would generate significant amounts of traffic by increasing the lanes of traffic on I-10 by 25 percent, this is a project of statewide, regional, or area wide significance. The requirements of CCR § 15206(a) have been ignored. If the procedures that the CEQA Guidelines and the law require were followed, the Project could have been properly defined and environmental impacts analyzed. Without any of the proper legal notice and State Clearinghouse involvement on so many crucial documents, not only has public participation been thwarted, Caltrans has prevented the public and other

\textsuperscript{9} CCR § 15086.5(g)'s requirement to summarize changes in the environmental review for a recirculated EIR have not been followed. Thus, we assume that this is not a recirculated EIR even though it would have been helpful to have a summary of the changes in environmental impacts compared to the previous environmental review.

\textsuperscript{7} The Draft EIR includes comments from various public agencies on an EIR that was circulated a decade ago. There are no scoping comments from any public agency or member of the public on this Draft EIR.
public agencies from helping to make the EIR a better environmental document that fully analyzes the full extent of the Project impacts. CEQA requires recirculation.

d. Baseline

The Draft EIR has not compared the environmental impacts of the Project to the existing environmental conditions. Instead, impacts were inconsistently compared against future predicted conditions with build-out years that varied section to section from 2016, 2017, 2030, 2035 and 2038. "Although [n]either CEQA nor the CEQA Guidelines mandates a uniform, inflexible rule for determining the existing conditions baseline" (Communities For A Better Environment, supra, 48, Cal.4th at p. 328, italics added), nothing in the law authorizes environmental impacts to be evaluated only against predicted conditions more than a decade after EIR certification and prior approval.” Sunnyvale West Neighborhood Association v. City of Sunnyvale 190 Cal.App.4th 1351, 1380 (2010). By using 2015, 2017, 2030, 2035 and 2038 future baseline levels to measure Project impacts for different impact areas, such as traffic, noise and air quality, not only does the EIR not compare the Project impacts against the existing physical conditions, there is no explanation why the “future” baseline should be so different for different impact areas. It is difficult to know the true impacts of the Project. In addition, the baseline is normally the existing physical conditions at the time the Notice of Preparation is released. The State Clearinghouse has no record of receiving the Notice of Preparation for this EIR and it is uncertain when it was released. Further, existing baseline conditions are variously described as 2008, 2010 and 2011. Similar to the problems with the future baseline, there is no explanation why the existing conditions baseline year should be so different for various impact areas and the conflicting baseline years makes it difficult for the public to know the true impacts of the Project. As a result of the flawed environmental analysis, this Draft EIR makes it “… impossible for decision makers and the general lay public to readily grasp the traffic and related impacts of the project itself on the environment as it presently exists.” Id. at 1389.

The Draft EIR fails to identify and consider the incremental effects of the widening on the Property and Impacted Parking, as well as the larger Project, individually, on the existing traffic, noise, and air quality conditions, among others. Impermissibly, “the EIR instead evaluates any incremental change in those conditions due to the project against the already worse traffic environment of the future.” Id. at 1387. With the current analysis, there is no way for the public to know the incremental impact of the Project compared to existing conditions.
While the EIR describes the existing roadway network and the existing traffic volume on certain roadway segments and the existing LOS at certain intersections, the EIR does not use the existing conditions as its baseline and, consequently, fails to answer how and to what extent the proposed project itself would adversely change the existing traffic conditions without those other roadway improvements assumed to be in place by the year 2020. How would the project change the delay and LOS at the various intersections under the existing conditions? Would the project alone substantially increase existing traffic volumes on certain roadway segments or substantially increase the existing traffic congestion and delay at certain intersections? The FEIR does not address those questions.

Id. at 1389.

The very exact problems relating to the baseline that existed in the EIR rejected by the court in Sunnyvale West exist with this EIR, and revision and recirculation are necessary.

e. Thresholds Of Significance

According to CCR § 15064.7 an agency uses thresholds of significance to determine the significance of environmental effects. “A threshold of significance is an identifiable quantitative, qualitative or performance level of a particular environmental effect, non-compliance with which means the effect will normally be determined to be significant by the agency and compliance with which means the effect normally will be determined to be less than significant.” While the Draft EIR states that criteria for determining the significance of impacts are based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the text of the Draft EIR rarely lists thresholds of significance, and when it does, there are errors. In the Noise section of the Draft EIR a 5 dBA increase is considered a significant impact, even though this contradicts the threshold listed in the Noise Study Report that is included in the Appendices. See Draft EIR p. 3.4-11. There is no information to determine when a change in baseline conditions caused by the Project would be considered significant other than Caltrans saying every time in this document that the impact is less than significant without reference to any standard or threshold (other than for the one conflicting noise threshold). There must be thresholds of significance in order to determine significant

As described later in this letter, there are several locations where the ambient noise levels will exceed this 5 dBA threshold as a result of the Project, but the Draft EIR does not classify this impact as significant. The Noise section of the Draft EIR also does not follow and apply the thresholds of significance listed in the Noise Study Report. There are new significant and unavoidable noise impacts and CEQA requires recirculation.
impacts, and there is an absence in this document. CEQA requires more than just “trust me.” This is a fundamental flaw with this Draft EIR. Recirculation is required.

2. STABLE PROJECT DESCRIPTION

“An accurate, stable and finite project description is the sine qua non of an informative and legally sufficient EIR.” See County of Inyo v. City of Los Angeles (1977) 71 Cal.App.3d 185 at 192. Not only is it uncertain where the construction impacts would occur because the TCE locations have not been described, the operational components of the Project, including the location of all of the proposed partial property acquisitions, have not been described.

a. Statements And Design Drawings Of Caltrans Conflict With Draft EIR

The Owner is troubled by the actions of Caltrans that have the effect of impermissibly concealing the true scope and environmental impacts of the Project it proposes. On December 30, 2011, Mr. Iverson of Caltrans told me in person that there would be no taking of property to the east of Vincent Avenue for the high occupancy vehicle (“HOV”) lanes or Vincent Avenue ramp improvements at the southeast intersection of Vincent Avenue and I-10.9 Mr. Iverson even maintained this position at the January 5, 2012 Town Hall meeting when he told Mrs. Nunes and me that there would be no takings affecting the Property. Impact LU-6 (“The proposed project would displace nonresidential properties, necessitating replacement nonresidential properties”) omits a description and analysis of the proposed permanent displacement that would occur as a result of the Project, including an omission of the impacts to the Impacted Parking area. See Draft EIR pp. 3.10-11 to 3.10-13. In addition, Draft EIR Table 3.8-1 (“Summary of Initial Site Assessments and Hazardous Waste Assessments for Parcels Subject to Acquisition”) which purportedly summarizes the parcels subject to acquisition, does not list or analyze the Impacted Parking as being subject to acquisition, even though Caltrans proposes a 15 foot wide condemnation of the Impacted Parking and an additional 10 foot wide TCE along over 1,000 feet of Impacted Parking frontage.10 The total taking of the Impacted Parking may be as much as 25,000 square feet (i.e., 25 feet x 1,000 feet of frontage). This is over one-half of an acre of valuable land integral to the operations of the Property. Assessor Parcel Numbers (“APNs”) 8474-011-942 and -943, the properties

9 The attached 12/29/11 e-mail from Gary Iverson also states “[t]f our conversation it appears that the proposed project will not have a direct impact to your clients [sic] properties.”
10 At the January 5, 2012 West Covina Town Hall meeting, Caltrans presented Boards showing that the frontage of the Impacted Parking parcels would be subject to acquisitions. Mr. Gobran of Caltrans showed Ms. Nunes and me Caltrans design drawings showing a permanent 14.96-foot wide acquisition of the Impacted Parking’s freeway frontage in addition to a 10-foot wide TCE.
containing the impacted Parking, have simply not been listed or analyzed as parcels subject to acquisition even though Caltrans proposes to use parts of those properties to expand the freeway and to conduct construction. As such, the Draft EIR fails to describe the Project proposed; there is also no analysis of the environmental impacts of the omitted portions of the Project in the Draft EIR. On a most fundamental basis, it is impossible for the public to know the Project that Caltrans truly proposes, as the Draft EIR and statements made by the people who are responsible for the design drawings for the Project and the preparation of the environmental review of the Project are irreconcilable. CEQA requires recirculation pursuant to CCR § 15068.5.

b. Other Project Description Inaccuracies

There are a substantial number of inaccuracies, contradictions and lack of information in the Project Description. They include the following:

- Failure of the Project Description to describe the increase in traffic attributable to the Project and inconsistent descriptions of the change in vehicular traffic as a result of the Project. According to Table 4.3-2, greenhouse gas emissions will increase by 29.8 percent as a result of the Project; presumably because the Project involves an increase in the generation of traffic, yet other portions of the Draft EIR incredibly assume that there would not be an increase in vehicular traffic even though the number of I-10 traffic lanes would increase by 25 percent. While it is inconceivable that increasing the number of lanes on I-10 would not cause an increase in the amount of traffic generated, several sections of the EIR rely on this faulty premise. For example, “There would not be a significant increase in traffic volumes under the Proposed Project Alternative compared to the No Project Alternative. The projected traffic volumes are the same for both alternatives.” See Draft EIR p. 3.3-17. “Under the Proposed Project Alternative, no change in the volume of vehicles carrying hazardous and toxic materials is expected either during construction or operation.” See Draft EIR p. 3.8-5. See also p. 4 of the Caltrans Letter of Commitment dated 8/8/2003 contained in Draft EIR Appendix H: “Because the volume of vehicles is assumed to be the same under the No Action/No Build Alternative and the proposed project, there will not be a substantial change in traffic volumes on local streets or at the interchanges of I-10.”
Various conflicting descriptions of the widening. Each side of the freeway would include the addition of a 12 foot wide lane with an eight to ten foot wide shoulder (Draft EIR p. 8-2); a 12 foot wide lane with a ten foot wide shoulder (Draft EIR Figure 1-4); an 11 foot wide lane plus a two foot wide buffer; and a 10 foot wide shoulder (Noise Study Report (Reevaluation/Supplemental Study, p. 3)). Clearly the Project cannot be all three at the same time.

Draft EIR p. 1-13 states that northbound lanes at Vincent and I-10 would be modified from three through lanes to 2.5 through lanes. At northbound Vincent Avenue there are currently only two through lanes.

Partial widening and replacement of the Vincent Avenue bridge is listed in the Project Description on p. 1-12 of the Draft EIR, but there is no information anywhere in the document regarding the extent of changes or analysis of construction impacts for bridge demolition/work.

Takings on the westside of the Vincent Avenue eastbound off-ramps are described, but takings on the eastside of the Vincent Avenue eastbound off-ramp affecting the Impacted Parking and the Property are not described (compare Draft EIR p. 1-14 to the analysis in the Land Use and Air Quality sections).

Signallization for northbound Vincent Avenue is discussed on Draft EIR p. 3.2-13, but it is not described in the Project Description.

The Project Description states that the eastbound I-10 exit ramp to northbound Vincent Avenue would be removed, yet Sheet L-11 of the Noise Study Report depicts no removal of the ramp.

Location of the ramp metering for the eastbound Vincent on-ramp. Draft EIR p. 1-12 states that the metering would be placed 336 feet downstream, even though elsewhere in the Draft EIR it is stated at 250 feet downstream.
3. INADEQUACIES IN THE TRAFFIC ANALYSIS

a. No Increase In Trips Generated As A Result Of The Project

The traffic analysis does not assume that there would even be a single new trip as a result of the capacity of I-10 increasing with the addition of 25 percent more traffic lanes. Increasing the capacity of the freeway will not just cause the existing traffic and expected growth to use the HOV lane, but additional new motorists who otherwise would take other east-west freeways, such as SR-60 and I-210, and other east-west arterials would utilize this new traffic lane. Not only must the increase in trips on I-10 be analyzed, but the redistributed traffic impact on impacted streets, such as Vincent Avenue, must be analyzed since the new additional motorists utilizing the HOV lanes would travel on arterials to access the freeway. As a result, the estimate of traffic generated by the Project has been grossly underestimated and impacts not analyzed as required.

b. Site Access Changes Would Create Safety, Spillover and Traffic Impacts That Have Not Been Analyzed

The up-to-25 foot taking during the construction timeline may fully block through access along the north side of the Impacted Parking area. Even if there is only a partial blockage of access, this may result in the need to narrow the driveway that connects the east and west portions of the Impacted Parking area and/or convert it to one way access. This may present a safety hazard in case cars go the wrong way. If there is full blockage, then cars will need to make U-turns and in addition to depleting much needed parking, this will create a safety hazard. Further, due to the location of handicapped parking and high pedestrian movements across the Impacted Parking areas, cars may back up onto Lakes Drive as they try to enter the Property. This would further slow down traffic and degrade the level of service ("LOS"); yet there has been no analysis. The environmental impact of this configuration has not been analyzed.

In addition, the movement of the freeway 15 feet closer to the Property’s buildings and sensitive receptors would create a substantially increased hazard. Cars have flown off the freeway into the Impacted Parking area previously. Moving the freeway any closer will increase the potentially catastrophic risk to sensitive receptors and property that much more greatly. As the Draft EIR does not even discuss the freeway moving any closer to the buildings on the Property, it does not disclose or analyze this increased risk. The risk is also exacerbated by the grade differential; the freeway is higher in elevation than the Property. The consequences to life and property of not only being rammed by a flying vehicle, but also crushed from on top will be worse with the movement of the freeway closer to sensitive receptors. These significant impacts were not analyzed in the Draft EIR and CEQA requires mitigation for
these new significant impacts. Appropriate mitigation measures include not moving the freeway any closer to the Property, as well as constructing aesthetically pleasing safety barriers that would minimize to a less than significant level the risk of cars flying off the freeway and onto the Impacted Parking area and Property.

The reconfiguration would likely create a hazard for motorists, visitors, workers and pedestrians, and may also contribute to increased traffic congestion on adjacent streets; these impacts were not analyzed. See CEQA Guidelines Appendix G Sections XVI(a) and (d).

c. There Was No Analysis Of The Conflict With Adopted Policies, Plans, Or Programs Regarding Public Transit, Bicycle, Or Pedestrian Facilities, Or Otherwise Decrease The Performance Or Safety Of Such Facilities

Adding a full new dedicated lane to the eastbound on-ramp from northbound Vincent Avenue may increase the hazards to pedestrians and bicyclists. Cars already often do not yield to pedestrians and bicyclists at the on-ramps, and increasing the vehicular capacity of the on-ramp will encourage more cars to enter the on-ramp and increase the danger to pedestrians and bicyclists. Further, there was no analysis of access through the Vincent Avenue undercrossing during construction for pedestrians and bicyclists. CEQA requires this analysis, as well as mitigation for these potentially significant impacts, such as enhanced visibility crosswalks and other safety measures. See CEQA Guidelines Appendix G Sections XVI(f).

d. New Hazards Created By The Potential Full Or Partial Blockage Of The Impacted Parking Area

The potential impacted Parking area closure presents a hazard to the community because it would thwart police and ambulance access onto the Property. There was no analysis in the Draft EIR on the impact to ambulances and police as a result of the potential closure. This could create significant environmental and safety impacts, especially as response times are critical for life/safety. Critical emergency services can be severely impacted, especially as a fire lane access may be permanently lost.

e. Growth Inducing Impacts

The Project would have growth inducing impacts that have not been analyzed. Adding capacity to the freeways with HOV lanes, reconfigured ramps and wider overpasses would encourage more cars to utilize area roadways. This would facilitate growth. It is implausible to assume, as the Draft EIR does,
that there would not be growth inducing impacts as a result of these improvements. The court in Sunnyvale West stated:

"...it must be recognized that a roadway infrastructure project aimed at reducing regional traffic and related problems might still have growth-inducing impacts with indirect adverse environmental impacts in the immediate vicinity of the project, such as a localized increase in traffic problems, noise or air pollutants, which may only become apparent when the project is evaluated directly against existing conditions."

See Sunnyvale West at 1383.

As the Project would be designed to “improve mobility,” “implement corridor improvements,” and “increase continuity of the HOV system,” it means that more cars would travel the area roadways. See Draft EIR p. 1-4. The traffic, air quality and noise impacts of the incremental increase in cars and trips as a result of the growth inducing nature of the improvements have not been analyzed in the Draft EIR. PRC § 21100(b)(5) and CCR § 15126.2(d) require such an analysis.

f. City of West Covina Thresholds

The Draft EIR fails to disclose the City of West Covina’s LOS thresholds for traffic.11 The minimum LOS at intersections pursuant to the Congestion Management Plan is not described. The threshold of significance at the new signal at Vincent Avenue and the I-10 eastbound off-ramp is not described. It is impossible for the public to know whether there is a significant impact at Vincent Avenue and I-10 based on the information Caltrans has provided in the Draft EIR. When the additional growth inducing traffic is taken into account, traffic will be that much worse. Revision and recirculation of the Draft EIR are required.

g. Baseline

Had the Draft EIR compared the incremental effects of the Project to the existing conditions instead of the worse traffic conditions of a future baseline, significant traffic impacts may be likely at a number of intersections, but it is impossible to know since the Draft EIR did not do that analysis. See the previous discussion in this letter of Baseline issues.

h. Parking

Eighty or possibly more parking spaces would be lost on the Property as a result of the proposed condemnation to accommodate the freeway widening, even though this has not been analyzed in the

11 In fact, all of the West Covina thresholds of significance have been omitted.
Draft EIR. Reduction of the Property’s parking may result in inadequate parking capacity that has not been analyzed in the Draft EIR. There is no analysis in the Draft EIR regarding how many spaces would be removed or the impact on adequate parking. Combined with the potential loss of off-street parking, there may be a new significant impact that has not been analyzed.

i. Construction Mitigation

There is no analysis of the construction staging plans. Draft EIR p. 3.2-10 impermissibly defers the construction staging plan formulation to the future when the impacts can no longer be scrutinized or challenged by the public. Further, while a Traffic Mitigation Plan ("TMP") is proposed, there is too little information contained in it for anyone to know the measures that will be required to mitigate the significant environmental impact. CEQA does not allow deferral of preparation of mitigation. See Sacramento Old City Ass’n v. City of Sacramento, 226 Cal.App.3d 1011 (1991). A menu of binding and enforceable mitigation measures to reduce the construction traffic mitigation measures is required now.

4. IMPACTS ON AESTHETICS NOT ADEQUATELY ANALYZED

The Property has copious amounts of landscaping and water features. The parking, landscaping and driveways in the impacted Parking area act as a buffer separating the freeway from the Property. Moving the freeway closer will reduce the physical separation from the freeway and bring the negative impacts of the freeway that much closer to the Property. Mitigation for the aesthetic impact of a ten-lane freeway 15 feet closer and the increased trash and litter that would result from the increase in capacity to the freeway is required.

a. No analysis of potential light/glare impacts

The Draft EIR does not analyze the lighting impacts of moving the freeway 15 feet closer, including the elongation of the Vincent Avenue eastbound on-ramp, to sensitive receptors and to the Property. As the freeway is elevated, it would cause the headlights of thousands of cars to spillover onto the Property’s four-story buildings, including onto the lush grounds of the Property. There would not be any landscaping or architectural buffer. The headlights of a high number of cars would shine all over the Property and create an annoyance to tenants trying to work in their offices, as well as medical patients at the Property. There has been no analysis of this impact and it would create light pollution and a worsened lighting impact. Possible mitigation for this significant impact includes an aesthetically pleasing barrier to minimize the possibility of lights shining into offices.
b. Full Visual Impact Not Shown

The Project Description does not adequately describe or show the visual impact of the freeway coming closer to the Property. The Draft EIR does not include information or diagrams showing how the Project, including the proposed retaining wall, would appear along the approximately 1,000 foot frontage with the Impacted Parking area. Nor is it clear how the design would be integrated with the adjacent properties or impact them. Caltrans already struggles to maintain I-10 free of litter and graffiti. Adding additional capacity and moving the freeway closer to the Property will exacerbate litter and graffiti problems. CEQA Guidelines Appendix G Section 1(c) requires analysis and disclosure if the Project will degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings, and the Draft EIR does not give enough information about the appearance of the Project to satisfy this requirement.

c. Aesthetic Impacts of Construction Not Described

The construction timeline will last up to five years for the Project. Caltrans proposes a 10 foot TCE on the Impacted Parking area, in addition to a 15 foot permanent taking. There will be extensive construction within Caltrans’ existing right-of-way. The change in the existing aesthetic conditions will be dramatic and aesthetic mitigation, such as temporary walls and barriers, are necessary.

5. NOISE ANALYSIS INADEQUATE

a. The Project Would Create New Noise Sources In Closer Proximity To The Property Exceeding Applicable Standards

Pursuant to Sheet L-12 of the Noise Study Report, existing ambient noise on the north side of I-10, directly across from the Property, is 76.1 dBA. This high level of noise exceeds the exterior noise abatement criteria (“NAC”) standard of 72 dBA for commercial uses and 67 dBA for hospital/medical uses.12 See p. 13 of the Noise Technical Study. Considering the numerous medical uses at the Property, the lower 67 dBA noise standard applies to determine impacts at the Property. Even if the higher 72 dBA noise standard applies, the existing noise levels combined with the increased noise levels of the Project cause a new significant impact and warrant abatement.

While the Noise section of the Draft EIR omits listing the NAC standard, according to p. 6 of Caltrans’ Traffic Noise Protocol dated May 2011, a noise impact occurs when “noise level in the design

12 While the Noise Study Report includes thresholds of significance, they are not repeated or listed in the text of the Draft EIR.
year approaches or exceeds the Noise Abatement Criteria (NAC) specified in 23 CFR 772, or a predicted noise level substantially exceeds the existing noise level (a "substantial" noise increase)." The existing noise measurement taken behind a sound wall directly across the freeway from the Property site was measured at 76 dBA. The high existing ambient noise level already exceeds the applicable noise standard pursuant to Caltrans own standards for residential, hospital and commercial uses. When the additional noise of traffic from the 25 percent increase in lane capacity is added, compounded by noise bouncing off the sound wall proposed for the north side of the freeway towards the Property on the south, the impacts will exceed thresholds of significance. This is clearly a case of a significant impact that has not been disclosed, analyzed or mitigated.

Even if one were to ignore Caltrans' own Traffic Noise Protocol and Noise Study Report, as the Draft EIR does, and utilize the 5 dBA threshold listed on p. 3.4-11 of the Draft EIR, there would still be several new significant and unavoidable noise impacts that have not been disclosed. Table 3.4-1 shows a 10.8 dBA increase as a result of the Project at Receiver ID H, a 5.5 dBA increase at Receiver ID H5, and a 5.0 dBA increase at JM4 as a result of the Project. These are all significant impacts even though the EIR does not call these significant impacts despite the fact that the noise increases exceed the threshold listed in the Draft EIR. In addition, the Draft EIR did not analyze the noise standards of the various General Plans of the cities impacted by the Project. The City of West Covina General Plan noise standards were not analyzed, even though CEQA Guidelines Appendix G Section XII(a) requires this analysis.

Significant impacts require mitigation, such as a sound wall and/or dense vegetation to break the line of sight to the proposed widening. Other mitigation may include the installation of double paneled windows on the Property's windows to mitigate the high level of noise. The Project would create substantial temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the Property above levels existing without the Project. See CEQA Guidelines Appendix G Section XII(c) and (d). There is inadequate analysis and mitigation of these significant environmental impacts.

b. The Draft EIR Does Not Adequately Analyze Or Mitigate The Noise Impacts Of Construction

The Draft EIR only lists construction noise equipment levels at 50 feet from the equipment noise source. See Table 3.4-3 (Construction Equipment Noise) of the Draft EIR. As it relates to the Property, the edge of the TCE will encroach 25 feet south of the existing freeway property line. The construction noise heard by sensitive receptors on the Property will be zero feet from the noise source, not 50 feet.
away. As a result, the noise impacts will be much worse than analyzed in the Draft EIR. Further, there was no analysis of the Vincen Avenue interchange improvements. See Draft EIR p. 3.4-17. In addition, the City of West Covina’s construction noise regulations, even though the Draft EIR states on p. 3.4-10 that “… noise levels generated during construction shall comply with applicable local, state, and federal regulations…” it is not clear how there can be compliance with the West Covina regulations when there is no analysis or demonstration that the Project will comply with those regulations. This is a potentially significant impact not disclosed. Further, while the Draft EIR has a list of "possible control measures that can be implemented," these are not required, binding mitigation measures that reduce the construction noise and vibration impact to less than significant. Binding and enforceable mitigation is required. As such, CEQA requires revision and recirculation of the EIR. See CEQA Guidelines Appendix G Section XII(a).

c. Operational Vibration Not Examined

The Project includes widening the freeway so that one lane of traffic will come closer to the Property. Heavy trucks, i.e., those likely to cause more vibration and sound impacts, typically utilize the slow lane of the freeway more so than the lanes closer to the center median. As such, operational vibration impacts could have a potentially significant impact on both the Property’s buildings, as well as the Property’s outdoor areas. Yet, vibration impacts from operations have been omitted from analysis in the Draft EIR. CEQA Guidelines Appendix G Section XII(b) requires analysis of this potentially significant impact.

6. AIR POLLUTION ANALYSIS INADEQUATE

a. Operations Analysis Inadequate

There will be an increase in air pollution as a result of the Project, but the Draft EIR does not disclose or analyze any increase in criteria pollutants. While the Draft EIR assumes on p. 3.3-16 that there will be a slight decrease in criteria pollutants due to engine combustion, there is no analysis to show that the increased efficiency in engine combustion exceeds the vehicular emissions that will be created by a 25 percent increase in new lanes of traffic added to the freeway. The Draft EIR relies on the faulty premise that there would not be a significant increase in traffic volumes as a result of the Project. See Draft EIR p. 3.3-17. The Draft EIR is without support, as increasing the capacity of the freeway will not just relieve congestion, but it will encourage additional motorists who either are not driving, or are taking
other routes to now take I-10. This will result in a net increase in criteria pollutants that has not been analyzed or mitigated, as necessary.

b. Localized Significance Thresholds Not Analyzed

The Southern California Air Quality Management District requires the analysis of localized significance thresholds (“LST”). No such analysis has occurred here. This is particularly problematic as it relates to the Property as there are sensitive uses at the Property, such as rehabilitation services and other medical offices. The harmful air quality impacts as a result of adding one lane of traffic in each direction adjacent to the Property must be analyzed.

c. A Health Risk Assessment Is Necessary

Caltrans cannot just conclude without substantial evidence that “the magnitude and the duration of potential increases and exposure to TACs [Toxic Air Contaminants] of the No Project Alternative compared to the proposed project cannot be accurately quantified due to the inherent deficiencies of current models.” See Draft EIR p. 3.3-17-18. With sensitive receptors on the Property, including patients at the rehabilitation clinics and dental offices, the lack of a Health Risk Assessment is inadequate; analysis of the health risk impacts of the exhaust from all of the vehicles that will be added to the freeway as a result of the increased capacity is necessary. CEQA requires the analysis of Project impacts. The Draft EIR must be revised and recirculated to assess the air quality impacts for the public in the vicinity of the Vincent Avenue improvements, including an assessment of long-term exposure to Diesel Particulate Matter.

7. MITIGATION MEASURES INADEQUATE

Many of the mitigation measures in the Draft EIR are legally inadequate. The language used in the mitigation measures (i.e., “to the extent feasible”) takes away from the enforceability of mitigation measures. See Draft EIR p. S-5, p. 3.1-12. The words “to the extent feasible” should be removed. As discussed previously, more mitigation is necessary. There is simply a deferral of analysis for many mitigation measures, such as for the TMP and construction staging plans. See Sacramento Old City Ass’n v. City of Sacramento, 229 Cal.App.3d 1011 (1991).

8. LAND USE ANALYSIS INADEQUATE

The Project involves the partial acquisition of many properties along the length of the Project. While full property acquisitions were discussed, the land use impacts and the conversion of residential
and commercial property to freeway uses for all of the partial acquisitions have not been disclosed or analyzed. With regard to the Property, the taking of land will result in zoning non-conformances since required parking will be eliminated. The Draft EIR is conclusory and does not have any substantial evidence to support the claim that the Project is consistent with all local plans and programs; that it does not require any zoning changes and that it is consistent with the goals and policies of various City General Plans, such as the City of West Covina. See Draft EIR p. 3.10-1C. The conclusion that the Project is consistent with the City of West Covina General Plan is without any support considering that there is no analysis of the General Plan policy and goals.  

9. HAZARDS ANALYSIS INADEQUATE

Table 3.8-1 (Summary of Initial Site Assessments and Hazardous Waste Assessments for Parcels Subject to Acquisition) lists the sites subject to acquisition, including the partial acquisitions. This Table omits analysis of the Impacted Parking parcels. Unlike 950 Lakes Drive which is analyzed for hazardous conditions, such as aerially deposited lead, there is no such analysis of the Impacted Parking parcels. There should be analysis of all of the potentially hazardous materials in all of the acquisition parcels. Further, Impact HAZ-1 states that there would be a less than significant impact with regard to the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials since there would be "no change in the volume of vehicles carrying hazardous and toxic materials expected either during construction or operation." See Draft EIR p. 3.8-5. This conclusion is not supported by substantial evidence. First, Table 3.8-1 lists no less than 14 sites where there are potentially hazardous conditions that would be disturbed by the construction of the Project; the potentially hazardous materials at all of these sites need to be transported off-site. There may be other sites with potentially hazardous conditions, such as those subject to partial acquisitions, that have not been analyzed. Second, demolition of the bridges/overpasses may create the need to transport hazardous materials, such as lead and asbestos, from those bridges/overpasses, but this was not analyzed. Third, the freeway lane capacity is increasing by 25 percent. There will be at least some increase in the number of vehicles transporting hazardous materials on the freeway. The conclusion that there would be a less than significant impact is not supported by substantial evidence.

13 Other sections of the Draft EIR, such as Aesthetics, impermissibly did not analyze the West Covina General Plan because "they were unavailable for online review."
10. ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS INADEQUATE

CEQA requires a reasonable range of alternatives and one important alternative that would meet the Project’s purposes would be to convert an existing mixed-flow lane to a dedicated HOV lane. This alternative would achieve the Project’s goals, yet was not analyzed. It would have the impact of incentivizing carpools and it would close the gap in the HOV lane system. Not only would this also increase the person-carrying capacity of I-10, in this era of limited resources, it would also be an extremely cost effective way of reaching Caltrans goals for the Project without creating new significant environmental impacts and it would not incur hundreds of millions of dollars in costs. A reasonable range has not been examined in the Draft EIR.

11. CONCLUSION

The Owner is supportive of Caltrans’ efforts with regard to components of the Project that will increase regional mobility and decrease congestion. However, the Project that Caltrans has analyzed does not reflect the Project it proposes. Further, the Project would create new significant environmental impacts that have not been adequately analyzed or disclosed. CEQA requires that the full environmental impacts of the Project be disclosed, analyzed and mitigated. By failing to identify and consider the incremental effects of the Project, such as the harmful effects on air quality, noise, parking and safety, the Draft EIR fails to accomplish this in a number of respects.
On behalf of the Owner, we look forward to your responses and a more meaningful analysis of the Project in a revised and recirculated Draft EIR.

Very truly yours,

DLA Piper LLP (US)

Ryan M. Leaderman
Associate
Admitted to practice in California

Attachment
cc: Mark Knapp, Cornerstone Real Estate Advisors
    Kelly Kinnon, Esq., Cornerstone Real Estate Advisors
    Natalia Nunes, CBRE
    Honorable Mike Touhey, West Covina Mayor
    Chris Freeland, West Covina Deputy City Manager
    Ben Kim, West Covina Redevelopment Manager
    Rich Mendelson, Esq., DLA Piper
Response to Comment Letter No. 13 - Gateway Crescent, LLC

#1 – Caltrans has conducted extensive studies and analysis on impacts associated with implementation of the proposed project, and those are disclosed in the EIR. Additionally, extensive design considerations have been included in the project to avoid or minimize project impacts. Further response to this comment is included in the following responses below.

#2 – At a March 14, 2012 meeting (with the commenter in attendance) at the Caltrans Building (100 S. Main Street, Los Angeles, CA), the number of parking spaces required for this project was identified as belonging to the City of West Covina. The negotiations for those parking space impacts are in progress. The current proposal is for Caltrans to provide the funding for the City of West Covina to address the parking and access changes on the parking area adjacent to the Gateway Crescent property.

However, at that same meeting it was disclosed that the current Caltrans proposal shows that only seven parking spaces would be removed from use adjacent to the Gateway Crescent properties. The commenter was also informed that during project construction, and to adhere to expressed wishes to have a shortened construction schedule in the area adjacent to the Gateway Crescent property, 80 parking spaces directly adjacent to the Caltrans right-of-way line would be temporarily removed from service, in order to speed up the construction process. Vehicular traffic and emergency access would be maintained during project construction and after project implementation by providing a 25 foot wide area for two way traffic. This change of parking and access was considered as part of the project documentation, and Caltrans is in negotiation with the City of West Covina (the owner of the affected parking area). The net result from the change to parking and access is anticipated to not result in any substantial change to noise or air quality. See Comment Meeting No. 2 (March 14, 2012) of this appendix for more information about traffic control, noise, public safety, and landscaping.

#3 – This topic was discussed at the aforementioned March 14, 2012 meeting (see Comment Meeting No. 2 [March 14, 2012] of this appendix). As part of the project the existing chain-link fence will be removed and replaced with a retaining wall, safety barrier, and fencing on top of the barrier. The retaining walls facing the Gateway Crescent property will be treated with a “fractured rib” aesthetic treatment to reduce the visual impact of the project and enhance the existing appearance. Additionally, after the project is constructed, a remaining area owned by Gateway Crescent will be available for potential landscape installation by the property owner.

Interstate Route 10 is currently separated from the Gateway Crescent property by a six foot chain-link fence. The addition of the safety barriers as part of this project are specifically designed to substantially increase the safety of the adjacent property by reducing the ability
of errant drivers to enter that property. Additionally, the fencing on top of the barrier will continue to serve the same function as the existing chain-link fencing. Thus the viewshed from the Gateway Crescent will be enhanced, and the property will be safer.

#4 – The environmental document identifies those properties that are proposed to be affected by the project given the current state of design. As design work continues, refinements occur and it is possible that minor amounts of additional property may be required. All properties required as part of the project are subject to the Uniform Relocation and Real Property Acquisition Policy Act. Should it be the case that impacts from acquisition of additional properties extend beyond the level of ‘minor’ or ‘incidental,’ those impacts would be evaluated and a determination made regarding the need for new or revised environmental documentation. Such additional environmental documentation would be completed to assure legal compliance before the project starts construction, and the appropriate avoidance, minimization, or mitigation measures would be incorporated into the project. The present EIR contains all the known parcels, impacts, avoidance measures, minimization measures, and mitigation measures adjacent to the Gateway Crescent property (as well as the rest of the project area).

#5 – See #4 above. Additionally, the project was discussed with the representative of the Gateway Crescent (Ryan Leaderman, LLC) at the Public Hearing. Furthermore, Caltrans has agreed to meet with the Gateway Crescent property owners to discuss the project and potential project impacts in further detail before this EIR is finalized. A complete list of potential temporary and permanent project easements and acquisitions has been provided as Appendix I of the FEIR.

#6 – See #4 and #5.

#7 – This is a new Environmental Impact Report. The previous environmental documentation prepared for this project (prior to changes at the Vincent Avenue interchange area) led to the preparation of a Negative Declaration/Finding of No Significant Impact in January 2003. Subsequently, changes to the project in the Vincent Avenue Interchange area were determined to be required to facilitate the implementation of an improved design. These are the only changes to the project adjacent to the Gateway Crescent property and it has been disclosed in this document and at the public hearings for this project. The current FEIR stands alone; the previous document is no longer relevant to this project.

#8 – The State Clearinghouse has received this document (#2012011028), the Notice of Preparation for the Draft Environmental Impact Report, the Notice of Completion, and copies of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR). Additionally, the Air Quality Section of this document has been revised to reflect the anticipated finding by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (a finding that this project is not a project of air quality concern).
The Caltrans (Federal Highway Administration approved) scoping process was completed for this project as part of previous efforts. Comments from that effort were incorporated into this DEIR and responses provided.

#9 – The following is an accounting of impact comparisons with existing conditions, as identified by section in Chapter 3 of the DEIR:

Section 3.1 – Aesthetics and Visual Resources: Existing conditions is the only context for the impact assessment.

Section 3.2 – Traffic: This section compares forecasted Southern California Association of Governments data in the paragraph labeled Peak-Period Volumes (pg. 3.2-11) to existing conditions. In the paragraph labeled Persons Moved per Peak Period, Existing and Projected, a comparison is made between existing auto occupancy and occupancy with the HOV lanes in place, thereby indicating a measure of benefit in the very near term. Table 3.2-1 “AM/PM Peak-Period Volume Summary and ADT for Existing and Future Conditions” identifies and compares existing and future forecasted conditions. Also, Table 3.2-4 presents level of service estimates for 2015 and 2030 conditions, with 2015 being only a little over two years away from current conditions.

Section 3.3 – Air Quality: The section has been rewritten since the circulation of the DEIR. Within the PM Hot-spot Analysis portion of the current Air Quality analysis, there is an analysis of PM emissions with and without the project. The MSAT Emissions Analysis section provides a comparison of forecast emissions with current emissions.

Section 3.4 – Noise and Vibration: The section compares forecasted noise measurements in conformance with guidelines outlined in Caltrans’ TeNS and FHWA’s Measuring of Highway Related Noise to existing conditions at the bottom of pg. 3.4-11 and continued on the next page. In addition, Table 3.4-1 “Traffic Noise, L_{EQ}(H), Prediction Summary (DBA)” and Table 3.4-2 “Traffic Noise L_{EQ}(H), Prediction Summary (DBA) at Forest Lawn Memorial Park Cemetery” identifies existing and future forecasted conditions. According to the analysis methodology, existing (ambient) noise conditions are measured in the field and constitute the basis upon which impacts are determined and to which abatement is applied.

Section 3.5 – Biological Resources: Field review to determine existing conditions and the presence/absence of certain species was done and constitutes the basis for the impact determination, which, in this case, is fairly limited, owing to the highly urbanized nature of the corridor.

Section 3.6 – Cultural Resources: Existing conditions in the field is the basis for determining the presence of known or suspected resources, and therefore the impact assessment (in this case not an issue) is directly made in comparison with existing conditions.
Section 3.7 – Geology, Soils, and Seismicity: Existing conditions in the field and a geological history literature review are the basis for determining impacts.

Section 3.8 – Hazardous Waste/Materials: Existing conditions in the field, site assessments and a record search are the basis for determining impacts.

Section 3.9 – Hydrology and Water Quality: Existing conditions in the field is the only context for the impact assessment.

Section 3.10 – Land Use: Existing conditions in the field and City or County planning documents are the basis for determining impacts.

Section 3.11 – Agriculture: Existing conditions in the field is the only context for the impact assessment.

Section 3.12 – Public Services and Utilities: Existing conditions in the field is the only context for the impact assessment.

Again, the Notice of Preparation was sent, and received, by the State Clearinghouse for this project. Each impact was considered and the level of significance for each impact is identified in this EIR.

#10 – See #9 above for analysis of traffic, noise and air quality impacts in comparison with existing conditions. See #2 above with regard to on-going parking and access negotiations adjacent to the Gateway Crescent property.

#11 – In Chapter 3 of the DEIR, significance criteria have been provided within the text of the document, for every topic discussed. Appendix G, CEQA Checklist is the source of those criteria, supplemented in certain instances with additional criteria (e.g., air quality CO protocol; noise abatement criteria; traffic level of service criteria) where appropriate.

There are a few exceptions. There are no Forest Resources or Mineral Resources within the project area; therefore, these resources are not analyzed in the document and no significance criteria are included. The Hazards and Hazardous materials section does not address significance criteria (e) through (h). These thresholds pertain to airport land use plans or private airstrips, emergency response plans, and wildland fires, none of which are relevant to the project.

Insofar as the specific comment regarding the noise impact significance threshold is concerned, the EIR section clearly indicates (section 3.4.2) that the Caltrans Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol for New Highway Construction, Reconstruction and Retrofit Barrier Projects (May 2011) was used for the impact analysis. As is noted in the EIR section, two criteria are used to determine impact significance and required noise abatement. Under CEQA, as Appendix G prescribes, a significant impact would occur if one or more of the
four conditions listed in EIR section 3.4.3 were to occur. In accordance with the Protocol, Caltrans has established a standard of 12 dBA as the measure of impact significance, purely under CEQA. As is noted in the EIR section, such increases would not be expected with the project, as compared with existing conditions. Also as stated in the EIR section, a federal standard is also used routinely by Caltrans, pursuant to 23CFR772. This standard is “at or approaching the Noise Abatement Criterion (NAC) of 67dBA” which is effectively 66dBA (and which is more stringent than the CEQA standard). As the analysis presented in the EIR points out, there are a number of locations satisfying this measure of impact, for which soundwall abatement has been proposed and determined to be both feasible (reducing impacts by 5dBA or more) and reasonable (satisfying established cost effectiveness criteria).

#12 – At the March 14, 2012 meeting referred to in #2 above (see Comment Meeting No. 2 [March 14, 2012] of this appendix for more information), Caltrans’ proposal for the parking lot adjacent to the Gateway Crescent property was presented and explained in detail. The number of parking spaces required for this project were also identified, and explained as belonging to the City of West Covina. The negotiations for those parking space impacts are in progress with the City of West Covina. The current proposal is for Caltrans to provide the funding for the City of West Covina to address the parking and access changes on the parking area adjacent to the Gateway Crescent property.

#13 – As stated in Section 1.2.2 of the EIR, peak-period traffic demand on I-10 currently exceeds capacity and, as a result of existing and forecasted growth, is expected to continue to exceed capacity. Traffic in the project area is expected to grow by a small margin between 2008 and 2015 (year of opening), but by approximately 20 percent between 2008 and 2035 (Parsons, 2009). When comparing the Build against No Build project alternatives, there is about a 10-12 percent increase in traffic using I-10 in both the year of opening and the horizon year (2035). However, this increase is split between the mixed flow lanes and HOV lanes, such that traffic in the mixed flow lanes decreases by about 5-8 percent, with the balance 15-20 percent shifting to the HOV lanes, thereby decreasing congestion in the mixed flow lanes and adding person carrying capacity in the HOV lanes. Overall, the efficiency of the freeway would increase with the HOV lanes in place. This is evidenced by an increase of overall auto occupancy and an overall increase in person trips moved per unit of time.

Regarding greenhouse gas production, Table 4.3-1 shows an increase between the No Build and Build alternatives of about 12 percent in 2015 and 6 percent in 2035. When compared with existing (2008) conditions, the increases attributable to the Build alternative are about 18 percent in 2015 and 44 percent in 2035. The increases are attributable to increased vehicular travel in the corridor.

In the August 2011 Air Quality Report, it is outlined that the operational emissions are not necessarily an accurate reflection of what the true GHG emissions will be because GHG emissions depend on other factors that are not part of the model (such as fuel mix and
consumption, rate of acceleration, and the aerodynamics and efficiency of the vehicles). The Air Resource Board's EMFAC model emission rates utilized in quantifying operational GHG emissions are only for direct engine-out CO2 and CH4 emissions and do not account for a full fuel cycle. Fuel cycle emission rates can vary dramatically depending on the amount of additives, such as ethanol, and the source of fuel components.

#14 – A review of the project description did find minor inaccuracies that have been corrected in this Final EIR. The Summary description, indicating 8-10 foot wide shoulders is consistent with the cross sections shown in Figure 1-4. While the reference to page 3 in the Traffic Noise Abatement Report does indicate an 11-foot lane, it also references the correct cross section width of 162 feet and further indicates that the width would be wider where auxiliary lanes are to be used. The engineering drawings were used for the noise impact analysis, reflecting accurate distances from the project to adjacent sensitive receptors.

#15 – Lane configurations for northbound Vincent Avenue and south of the eastbound I-10 on-ramp intersection will be changed from one existing through lane, one shared through/right turn lane and one right turn lane (total of three lanes) to two dedicated through lanes and two dedicated right turn lanes (total of four lanes). The description in section 1.4.4 refers to the shared lane as .5 through and .5 right turn. The description is correct, with this clarification.

#16 – Bridge improvements are associated with the proposed project as described in Section 1.4.4 and listed in Table 1-2 of the EIR. This section also addresses extensive proposed improvements specific to the Vincent Avenue interchange. The Vincent Avenue Bridge will be partially removed for about 42 feet along eastbound I-10 and would be widened as per project structural plans. The edge of the new widening would be three feet to the south of the edge of the existing bridge. Construction duration is anticipated to be eight months within the first three years of construction. Construction activities would be conducted during daytime behind temporary concrete barriers, with the exception of night closures for ramp connections, if needed.

Temporary traffic impacts during bridge widening work, including at the Vincent Avenue interchange, are described in Section 3.2.4.2 of the EIR (Impact TRAF-2). The report states that motorists traveling in the immediate vicinity of street, ramp and lane closures would at times experience inconvenience due to temporary traffic congestion. In a paragraph specific to bridge and ramp work, the report lists three measures (i.e., construction staging, nighttime work for bridge closures, and construction scheduling) that would be incorporated into the project to reduce temporary impacts to the traveling public. The EIR also includes measures not specific to bridges that would help reduce traffic concerns near the Vincent Avenue interchange, such as implementation of a TMP, use of various congestion management techniques, and timely public outreach.
#17 – See #2 and #12 above.

#18 – The intersection between Vincent Avenue and the eastbound I-10 ramps will become a fully signalized intersection. The new design will eliminate weaving movements along northbound Vincent Avenue and along eastbound I-10. Also, the design will provide two dedicated through lanes and two dedicated right turn lanes along the approaching northbound Vincent Avenue traffic. The existing condition has a half signal controlling only southbound Vincent Avenue.

#19 – The Noise Study Report used the existing aerial photographs to show the placement of the proposed noise barrier, and was never intended to show the project design to remove the eastbound Interstate Route 10 off-ramp to northbound Vincent Avenue as proposed. The project does, in fact, propose to remove the existing eastbound Interstate Route 10 off-ramp to northbound Vincent Avenue. For the proposed project details please refer to the proposed project design layout sheets, and not the Noise Study Report.

#20 – Project design shows the eastbound I-10 on-ramp from northbound Vincent Avenue ramp meter limit line at a distance of 370 feet from Vincent Avenue, and the eastbound I-10 on-ramp from southbound Vincent Avenue ramp meter limit line at a distance of 375 feet from Vincent Avenue.

#21 – As is pointed out in the environmental document, the intent of the proposed project is to improve travel capacity and reduce congestion within the I-10 corridor. This would also assist in relieving congestion on access points into the corridor. Of the five freeway interchanges to I-10 located within the City of West Covina (Pacific, Vincent, Azusa, Citrus, Grand and Holt Avenues), Vincent Avenue has been specifically identified for analysis of traffic conditions, due to the fact that Caltrans is proposing a reconfiguration of the geometrics at that location.

In conducting the analysis, it was recognized that the limits of the Interstate Route 10 High Occupancy Vehicle corridor project and, more specifically, the segment which traverses through the Vincent Avenue interchange, is in a predominantly built out region. Despite that, a generous growth rate was incorporated of two (2) percent per year up to horizon years 2015 (Build out) and 2030 (Future), respectively. The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) has identified a growth rate of two (2) percent in their Compass Blueprint Strategy. While it is true that a measurable trip generation factor was not identified to account for what the HOV lane is projected to attract as it concerns motorists accessing the Interstate Route 10 High Occupancy Vehicle lanes from Vincent Avenue, Caltrans believes that two percent growth per year in this highly urbanized region, up to the aforementioned horizon years, should satisfactorily account for the appropriate mitigation measures on the local roadway and the freeway system. While the focus of the comment relates to additional...
trips in terms of physical vehicles, it should also be noted that one of the greatest benefits of a High Occupancy Vehicle lane is the increase in occupants per vehicle. With this improvement, carpooling usage is expected to increase, which should make operations in all functional lanes better than it is today, by promoting fewer vehicles on the roadway as a result. Improvements such as this are likely to benefit the local street system as well, because with improved operational conditions on the freeway motorists should not be as inclined to seek alternative routes on local roadways.

Currently, the Vincent Avenue eastbound I-10 ramps interchange operates at LOS A, with an average of 7.1 seconds of delay. As is noted in section 3.2.4.2 of the EIR (Traffic Impacts – Proposed Project Alternative – Impact TRAF-2 [page 3.2-12]), traffic operations at this location were analyzed for Buildout (2015) and Future (2030) conditions using the Synchro/Simtraffic model. The results indicate that, in the post-project condition, the Vincent Avenue/eastbound I-10 ramps interchange would operate at LOS E in 2015 (64.6 seconds of delay) and LOS F in 2030 (84.3 seconds of delay), with the movement on northbound Vincent Avenue to eastbound I-10 being the most affected movement at the interchange. The shared through and right turn lane is noted as a likely contributing factor to this situation. It is further noted that the proposed realignment of the on-ramp, coupled with the signalization of the right turn movements, would offset the queuing and spillback issues currently being experienced at that location.

Currently, at the Vincent Avenue and Plaza/Lakes Drive intersection, traffic operates at LOS C, with 30.9 seconds of delay. By 2015, in the post-project condition, it is expected the LOS C would be maintained, with an estimated 30.3 seconds of delay, essentially unchanged from present conditions. However, by 2030, conditions are expected to become LOS D with 46.8 - seconds of delay.

Caltrans recognizes that the impact at these two nearby intersections require treatment and has provided mitigation. By 2015, on northbound Vincent Avenue at the eastbound I-10 ramps, the existing shared (through/right) lanes would be converted to an exclusive through lane, and a right turn deceleration lane of approximately 250 feet in length would be added. Also, the crosswalk at this location would be removed. This would result in a LOS B, with an estimated 13.6 seconds of delay at that intersection.

By 2030, additional mitigation is required. At the eastbound I-10 on-ramp from northbound Vincent Avenue, the capacity would be increased by adding a lane at the ramp terminal of 600-650 feet in length and relocating the proposed ramp meter approximately 250 feet to the east. This improvement would result in operation of the Vincent Avenue/eastbound I-10 ramps intersection at LOS C (26.5 seconds of delay) and the Vincent Avenue and Plaza/Lakes Drive intersection at LOS D (47.4 seconds of delay).
With signal optimization included, it is expected that these mitigation measures would allow both intersections to operate at an acceptable level of service.

The proposed project is not a vehicle capacity increasing project. Traffic projections in the traffic studies, prepared for this project, identify that an increase in vehicular traffic without the project in future years is anticipated. This project is proposed to provide an incentive to promote an increase in passengers per vehicle, and thus benefit future traffic flow. No aspect of this project is identified in the traffic studies prepared for this project as vehicle capacity increasing.

Additionally, High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) Lanes already exist on Interstate Route 210 (Route 210) and State Route 60 (Route 60). The existing HOV lanes on Route 210 and Route 60 run parallel to I-10. There is no indication in the traffic studies conducted for this project that motorist would, under non-adverse traffic conditions, choose to use the proposed I-10 HOV lane simply because it exists.

Furthermore, the traffic studies prepared for this project did analyze the potential for the redistribution of traffic as a result if the implementation of this proposed project. It was noted in the traffic studies that, if congestion is reduced in the existing Route 10 lanes due the successful use of the HOV lanes by multiple passenger vehicles (as a result of this proposed project), that traffic would not likely divert to local arterials, including Vincent Avenue.

Traffic studies prepared as part of this project were conducted by specialists in this field, using accepted methodology and analysis using Federal and State guidelines. The information in the traffic studies prepared for this project were analyzed using those guidelines.

Since there would not be anticipated diversion of traffic from State Route 60 and Interstate Route 210 to the HOV lanes on I-10, there would likewise not be an anticipated increase in traffic use of local arterials from these routes.

According to the Traffic Impact Analysis Interstate Route 10 at Vincent Avenue study (2011), Office of Traffic Investigations analysis shows that there is no traffic queuing issue, with the exception of the eastbound I-10 on-ramp from northbound Vincent Avenue, which will be mitigated by reconfiguring the approaching northbound traffic lanes to be total of four lanes; two dedicated through traffic lanes and two dedicated right turn lanes.

#22 – The use of property is currently under negotiation as part of the right-of-way acquisition process. No elimination of access is planned for the area mentioned for emergency service providers, renters, or patrons. Since negotiations are underway, the potential compensation for the access alteration cannot be discussed in this documentation.
Additionally, the installation of the safety barrier is included in this project to provide a physical barrier between Interstate Route 10 and the Gateway Crescent property, thus addressing the safety concern mentioned. In regards to safety concerns relating to the reduced spacing between the property buildings and the proposed freeway system, the project proposes to remove the existing chain-link fence and install a Portland concrete safety barrier wall between the widened ramp and the Gateway Crescent property. The Project Description (Chapter 1) of the FEIR identifies safety barriers as part of the proposed project.

Despite the closer than desired spacing from the facility, improvements to the alignment of the eastbound on-ramp and the removal of the eastbound I-10 to northbound Vincent Avenue off-ramp, should alleviate any potential run-off-road accident. Given these considerations, in addition to the tangent alignment of the freeway mainline itself, post-project conditions at the Gateway Crescent property should be safer than current conditions.

#23 – The modification of the eastbound I-10 on-ramp from northbound Vincent Avenue from a non-signalized to a signalized interchange will improve pedestrian and bicycle safety. The primary purpose of a traffic control signal is to provide right-of-way to its users, including pedestrians and bicyclists and thus increase the safe use of that interchange. Pedestrians will have a signal phase dedicated exclusively for them to allow for safe crossing. Pedestrians will also be informed of appropriate detours to their normal routes during project construction. Project plans are available for review at the District 7 Caltrans office at 100 S. Main Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012.

There is no designated bike lane on Vincent Avenue. The designated bike lanes are included in the FEIR. All designated bike lanes will remain open during project construction. However, it has been noted that bicyclists use Vincent Avenue and those bicycle users will be afforded the same pedestrian signal phasing and identified detours during project construction safety considerations as pedestrians.

Based on MUTCD, Ch. 4, Sec. 4C.01, 2009 ed., a signalized traffic control will manage speeds better, which would reduce the number and severity of accidents on the roadway. The increase in capacity would more effectively move demand to the freeway, reducing any potential spillback onto the local roadway, and allowing traffic on the local road, Vincent Avenue, to move as progressively as possible.

Caltrans recognizes the trip generators in the form of the local mall, theaters, restaurants, and business area; the appropriate measures will be implemented to ensure the communities’ safety during all phases of construction and for the life of this improvement. Motorists will be encouraged to share the road with bicyclists in a manner which promotes the safety of all users.

These measures include traffic controls (i.e. signs, striping, safety barriers, etc.) to be provided as part of the project, to properly inform motorists, pedestrians and bicyclists of the
conditions of the roadway. A public awareness campaign will be in effect, informing and educating the community regarding potential impacts. The Project Description (Chapter 1) of the FEIR identifies the public awareness campaign as part of the proposed project construction phase.

#24 – See #22 above.

#25 – The proposed project addresses both existing and future traffic conditions. The current traffic level of service is below the acceptable level. Implementation of this project is intended to improve efficiency of travel in the corridor by increasing the number of individuals per vehicle. The project study area is nearly built out and the project has as its primary objective to facilitate greater efficiency of travel in that area. The project would not open up any new areas to development. The project is, therefore, not growth inducing. In the FEIR, Chapter 4, Section 4.1, Growth Inducement, discusses growth inducement for the proposed project.

#26 – The existing intersections at Interstate Route 10 and Vincent Avenue are owned and operated by Caltrans. As such, the City of West Covina thresholds do not apply. Caltrans applied the Measures of Effective (MOE) to ensure that this interchange will operate at an acceptable level (i.e. LOS D or better).

#27 – The anticipated demand in the Build out year (2015) and Future (2030) years considered the worst case scenario (PM Peak Hour) when analyzed in comparison to the existing conditions. In those cases where it was determined that operations were below what was considered acceptable for those respective horizon years, the appropriate mitigation measures were applied as part of the project. As a result of this, it was determined that mitigation measures were needed at the intersection of the I-10 eastbound ramps and Vincent Avenue in both horizon years; specifically, mitigation was warranted for the northbound Vincent Avenue approach at the I-10 eastbound ramps in 2015 and both the northbound Vincent Avenue approach and the eastbound I-10 off-ramp in 2030. With mitigation, the project will have a less than significant impact on traffic patterns in the proposed project study area.

#28 – See #22 above.

#29 – The staging plans will be prepared during the final design phase and they will be formulated to comply with the conditions outlined in this EIR. Construction staging is dependent upon the approach of the individual contractor selected to perform the work. Irrespective of this, the impacts to be experienced during construction are well known (consisting of traffic, air quality, noise, etc.) and are sufficiently disclosed in the environmental document.
With regard to the specific concerns of the commenter, Caltrans has agreed to meet with the Gateway Crescent property owner prior to finalizing the staging plan to discuss the project and concerns that Gateway Crescent or their representatives may have. This coordination will continue through the construction period.

#30 – At the March 14, 2012 meeting mentioned in #2 and #12 above, the commenter was informed that the retaining walls facing the Gateway Crescent property will be treated with a “fractured rib” aesthetic treatment to reduce the visual impact of the project and greatly enhance the existing appearance. Additionally, after the project is constructed a remaining area owned by Gateway Crescent will be available for potential landscape installation by the property owner (the City of West Covina). Soundwall aesthetics are discussed in the FEIR in Section 3.1, Aesthetics and Visual Resources.

#31 – The eastbound Interstate Route 10 ramp to northbound Vincent Avenue will be removed as part of this project. This will eliminate the existing light intrusion from vehicle headlights toward the Gateway Crescent property.

The median barrier will also be replaced with a taller safety barrier to eliminate headlights from the westbound Interstate Route 10 from intruding toward the Gateway Crescent property.

As previously mentioned, a solid safety barrier will also be installed between Interstate Route 10 and the Gateway Crescent property to further reduce light intrusion going toward the Gateway Crescent property.

The result of these project elements will be a reduction of the existing light intrusion reaching the Gateway Crescent property. Additionally, the barriers to be installed will have aesthetic treatments (the treatments having been designed in consultation with the City of West Covina for continuity purposes) applied to them to improve the existing visual character of the new barriers when compared to the existing chain-link fence. Project plans are available for review at the District 7 Caltrans office at 100 S. Main Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012.

#32 – See #30 above.

#33 – As is noted in Section 3.1.4.2, under Impact VIS-3 temporary construction impacts are noted to occur at varying times and locations, and their effects are a common feature in the highly urbanized environment in which the project resides. Accordingly, the visual impacts are not regarded as substantial and therefore no special mitigation for visual purposes is proposed.

This project is anticipated to take four years to construct, not the five years identified in this comment. The Temporary Construction Easement (TCE) mentioned for parking will not be
required for the entire construction period. The TCE’s will be secured as part of the right-of-way acquisition process. See #22 above for discussion restrictions related to the right-of-way acquisition process.

#34 – The Noise Study Report utilized the Caltrans Noise Protocols (August 2008 version). The Caltrans Noise Protocol (August 2008) does not identify office buildings and/or medical offices (except for hospitals) as noise sensitive land uses as listed in the Noise Abatement Criteria (NAC). Additionally, it was found that there are no exterior frequent human use areas within the Gateway Crescent commercial area that would qualify for noise abatement consideration.

#35 – Construction noise, as discussed in Section 3.4.4.2 (Impact NOI-1) of the EIR, will be offset by the use of Best Management Practices, which are incorporated into this project by the Special Provisions (as identified in the Special Provision 14-8.02) prepared for this project. The Special Provision related to noise states that noise levels generated during construction shall comply with applicable local, state, and federal regulations and that all equipment shall be fitted with adequate mufflers according to manufacturers’ specifications. The Special Provisions will also provide limits on construction noise levels, which should not exceed 86 dBA (Lmax) at a distance of 50 feet. Construction noise will be monitored and controlled per local, state, and federal noise ordinances/laws as part of this project.

#36 – Impacts associated with vibration are adequately described in Section 3.4.4.2 (Impact NOI-2) of the EIR. For informational purposes, additional discussion of vibration specific to the Gateway Crescent properties is provided below. This information is based on extensive research into the topic by Caltrans¹ and others.

There are no FHWA or state standards for vibrations. However, vibration impacts associated with the implementation of this project were considered using the Transportation- and Construction-Induced Vibration Guidance Manual.² The traditional view has been that highway traffic and construction vibrations pose no threat to buildings and structures, and that annoyance to people is no worse than other discomforts experienced from living near highways.

Additionally, the way buildings are constructed and the condition the buildings are in determines how much vibration they can withstand before damage appears. All damage criteria for buildings are in terms of ground motion at the buildings’ foundations. A visual examination of the buildings at the Gateway Crescent property revealed they are all recent in construction and appear to be in good condition, and therefore built to withstand ground

shaking movement (seismic standards). Vibrations for the purpose of this project are considered under two categories, Operational and Construction.

OPERATIONAL

Operational vibrations result from the use of the facility by vehicular traffic before and after the project is constructed. Caltrans has identified that the measurement of operation of surface transportation facilities are mainly in the form of surface (Raleigh) waves. Because vehicles traveling on highways are supported on flexible suspension systems and pneumatic tires, these vehicles are not an efficient source of ground vibration. Caltrans studies have shown that multiple vehicles traveling on the same route, at the same time, does not result in Raleigh waves that are higher peaked (does not result in substantial vibration amplitude).

Vibrations also vary with operational use patterns. This is due to differing amounts and types of vehicles utilizing the facility at different times of the day. Since traffic vibrations can be considered random, the probabilities of total destructive or constructive interference are extremely small (not significant).

CONSTRUCTION

Caltrans studies have indicated that three types of construction activities result in the highest generation of vibrations. These three activities are blasting, crack-and-seat procedures, and pile driving. In general, literature on the subject shows that only blasting, pile driving, and pavement breaking have documented examples of potential damage to buildings\(^3\). For pile driving and pavement breaking, the potential for damage from vibration is at locations in relatively close proximity to the activity.

This proposed project would not involve blasting, crack-and-seal procedures, or pile driving (cast-and-drilled holes will be used in lieu of pile driving) in the area adjacent to the Gateway Crescent property.

Additionally, this project will utilize Best Management Practices (as implemented in the Special Provisions) prepared for this project. Some of the Best Management Practices incorporated into the project include:

- Schedule work to reduce adverse effect of vibration. Construction activity should be scheduled to occur during times of maximum human activity, rather than during times of extreme quiet.

- Use of vibration monitoring equipment adjacent to the Gateway Crescent property to ensure construction activities do not create vibration related impacts.

- Use of construction techniques which result in the least amount of vibration generation.

- Use of vehicles with pneumatic tires instead of “track-type” vehicles when possible during project construction.

The result is that this project will not have a significant impact related to vibration.

#37 – The Air Quality section of the document has been revised to include text from the Air Quality Report prepared in August 2011. The August 2011 Air Quality Report was used to prepare the Draft EIR and included by reference. Additionally, the August 2011 Air Quality Report was provided to the commenter on 12/30/2011 (prior to the close of the comment period for the Draft EIR).

#38 – Caltrans worked with the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) to analyze air quality impacts associated with this project in the SCAG regional emissions model. This modeling resulted in this project being determined not to be a project of concern related to air quality impacts (no local or regional significant impacts would result with implementation of this project). This modeling also demonstrates project-level conformity to satisfy regional (local) conformity requirements.

Localized significance thresholds are analyzed as part of the SCAG regional modeling conducted for this project. This project would not result in a substantial increase in traffic. Again, no significant impacts associated with air quality result for implementation of this project.

#39 – This project is not a Type A (impact receptors) or Type B (place receptors near existing toxic generation sources) project as identified in the June 2009 “Health Risk Assessments for Proposed Land Use Projects” prepared by California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA). The proposed project is not located near existing toxic generation sources such as truck or bus idling areas, portable power generation engines (stations), cargo handling areas, transport refrigeration units, nor any other planned toxic air contaminant (TAC) generating facility.

Measures and considerations on the need for a Health Risk Assessment indicated the following:

- The Best Management Practices (as included in the Special Provision) prepared for this project include the mandate that equipment to be used during construction will be the least polluting type possible and that excessive idling will not be allowed.

- TAC’s for projects on existing alignments, such as this one, are expected to decline due to the effect of new Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) engine and fuel standards.
- Projects, such as this one, that anticipate an increase in travel speed are expected to reduce TAC’s per vehicle mile traveled.

- Projects, such as this one, that promote multiple-passengers per vehicle are anticipated to reduce the volume of existing traffic, and thus are anticipated to reduce TAC’s.

- Projects, such as this one, which create new travel lanes, are expected to reduce TAC’s when compared to the No Project alternative.

- Health Risk Assessments are not required under CEQA.

The proposed project is anticipated to have a net improvement in the reduction of TAC’s due to the nature of the project to improve existing traffic flow. Furthermore, as described in Section 3.3.1.3 of the EIR SCAG has determined that this project is not a project of concern; therefore, it would not pose a significant health risk. Based on these considerations, it was determined that a Health Risk Assessment was not warranted.

#40 – Again, the Traffic Management Plan (TMP) and construction staging plans are in the process of being developed and can only be finalized after the project environmental documentation phase is completed. Only after the completion of the project environmental documentation process can an alternative be selected as the “Preferred Alternative”. Only after a “Preferred Alternative” is selected can the TMP and construction staging plan be completed for the identified project.

The wording, ‘to the extent feasible’ is used in two mitigation measures involving removal and replacement of vegetation. It is intended to convey the message that not all vegetation can be saved, and it may not be possible to replace all skyline trees removed. During final design, Revegetation Plans will be prepared to specifically identify where vegetation can be avoided during construction and where trees will be replaced. Mitigation measures for this project will be included in the Environmental Commitment Record prepared for the selected alternative, and implemented for the project in the Special Provisions.

#41 – All the properties that were anticipated in or adjacent to the Gateway Crescent properties in West Covina which would be potentially affected by the project were identified in the Draft EIR. None of the Gateway Crescent properties would be directly affected by the proposed project. The properties adjacent to the Gateway Crescent properties are the non-structure parking lot areas owned by the City of West Covina. Reduction of impacts for use of property owned by the City of West Covina will be provided through the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Act. Finally, all the currently known affected property owners have been contacted, and initial offers under the offsets provided through the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Act have been made to those property owners. The result is that there will not be a significant effect to the parking lot areas adjacent to the Gateway Crescent properties.
Project alternatives included in Chapter 5 of the EIR and representing a reasonable range of alternatives are the No Project Alternative, an Additional Mixed-Flow Lane Alternative, an Elevated Facility Alternative, and a Traffic System Management Alternative.

Other alternatives were also considered early in the environmental documentation process but were removed from consideration for a variety of reasons. One such alternative to change one of the existing mixed-flow traffic lanes into HOV lanes was indeed considered as part of this project. This alternative would not meet the project’s goals, would not be consistent with the purpose and need, and it would not increase the freeway’s person carrying capacity, as asserted in the comment. Contrarily, this alternative would make traffic conditions worse and it would not reduce any significant environmental effects associated with the Proposed Project Alternative.

#42 – A parcel specific analysis was conducted for 950 Lakes Drive. As part of the analysis for this specific parcel, the area where the affected parking spaces are located was included in the database search, which would have identified hazardous material concerns in that location. Aerially deposited lead is a concern along the entire project length and not solely an issue at the analyzed parcels. Until aerially deposited lead samples and analysis are conducted, it cannot be stated that aerially deposited lead is present in levels above regulatory requirements; thus, the need for sampling and analysis to determine disposition of the soils involved. As MM HAZ-8 states, additional testing will be conducted to determine if hazardous materials are present within the proposed right-of-way. The affected parking parcels will be analyzed at that time if determined to be an area of hazardous material concern.

Impact HAZ-1 text has been revised to reflect that there may be some trucks needed to transport hazardous materials off-site during construction. However, as stated in MM HAZ-9, local, state and federal regulations address the identification, removal, handling and disposal of hazardous wastes and that Project contractors will be required to follow these procedures and to maintain the required documentation during all site preparation, grading and construction of the proposed project.

While the freeway lane capacity may be increasing, the overall percentage of trucks (including those carrying hazardous materials) would not be expected to increase over current (2012) conditions. Acknowledging that the project is intended to reduce congestion on I-10, it would not be expected to attract more trucks on this heavily used route because future congestion is projected to increase even with the HOV lanes. Furthermore, trucks are not normally allowed to use HOV lanes. As such, the percentage of trucks on this route, whether transporting hazardous materials or otherwise, is not expected to increase overall. Therefore, the impacts associated with trucks transporting hazardous materials as a result of implementation of the Proposed Project Alternative would be less than significant.
Revised Impact HAZ-1 (page 3.8-5)
Under the Proposed Project Alternative, no change in the volume of vehicles carrying hazardous and toxic materials is expected during project operation. As a result, there would be no impacts associated with hazardous waste or materials as a result of implementation of the Proposed Project Alternative.

During construction, hazardous waste or materials may be removed. These materials would need to be transported off-site to an appropriate disposal facility. The United States Department of Transportation specifies procedures for safely transporting hazardous materials and procedures to follow in case of accidental spills during transport. The United States Environmental Protection Agency specifies the requirements for proper labeling and placarding of hazardous substances. Other local, state and federal regulations address the identification, removal, handling and disposal of hazardous wastes. These procedures would be followed in the event hazardous materials are found during construction. As a result, the impacts associated with the transport of hazardous waste or materials as a result of implementation of the Proposed Project Alternative would be less than significant.

#43 – Project alternatives included in the Chapter 5 of the EIR and representing a reasonable range of alternatives are the No Project Alternative, an Additional Mixed-Flow Lane Alternative, an Elevated Facility Alternative, and a Traffic System Management Alternative.

Other alternatives were also considered early in the environmental documentation process but were removed from consideration for a variety of reasons. One such alternative to change one of the existing mixed-flow traffic lanes into HOV lanes was indeed considered as part of this project. This alternative would not meet the project’s goals, would not be consistent with the purpose and need, and it would not increase the freeway’s person carrying capacity, as asserted in the comment. Contrarily, this alternative would make traffic conditions worse and it would not reduce any significant environmental effects associated with the Proposed Project Alternative.
April 6, 2012
Via E-MAIL GARY_IVERSON@DOT.CA.GOV

Mr. Ron Kosinski
Deputy District Director, Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)
100 S. Main Street
Los Angeles, California 90012

Mr. Gary Iverson
Senior Environmental Planner, Division of Environmental Planning
Caltrans
100 S. Main Street
Los Angeles, California 90012

Re: Additional Comments on the Legal Inadequacies of the Recently Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report for the One High Occupancy Vehicle Lane in Each Direction on the San Bernardino Freeway (Interstate 10) from Puente Avenue to State Routes 57/71 in Los Angeles County

Dear Mr. Kosinski and Mr. Iverson:

This office represents the Los Angeles County Employees Retirement Association, the owner (the “Owner”) of Gateway Crescent, LLC, the owner of the office buildings located at 1000 and 1050 Lakes Drive, West Covina, California, 91790 (the “Property”). On behalf of the Owner, this letter constitutes additional comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the One High Occupancy Vehicle Lane in Each Direction on the San Bernardino Freeway (Interstate 10) from Puente Avenue to State Routes 57/71 in Los Angeles County (the “Draft EIR”). This letter incorporates by reference in full our January 12, 2012 comment letter to you on the Draft EIR and the freeway widening project (the “Project”).

The Project will have several significant and unavoidable environmental impacts that have not been adequately analyzed, disclosed, or mitigated. These impacts include, but are not limited to, noise, safety/hazards, aesthetics, parking, and land use/ zoning impacts that will have a harmful impact on the Property and the public. As the full scope of the Project was not disclosed or analyzed, the Draft EIR “fails to include relevant information and precludes informed decisionmaking and public participation.” See Save Our Peninsula Committee v. Monterey County Bd. Of Supervisors (2001) 87 Cal.App.4th 99, 128.

Pursuant to the March 28, 2012 e-mail from Gary Iverson, Caltrans Senior Environmental Planner, comments received by April 6, 2012 will be attached to the environmental document. See attached. According to Public Resources Code Section 21177(a) comments on the Project may occur during the public comment period or prior to the close of the public hearing.
ADDITIONAL MITIGATION MEASURES NECESSARY

The significant environmental impacts that have not been adequately analyzed, disclosed or mitigated as required by the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") are of the greatest concern to the Owner. California law states that "...public agencies should not approve projects as proposed if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of such projects..." See California Public Resources Code § 21002. To comply with CEQA, Caltrans must adopt additional mitigation to reduce environmental impacts to a less than significant level. Additional mitigation measures that would reduce significant impacts to less than significant include:

- The installation of double pane windows on the Property office buildings to reduce noise levels from the Project to less than significant.
- The installation of a sound wall along the freeway boundary adjacent to the parking lot abutting the Property to reduce noise levels from the Project to less than significant.
- The addition of safety barrier(s) along the freeway boundary adjacent to the parking lot abutting the Property to reduce the increased hazard by moving the freeway and faster moving traffic closer to the Property to less than significant.
- The addition of replacement landscaping/vegetation along the freeway boundary to mitigate the loss of a substantial amount of landscaping in the surface parking lot serving the Property that would occur as a result of the Project to less than significant.\(^2\)
- Procurement of a parking demand study at Caltrans' expense to analyze the loss of parking and landscaping that would occur at the Property and surrounding parking lots.\(^3\) Caltrans shall reconfigure the parking lots surrounding the Property to minimize parking loss while also adding

\(^2\) Proposed Caltrans design drawings given to us (see attached) indicate that large landscaped areas, including many large trees, would have to be removed in order to minimize the loss of surface lot parking. The loss of these aesthetic improvements has not been described or analyzed in the Draft EIR. The loss of these landscaped areas would create a significant aesthetic impact as it would remove trees and landscaping that buffer the freeway.

\(^3\) The Property and surrounding area's loss of parking and landscaping as a reasonably foreseeable direct consequence of the Project has not been described, analyzed or mitigated in the Draft EIR. This is unlawful segmentation that CEQA does not permit.
replacement landscaping (and infrastructure to accommodate new landscaping) to mitigate the
impacts of the Project on the Property and surrounding parking areas to less than
significant.
- Conduct construction work adjacent to the Property as expeditiously as possible, so that
construction adjacent to the Property shall not last more than 12 months. Caltrans shall require
nighttime and weekend construction adjacent to the Property, so as to reduce the significant
impacts of construction to less than significant.

Please see the January 12, 2012 comment letter for additional mitigation measures that are
required.

REIRCULATION

While we are pleased that Caltrans has recirculated the Draft EIR presumably to address the
procedural infirmities that we identified in our January comment letter, we are disturbed that no changes
have been made to the text of the Draft EIR to address our comments or those of other members of the
public concerned about the significant environmental impacts of the Project. First and foremost, CEQA
requires consultation when there is recirculation, and there is no evidence in the Draft EIR that this has
occurred here as a result of recirculation. See California Code of Regulations ("CEQA Guidelines") §§
15086.5, 15089. Further, pursuant to Public Resources Code § 21083.9(a)(2) for a project of statewide,
regional or areawide significance, such as this Project, there must be a scoping meeting, and it does not
appear that this basic procedural steps was taken with this Draft EIR.

CONCLUSION

CEQA requires that the full environmental impacts of the Project be disclosed, analyzed and
mitigated. By failing to identify and consider the incremental effects of the Project, such as the harmful
effects on air quality, noise, parking and safety, the Draft EIR fails to accomplish this in a number of
respects. The Owner and the Property will suffer great harm as a result of the Project as currently
proposed. The law requires a complete analysis and disclosure of the impacts, as well as mitigation to
reduce significant impacts of the Project.

4 CEQA Guidelines § 15088(a)(5) requires that the California Air Resources Board be consulted for this
type of project and that it determine conformity with the air quality management plan.
On behalf of the Owner, we look forward to your responses and a more meaningful analysis of the Project in a revised and recirculated Draft EIR.

Very truly yours,

DLA Piper LLP (US)

Ryan M. Leaderman
Associate
Admitted to practice in California

Attachments:
January 12, 2012 Comment Letter
March 28, 2012 Iverson E-mail
Caltrans Proposed Design Drawings

cc: Honorable Mike Touhey, West Covina Mayor
     Andrew Pasamant, West Covina City Manager
     Arnold Alvarez-Glasman, Esq., West Covina City Attorney
     Mark Knapp, Cornerstone Real Estate Advisors
     Kelly Kinnon, Esq., Cornerstone Real Estate Advisors
     Natalia Nunes, CBRE

WEST1229741331.2
Response to Comment Letter No. 14 - Gateway Crescent, LLC

#1 - Caltrans has adequately analyzed the project impacts to the Gateway Crescent property. The analysis of those impacts is contained in this Environmental Impact Report and the associated studies prepared for the specific impacts mentioned in your most recent letter.

The additional mitigation measures you proposed were considered as follows:

- Installation of double paned windows on the Property office buildings to reduce noise levels from the Project to less than significant.

A study of the noise impacts as a result of project implementation found that the Gateway Crescent properties were determined to not be considered a noise sensitive land use eligible for abatement per 23 CFR 772 because there is no exterior frequent human use areas within the property. Therefore, a no impact conclusion was determined and no noise mitigation is proposed for the Gateway Crescent properties.

- Installation of a sound wall along the freeway boundary adjacent to the parking lot abutting the Property to reduce the noise levels for the Project to less than significant.

A study of the noise impacts as a result of project implementation found that the Gateway Crescent properties were determined not to be considered a noise sensitive land use eligible for abatement per 23 CFR 772 because there is no exterior frequent human use areas within the property. Therefore, a no impact conclusion was determined and no noise mitigation is proposed for the Gateway Crescent properties.

- The addition of safety barrier(s) along the freeway boundaries adjacent to the parking lot abutting the Property to reduce the increased hazard by moving the freeway and faster moving traffic closer to the Property to less than significant.

As was demonstrated at the March 14, 2012 meeting, held at the Caltrans Building (100 S. Main Street, Los Angeles, CA), safety barriers have been included in the project between the Gateway Crescent buildings and the Vincent Avenue on ramp to the eastbound Interstate Route 10. The Project Description (Chapter 1) of the FEIR identifies safety barriers as part of the proposed project.

- The addition of replacement landscaping/vegetation along the freeway boundary to mitigate the loss of a substantial amount of landscaping in the surface parking lot serving the Property that would occur as a result of the Project to less than significant.

The resultant area that would remain within the State-owned right-of-way would have no exposed ground suitable for planting replacement landscape vegetation. Therefore, no landscape vegetation could be planted in that area.
The resultant area outside the State-owned right-of-way would remain under the control of the existing property owner. The negotiations with that property owner are currently proceeding as part of the Right-of-Way Acquisition process. As part of that process, it is possible that funds may be provided to the property owner for landscape planting, should the property owner wish to include that element in the current negotiations.

At the March 14, 2012 meeting, the same issue was raised, and Caltrans encouraged the commenter to contact the property owner and express the desire to have landscaping included in the Right-of-Way Acquisition process.

- Procurement of a parking demand study at Caltrans' expense to analyze the loss of parking and landscaping that would occur at the Property and surrounding parking lots. Caltrans shall reconfigure the parking lots surrounding the Property to minimize parking loss while also adding replacement landscaping (and infrastructure to accommodate new landscaping) to mitigate the impacts of the Project on the Property and surrounding parking areas to less than significant.

Caltrans conducted an analysis of parking lot reconfiguration options which determined that a lesser amount of parking loss than originally anticipated would occur. In an effort to compensate the property owner for the parking loss, funding will be provided as part of the ROW acquisition process for a parking lot reconfiguration study.

The current Right-of-Way Acquisition process being conducted between the property owner and Caltrans will address issues relevant to the project impact on the subject properties as identified in this Environmental Impact Report. Project acquisitions are identified in the FEIR in Appendix I, Project Acquisitions and Easements.

Responses to the comments made in your January 12, 2012 letter have been addressed above.

#2 - An Initial Study / Environmental Assessment (IS / EA) for the proposed I-10 HOV Lanes Project was submitted to the State Clearinghouse for review in 2002. Caltrans circulated the IS / EA for public review and comment between October 18, 2002 and December 6, 2002. After circulation of the document, it was finalized and a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) was certified based on input from responsible agencies, commenting agencies, and the general public. A Notice of Determination was filed at the State Clearinghouse on March 4, 2004 and Caltrans subsequently proceeded with construction of the Segment 1 project.

In March 2011, Caltrans decided to prepare an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) due to the redesign of some Segment 2 and 3 components and also being aware of both agency and local concerns about environmental issues associated with the redesigned project. Caltrans subsequently, albeit belatedly, submitted a Notice of Preparation to the State Clearinghouse (SCH # 2012011028), which was distributed to a total of nine state agencies on January 13,
2012. On April 2, 2012, the Clearinghouse sent a letter to Caltrans indicating that no state agencies had submitted comments and that the comment was closed. Caltrans has circulated the EIR to numerous elected officials, agencies, and interested parties as documented in Chapter 8 of the EIR and in compliance with applicable laws. Caltrans held a public hearing on December 13, 2011 and has met on several occasions with both local agencies and the general public, as documented in this Final EIR. For the date of the scoping meetings please refer to the Chapter 7, Comments and Coordination section of the draft environmental document.
COMMENTS FROM THE DECEMBER 13, 2011 AND JANUARY 5, 2012 PUBLIC MEETINGS

*Comment sheets were used to solicit and respond to participants*

#A – At the December 13, 2011 Public Hearing and the January 5, 2012 Community Meeting, there were many inquiries related to the placement of the new soundwall and the relationship to the existing soundwall behind the properties adjacent to the westbound Interstate Route 10 and Mardina Street between Lark Ellen Avenue and Azusa Avenue. The primary concerns revolved around the space between the walls. This is the response to those comments:

The goal of the environmental process is to avoid or minimize community impacts. In an attempt to achieve that goal, Caltrans considered a range of potential solutions to the community concerns related to the 4-ft space proposed to remain between the existing property walls and the new soundwall. This review took into consideration project costs, legal constraints, procedural complexities, estimated timeframes, and the potential for successful negotiations with all of the adjacent property owners.

Caltrans considered the following build options:

1. **Proceed as recommended leaving the dual walls and 4-ft gap as planned.** This option would have the lowest cost, no legal constraints, minimal procedural complexities and the shortest timeframe. Negotiations with the adjacent property owners cannot be qualified.

2. **Proceed as recommended leaving the dual walls but offer to sell the 4 ft area as excess to the adjacent property owners after decertifying these 4 ft areas under Right of Way “finding A”.** This option would be infeasible because legal mandates and procedures require that any excess property be offered in a public sale at market value and not at any "discounted rate". Also, if the property owners were to acquire these excess properties, then these transactions would potentially increase the tax burdens on each property owner, and may affect any Proposition 13 tax advantage the property owners currently enjoy. Finally, it is foreseeable that some owners may want to acquire the parcel adjacent to their properties, while others may not, resulting in potential conflicts between owners and a complicated maintenance scenario.

3. **Proceed as recommended leaving the dual walls but offer the 4 ft area to the adjacent property owners as individual easements (not a sale).** This option would be infeasible because legal mandates and procedures require that any excess property be offered in a public sale.

4. **Proceed as recommended leaving the dual walls but offer to transfer the entire 4 ft area to the City of West Covina as a local easement (not a sale).** It is most probable
that the City would not want to obtain such an easement, which would be of little or no value, yet the City would incur all costs for future maintenance.

5. Direct a redesign to replace the existing walls with the new soundwall using temporary construction easements. While this option is feasible and still under consideration by Caltrans, it would have increased construction and right-of-way costs over Option 1, as well as more procedural complexities and potential construction schedule implications. This option would have the advantage of eliminating the need for long-term maintenance of the 4-ft gap between walls.

After various discussions and brainstorming sessions, it was determined that Option 1 would be the best approach. This option is currently part of the Proposed Project Alternative. Implementation of Option 5 in lieu of Option 1 will be considered during final design.

We would anticipate and encourage further discussions on specific measures that address individual property owners concerns during the development of the final plans for the project. Heightened maintenance and security features should be fully considered for the 4-ft gap area. This would be a joint responsibility of the Caltrans Design, Right of Way and Construction staff.
WRITTEN COMMENT SHEET

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
INTERSTATE 10 HIGH OCCUPANCY LANE PROJECT
from Puente Avenue to State Routes 57/71

Thank you for attending this Public Hearing. Our purpose for hosting this meeting is to provide information on the Draft Environmental Impact Report and to give you an opportunity to provide comments on pertinent environmental issues relevant to this project. You may use the back of this sheet if necessary.

Please print your comments below: Date: 12-13-2011

1. Section E (Map) for Segment #3: Is it possible to extend the sound wall on the northside of the fray between Holt + Via Verde to the point where the actual hill starts and thus start retaining wall?

2. Will Caltrans work with LA County in the unincorporated area of Covina - Covina Hills - in lieu of city of Covina?

3. Will Caltrans work with Traffic control (CHP etc) when ramps close or any traffic overflows to side street, specifically between Via Verde & Holt on Via Verde?

Your Name (please print): Sharon Johnson
Affiliation: Homeowner
Street Address: 28624 E. Via Verde St.
City, State, Zip: Covina, CA 91724

Phone Number and/or Email (optional):

Please hand this form in tonight, or mail it to:

MR. RON KOSINSKI
DEPUTY DISTRICT DIRECTOR
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DIVISION OF ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING
100 SOUTH MAIN STREET MS 16A
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

Please Note: Your letter must be submitted by January 6, 2012 to receive consideration in the Final EIR
Continued from other side:

4) Where can we get speaker/project contact info?

Your Name (please print): 
Affiliation: 
Street Address: 
City, State, Zip: 
Phone Number and/or Email (optional): 

Response to Comment Sheet No. 1 – Sharon Johnson

#1 – Current plans are to extend the existing noise barrier (soundwall) to the “point where the actual hill starts” as indicated in this comment. Project plans are available for review at the District 7 Caltrans office at 100 S. Main Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012.

#2 – Caltrans is in contact with the City of Covina and the County of Los Angeles (as well as the applicable law enforcement agencies) to obtain the most cooperation that can be facilitated to address local traffic circulation issues during project construction.

#3 – A description of the traffic control coordination that would occur during construction between Caltrans and emergency service providers is provided in Section 3.2.4.2 (Impact TRAF-4) of the EIR. Caltrans works closely with the California Highway Patrol (CHP) to identify roadway traffic pattern alterations and closures. Caltrans also works closely with the applicable law enforcement agencies when traffic pattern alterations and closures are implemented. One “tool” to conduct this coordination effort is the Traffic Management Plan (TMP) which is formulated with the CHP and local law enforcement agencies. This ensures constant communication between the Caltrans Resident Engineer and the applicable law enforcement agencies as the need arises.

#4 – At the January 5, 2012 Public Hearing the commenter was given the contact information for Mr. Ron Kosinski. Mr. Kosinski can arrange for speakers’ or project information contacts. Contact the Public Information Office at the District 7 Caltrans office at 100 S. Main Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012 for more information.
WRITTEN COMMENT SHEET

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
INTERSTATE 10 HIGH OCCUPANCY LANE PROJECT
from Puerto Avenue to State Routes 57/71

Thank you for attending this Public Hearing. Our purpose for hosting this meeting is to provide information on the Draft Environmental Impact Report and to give you an opportunity to provide comments on pertinent environmental issues relevant to this project. You may use the back of this sheet if necessary.

Please print your comments below:  

[Comment: Removing fencing around properties between Aves. A & B.]

Date: __________________

Your Name (please print): __________________
Affiliation: __________________
Street Address: __________________
City, State, Zip: __________________
Phone Number and/or Email (optional):

Please hand this form in tonight, or mail it to:
MR. RON KOSINSKI
DEPUTY DISTRICT DIRECTOR
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DIVISION OF ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING
100 SOUTH MAIN STREET MS 16A
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

Please Note: Your letter must be submitted by January 6, 2012
to receive consideration in the Final EIR
Response to Comment Sheet No. 2 - Albert Bailar

#1 – See #A above (page J-129.)
WRITTEN COMMENT SHEET

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
INTERSTATE 10 HIGH OCCUPANCY LANE PROJECT
from Puente Avenue to State Routes 57/771

Thank you for attending this Public Hearing. Our purpose for hosting this meeting is to provide information on the Draft Environmental Impact Report and to give you an opportunity to provide comments on pertinent environmental issues relevant to this project. You may use the back of this sheet if necessary.

Please print your comments below:

Segment 3 needs 15 feet all along the 4.4 mile section? Will it come from the properties north or south of the freeway? (Or half from each side?)

Date: 12/18/11

Your Name (please print): Joanne Anderson
Affiliation: homeowner
Street Address: 20840 E. Exbury Place
City, State, Zip: La Puente Hills
Phone Number and/or Email (optional): (626) 332-9561

Please hand this form in tonight, or mail it to:
MR. RON KOSINSKI
DEPUTY DISTRICT DIRECTOR
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DIVISION OF ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING
100 SOUTH MAIN STREET MS 16A
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

Please Note: Your letter must be submitted by January 6, 2012 to receive consideration in the Final EIR.
Response to Comment Sheet No. 3 - Joanne Anderson

#1 – Fifteen feet is the average number of feet required to implement the widening for this project. In some sections this fifteen feet is available within the existing Caltrans right-of-way. In other areas only minor areas of widening outside Caltrans right-of-way is required.

The fifteen feet is not consistently used from either the “north” or “south” side of the freeway. The fifteen feet varies throughout the project study area. The project plans (which are available for review at the District 7 Caltrans office at 100 S. Main Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012) show the areas required for project implementation.
WRITTEN COMMENT SHEET

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
INTERSTATE 10 HIGH OCCUPANCY LANE PROJECT
from Puente Avenue to State Routes 87/71

Thank you for attending this Public Hearing. Our purpose for hosting this meeting is to provide information on the Draft Environmental Impact Report and to give you an opportunity to provide comments on pertinent environmental issues relevant to this project. You may use the back of this sheet if necessary.

Please print your comments below:

Date: 12-13-11

WE HAVE A DRAINAGE PROBLEM IN BACK YARD THAT NEEDS TO BE ADDRESSED

Your Name (please print): Tom Bubaker
Affiliation: Home Owner
Street Address: 1730 E MARDING ST
City, State, Zip: West Covina, CA 91791
Phone Number and/or Email (optional): tomspirit@ymail.com

Please hand this form in tonight, or mail it to:
MR. RON KOSINSKI
DEPUTY DISTRICT DIRECTOR
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DIVISION OF ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING
100 SOUTH MAIN STREET MS 16A
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

Please Note: Your letter must be submitted by January 6, 2012
to receive consideration in the Final EIR
Response to Comment Sheet No. 4 - Tom Brubaker

#1 – The current project design documents did not create any changes to existing drainage conditions on the property behind the existing block wall. If any future design changes occur, the designer will address any issue that may be required by the new design.
WRITTEN COMMENT SHEET

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
INTERSTATE 10 HIGH OCCUPANCY LANE PROJECT
from Puente Avenue to State Route 87/71

Thank you for attending this Public Hearing. Our purpose for hosting this meeting is to provide information on the Draft Environmental Impact Report and to give you an opportunity to provide comments on pertinent environmental issues relevant to this project. You may use the back of this sheet if necessary.

Please print your comments below:

Date: 12-13-11

[Comment]

What time of day will most of the construction take place?

Your Name (please print): Janice Kappmeyer
Affiliation:
Street Address: 1727 E. Martina St.
City, State, Zip: West Covina, Ca 91791
Phone Number and/or Email (optional): janivan@cs.com

Please hand this form in tonight, or mail it to:
MR. RON KOSINSKI
DEPUTY DISTRICT DIRECTOR
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DIVISION OF ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING
100 SOUTH MAIN STREET MS 16A
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

Please Note: Your letter must be submitted by January 6, 2012 to receive consideration in the Final EIR
Response to Comment Sheet No. 5 - Janice Kappmeyer

#1 – As stated in the Public Hearing while most of the construction will occur during daylight hours, some nighttime work will be required during ramp closures and in the vicinity of the IKEA store in order to minimize the effects on traffic congestion.
WRITTEN COMMENT SHEET

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
INTERSTATE 10 HIGH OCCUPANCY LANE PROJECT
from Puente Avenue to State Routes 57/71

Thank you for attending this Public Hearing. Our purpose for hosting this meeting is to provide information on the Draft Environmental Impact Report and to give you an opportunity to provide comments on pertinent environmental issues relevant to this project. You may use the back of this sheet if necessary.

Please print your comments below:

Good job

Date: __________________________

Your Name (please print): Sharon Johnson
Affiliation: ______________________
Street Address: Via Verde
City, State, Zip: Los Angeles, CA 90012
Phone Number and/or Email (optional):

Please hand this form in tonight, or mail it to:

MR. RON KOSINSKI
DEPUTY DISTRICT DIRECTOR
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DIVISION OF ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING
100 SOUTH MAIN STREET MS 16A
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

Please Note: Your letter must be submitted by January 6, 2012
to receive consideration in the Final EIR
Response to Comment Sheet No. 6 - Sharon Johnson

#1 – Thank you. Comment noted.
Thank you for attending this Public Hearing. Our purpose for hosting this meeting is to provide information on the Draft Environmental Impact Report and to give you an opportunity to provide comments on pertinent environmental issues relevant to this project. You may use the back of this sheet if necessary.

Please print your comments below:

Date: 2012-01-05

As stated in my previous email the gap between the existing wall and the new wall make crime it would be a prime location for crime. Also what would happen do when a person (child and/or adult) is battered raped murdered would among other things between the wall?

Your Name (please print): Nathen Villanueva
Affiliation: 
Street Address: 1619 E Marshall A
City, State, Zip: West Covina

Please hand this form in tonight, or mail it to:
MR. RON KOSINSKI
DEPUTY DISTRICT DIRECTOR
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DIVISION OF ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING
100 SOUTH MAIN STREET MS 16A
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

Please Note: Your letter must be submitted by January 6, 2012 to receive consideration in the Final EIR.
Continued from other side:

Ron had suggested to give the land to the resident. What would be the impact? I'm sure California would give the land for free. It seems quite misleading. Not with this earning not all resident can afford to buy the land. In addition, if they give it for free, what reason does the home owner need to give California.

The new sound system how many feet gap between the lane. Impact on vehicle?

Your Name (please print):
Affiliation:
Street Address:
City, State, Zip:
Phone Number and/or Email (optional):
Response to Comment Sheet No. 7 - Nohreen Villanueva

#1 – Caltrans is currently seeking a solution to the “gap” you refer to. Caltrans participates in, and encourages everyone, to report any problems or criminal acts to the proper authorities for legal enforcement.

#2 – See #A above (page J-129).

#3 – The area on the “freeway side” of the roadway, between the soundwall and the edge of the travel way would be 10 feet wide. This 10 feet side area would be used for the paved freeway shoulder area for emergency use only.

The relocated soundwall will be constructed on top of a standard safety barrier; therefore, there will be no impact with regard to collision hazards. For more information, see project plans available at District 7 Caltrans office at 100 S. Main Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012.
WRITTEN COMMENT SHEET
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
INTERSTATE 10 HIGH OCCUPANCY LANE PROJECT
from Puente Avenue to State Routes 57/71

Thank you for attending this Public Hearing. Our purpose for hosting this meeting is to provide information on the Draft Environmental Impact Report and to give you an opportunity to provide comments on pertinent environmental issues relevant to this project. You may use the back of this sheet if necessary.

Please print your comments below:

________________________________________________________

Date: __________________

________________________________________________________

Your Name (please print): ________________________________

Affiliation: ____________________________________________

Street Address: ________________________________

City, State, Zip: __________________________________________

Phone Number and/or Email (optional): _______________________

Please hand this form in tonight, or mail it to:
MR. RON KOSINSKI
DEPUTY DISTRICT DIRECTOR
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DIVISION OF ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING
100 SOUTH MAIN STREET MS 16A
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

Please Note: Your letter must be submitted by January 6, 2012 to receive consideration in the Final EIR.
Continued from other side:

[Handwritten text]

Your Name (please print): __________________________
Affiliation: __________________________
Street Address: __________________________
City, State, Zip: __________________________
Phone Number and/or Email (optional): __________________________
Response to Comment Sheet No. 8 - Richard Ramage

#1 – See #A above (page J-129).

#2 – See #A above (page J-129). Since there will be no relinquishment, there will be no affect to property taxes.
Thank you for attending this Public Hearing. Our purpose for hosting this meeting is to provide information on the Draft Environmental Impact Report and to give you an opportunity to provide comments on pertinent environmental issues relevant to this project. You may use the back of this sheet if necessary.

Please print your comments below:

The proposed sound wall greatly diminishes the value of my property by the taking of my most valuable community frontage visibility. Will we be compensated for this loss?

Will the city provide me a way to erect a taller billboard so to meet the need for advertisement?

Your Name (please print): LILY MARTINI

Affiliation:

Street Address: 1385 S. GENTRY AVE S.

City, State, Zip: IN C. CA 92650

Phone Number and/or Email (optional): lilymartini@cox.com

Please hand this form in tonight or mail it to:

MR. RON KOSINSKI
DEPUTY DISTRICT DIRECTOR
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DIVISION OF ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING
100 SOUTH MAIN STREET MS 16A
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

Please Note: Your letter must be submitted by January 6, 2012 to receive consideration in the Final EIR
Response to Comment Sheet No. 9 - Lily Martini

#1 – The commenter’s business property is located in an area of mixed land use, a portion of which contains noise-sensitive receptors. In such situations, Caltrans is compelled to consider abatement and provide it, in the form of soundwalls, if it is determined to be both feasible and reasonable. Loss of visibility to commercial properties is not an environmental impact in that context, and therefore, Caltrans does not compensate business owners for the changes in visibility resulting from the construction of soundwalls.

#2 – At the January 5, 2012 Public Hearing for this project, the City of West Covina indicated that they would take the issue of taller signs under consideration for those properties behind new soundwalls constructed as part of this project.
Continued from other side:

[Handwritten text]

Your Name (please print): Robert Soto
Affiliation: 
Street Address: 2101 Edenview Lane
City, State, Zip: Redwood City, CA 94063
Phone Number and/or Email (optional): 626 333 9613
Response to Comment Sheet No. 10 - Robert Sotelo

#1 – Comment noted. This HOV lane project is not currently under consideration to become a High Occupancy Toll lane.
WRITTEN COMMENT SHEET
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
INTERSTATE 10 HIGH OCCUPANCY LANE PROJECT
from Puente Avenue to State Routes 57/71

Thank you for attending this Public Hearing. Our purpose for hosting this meeting is to provide information on the Draft Environmental Impact Report and to give you an opportunity to provide comments on pertinent environmental issues relevant to this project. You may use the back of this sheet if necessary.

Please print your comments below:

[Signature]

Date: ______________________

Your Name (please print):
Affiliation:
Street Address:
City, State, Zip:
Phone Number and/or Email (optional):

Please hand this form in tonight, or mail it to:
MR. RON KOSINSKI
DEPUTY DISTRICT DIRECTOR
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DIVISION OF ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING
100 SOUTH MAIN STREET MS 16A
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

Please Note: Your letter must be submitted by January 6, 2012 to receive consideration in the Final EIR
Response to Comment Sheet No. 11 - Tom Brubaker

#1 – Comment noted. See previous responses to the Tom Brubaker Comment Sheet above.
WRITTEN COMMENT SHEET

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
INTERSTATE 10 HIGH OCCUPANCY LANE PROJECT
from Puente Avenue to State Routes 77/71

Thank you for attending this Public Hearing. Our purpose for hosting this meeting is to provide information on the Draft Environmental Impact Report and to give you an opportunity to provide comments on pertinent environmental issues relevant to this project. You may use the back of this sheet if necessary.

Please print your comments below:

Date: 1/5/12

The EIR does not disclose all of the partial takings, both construction and permanent. Please describe those takings in West Covina as well as the environmental impacts so the public can understand the true environmental impacts of the project.

Your Name (please print): Ryan Leaderman
Affiliation: Represent owner of 1000 Lakes Dr & 1050
Street Address: DLA Ave SE 500 & Hope St SE 2B22, Lakes Dr
City, State, Zip: LA, CA 90071
Phone Number and/or Email (optional): ryan.lederman@dltapipes.com

Please hand this form in tonight, or mail it to:
MR. RON KOSINSKI
DEPUTY DISTRICT DIRECTOR
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DIVISION OF ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING
100 SOUTH MAIN STREET MS 16A
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

Please Note: Your letter must be submitted by January 6, 2012 to receive consideration in the Final EIR.
Response to Comment Sheet No. 12 - Ryan Leaderman

#1 – Please see the responses to the commenter’s January 12, 2012 letter. Additionally, Caltrans is meeting with the Gateway Crescent property owners to discuss concerns/comments.
WRITTEN COMMENT SHEET

Thank you for attending this Public Hearing. Our purpose for hosting this meeting is to provide information on the Draft Environmental Impact Report and to give you an opportunity to provide comments on pertinent environmental issues relevant to this project. You may use the back of this sheet if necessary.

Please print your comments below:

Date: 1/5/12

Concern: Four foot gap between existing wall & sound wall - why?

Concern: Homeless taking refuge in that space! Send police!

Are you removing the shrubbery and/or who will maintain it to prevent fires due to dead vegetation?

Your Name (please print): Helen Blackburn

Affiliation: Resident of WR

Street Address: 1400 E. Madison St.
City, State, Zip: 21400, CA 91311
Phone Number and/or Email (optional): KIzelle@emipro.com

Please hand this form in tonight, or mail it to:

MR. RON KOSINSKI
DEPUTY DISTRICT DIRECTOR
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DIVISION OF ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING
100 SOUTH MAIN STREET MS 16A
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

Please Note: Your letter must be submitted by January 8, 2012 to receive consideration in the Final EIR.
Response to Comment Sheet No. 13 - Helen Blackburn

#1 – See #A above (page J-129).

#2 – There are plans for the existing vegetation to be removed as part of this project in the area you indicated. Vegetation removal is discussed in the Visual Impacts section (Section 3.1.4) of the FEIR.
WRITTEN COMMENT SHEET

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
INTERSTATE 10 HIGH OCCUPANCY LANE PROJECT
from Puente Avenue to State Routes 57/71

Thank you for attending this Public Hearing. Our purpose for hosting this meeting is to provide information on the Draft Environmental Impact Report and to give you an opportunity to provide comments on pertinent environmental issues relevant to this project. You may use the back of this sheet if necessary.

Please print your comments below:

Data: 11/01/12

THE SOUND WALL WILL COVER THE VIEW OF MY BUSINESS. CAN THIS BE CHANGED? SMALL, SOOOTH WALL?

THE CITY WILL AUTHORIZE TOLL SIGNAGE FOR THE LANE? THEY WILL BE AFFECTED?

Your Name (please print): MARID LUNA
Affiliation: PLAZA BROS WEST COVINA MORTUARY
Street Address: 2322 W WELLESLEY AV
City, State, Zip: WEST COVINA CA-91790

Please hand this form in tonight, or mail it to:
MR. RON KOSINSKI
DEPUTY DISTRICT DIRECTOR
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DIVISION OF ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING
100 SOUTH MAIN STREET MS 16A
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

Please Note: Your letter must be submitted by January 8, 2012 to receive consideration in the Final EIR.
Response to Comment Sheet No. 15 - Mario Luna

#1 – Caltrans has worked with the City of West Covina to identify noise barrier (soundwall) lengths and heights that would be included in the proposed project between Interstate Route 10 and businesses along Garvey Avenue. The soundwalls you mentioned are proposed to provide legally mandated noise mitigation for area residential properties and cannot be eliminated. However, as part of the cooperative effort between Caltrans and the City of West Covina additional efforts conducted for this project have indicated that the soundwalls could be reduced in length in some areas and still provide the required noise mitigation. The design layout sheets for the proposed project show the proposed soundwall lengths.

#2 – At the January 5, 2012 Public Hearing for this project, the City of West Covina indicated that they would take the issue of taller signs under consideration for those properties behind new soundwalls constructed as part of this project.
WRITTEN COMMENT SHEET

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
INTERSTATE 10 HIGH OCCUPANCY LANE PROJECT
from Puente Avenue to State Routes 57/71

Thank you for attending this Public Hearing. Our purpose for hosting this meeting is to provide information on the Draft Environmental Impact Report and to give you an opportunity to provide comments on pertinent environmental issues relevant to this project. You may use the back of this sheet if necessary.

Please print your comments below:

Date: ____________________________

Your Name (please print): ____________________________
Affiliation: ____________________________
Street Address: ____________________________
City, State, Zip: ____________________________
Phone Number and/or Email (optional): ____________________________

Please hand this form in tonight, or mail it to:
MR. RON KOSINSKI
DEPUTY DISTRICT DIRECTOR
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DIVISION OF ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING
100 SOUTH MAIN STREET MS 16A
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

Please Note: Your letter must be submitted by January 8, 2012 to receive consideration in the Final EIR.
Response to Comment Sheet No. 15 - Maria Rodriguez

#1 – See #A above (page J-129).
WRITTEN COMMENT SHEET

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
INTERSTATE 10 HIGH OCCUPANCY LANE PROJECT
from Puente Avenue to State Routes 57/71

Thank you for attending this Public Hearing. Our purpose for hosting this
meeting is to provide information on the Draft Environmental Impact Report and
to give you an opportunity to provide comments on pertinent environmental
issues relevant to this project. You may use the back of this sheet if necessary.
Please print your comments below.

Date: 1/5/2012

Our company is in opposition of the construction of the soundwall. It is our understanding that some of the other businesses in the area oppose it, as well.

Per Mr. Shahbazian, we will not have a soundwall constructed in front of our property at 1539, 1541-1555 W. Garvey Ave. North or in front of the going model located to the west.

Your Name (please print): Aithea De Pietro
Affiliation: Frank De Pietro and Sons
Street Address: Business Address: 1325 Colorado, Suite 141
Los Angeles, CA 90012
Local Property: 1539, 1541-1555 W. Garvey Ave
City, State, Zip: Phone Number (optional): (213) 324-6526 / adep@depietro.com

Please hand this form in tonight, or mail it to:

MR. RON KOSINSKI
DEPUTY DISTRICT DIRECTOR
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DIVISION OF ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING
100 SOUTH MAIN STREET MS 16A
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

Please Note: Your letter must be submitted by January 9, 2012
to receive consideration in the Final EIR
We do have a freestanding illuminated sign at the northwest corner of Roberto and W. Convoy Ave. North. It contains the name of the property and the name of two of the major tenants. It is a concern of ours that if a soundwall were constructed to the east of our property that it will obstruct the view of our sign.

Your Name (please print):
Affiliation:
Street Address:
City, State, Zip:
Phone Number and/or Email (optional):
Response to Comment Sheet No. 16 - Althea de Pietro

#1 – The proposed soundwalls facing property at 1539, 1541-1555 W. Garvey Avenue North, as well as the Covina Motel, has been eliminated as requested by the owners of the noted properties. The proposed soundwall will then begin from the northeast corner of the Roberto Avenue and West Garvey Avenue North. Any further soundwall reduction to the east will result in the soundwall not being effective to the affected residences. A soundwall is effective when it reduces the future predicted noise level by the required minimum of five (5) decibels.
WrittEn Comment sheet

Draft environmenTal impacT report
Interstate 10 high occupancy lane project
From Puente Avenue to State Route 57/71

Thank you for attending this Public Hearing. Our purpose for hosting this meeting is to provide information on the Draft Environmental Impact Report and to give you an opportunity to provide comments on pertinent environmental issues relevant to this project. You may use the back of this sheet if necessary.

Please print your comments below:

[Comment by attendee]

Date: 1-5-12

Your Name (please print): Elizabeth Noreno
Affiliation:
Street Address: 1402 E. Medina St.
City, State, Zip: West Covina, CA 91791
Phone Number and/or Email (optional): 626-339-6619

Please hand this form in tonight, or mail it to:
MR. RON KOSINSKI
DEPUTY DISTRICT DIRECTOR
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DIVISION OF ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING
100 SOUTH MAIN STREET MS 16A
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

Please Note: Your letter must be submitted by January 6, 2012 to receive consideration in the Final EIR.
Response to Comment Sheet No. 17 - Elizabeth Moreno

#1 – See #A above (page J-129).
WRITTEN COMMENT SHEET

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
INTERSTATE 10 HIGH OCCUPANCY LANE PROJECT
from Puente Avenue to State Routes 57/71

Thank you for attending this Public Hearing. Our purpose for hosting this meeting is to provide information on the Draft Environmental Impact Report and to give you an opportunity to provide comments on pertinent environmental issues relevant to this project. You may use the back of this sheet if necessary.

Please print your comments below: Date: 11/5/12

We are extremely concerned about the gap proposed between our current freeway wall and the new sound wall. We feel the gap exposes our property to possible crime, trash, rodents, graffiti, etc. A different design for the wall is needed to remove the gap. We also have a drainage issue that may be impacted by the new construction.

Thank you!

Your Name (please print): David Lauer Harder
Affiliation: Resident affected by construction
Street Address: 1655 Martinosa Street
City, State, Zip: West Covina, CA 91791
Phone Number and/or Email (optional): 626-532-7936 - debharder2010@gmail.com

Please send this form in tonight, or mail it to:
MR. RON KOSINSKI
DEPUTY DISTRICT DIRECTOR
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DIVISION OF ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING
100 SOUTH MAIN STREET MS 16A
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

Please Note: Your letter must be submitted by January 6, 2012 to receive consideration in the Final EIR.
Response to Comment Sheet No. 18 - Dave and Laura Harder

#1 – See #A above (page J-129).

#2 – The current project design documents did not create any changes to existing drainage conditions on the property behind the existing block wall. If any future design changes occur, the designer will address any issue that may be required by the new design.
WRITTEN COMMENT SHEET

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
INTERSTATE 10 HIGH OCCUPANCY LANE PROJECT
from Puente Avenue to State Routes 57/71

Thank you for attending this Public Hearing. Our purpose for hosting this meeting is to provide information on the Draft Environmental Impact Report and to give you an opportunity to provide comments on pertinent environmental issues relevant to this project. You may use the back of this sheet if necessary.

Please print your comments below:

Date: 1-5-12

How much distance allowed to get out/ff HOV lane & exit freeway? Often this is too short to safely exit.

Why can't you post signs saying "x ft to exit HOV".

Your Name (please print): ROBERTA GOLDBERG

Affiliation: 

Street Address: 1055 E. GRENDELLE ST

City, State, Zip: W. Covina CA 91790

Phone Number and/or Email (optional): RSG1055@AOL.COM

Please hand this form in tonight, or mail it to:

MR. RON KOSINSKI
DEPUTY DISTRICT DIRECTOR
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DIVISION OF ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING
100 SOUTH MAIN STREET MS 16A
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

Please Note: Your letter must be submitted by January 6, 2012

to receive consideration in the Final EIR
WRITTEN COMMENT SHEET (CONT'D)

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
INTERSTATE 10 HIGH OCCUPANCY LANE PROJECT
from Puente Avenue to State Routes 57/71

Continued from other side:

WHAT TYPE OF SURFACE/PRINT ON

SOUND WALLS TO DETER GRAFFITI?

Your Name (please print): _________________________________
Affiliation: ____________________________________________
Street Address: _________________________________________
City, State, Zip: _________________________________________
Phone Number and/or Email (optional): ______________________

J-172
June 2012
Response to Comment Sheet No. 19 - Roberta Goldberg

#1 – Signage will be installed as part of this project to ensure that motorists using the HOV lanes are aware of exit points for specific off-ramps well in advance of the egress point for that off-ramp. Exit points will be designed to meet current standard lengths for HOV lane egress points.

#2 – There is no current product on the market that could be applied to structure surfaces to permanently repel graffiti. Currently graffiti is either removed or covered over, and this has been determined to be the most efficient manner to remove graffiti from view. Other methods including covering or hiding the structural surface with landscaping, and that will be included in this project as deemed possible. Additionally, the structural surfaces constructed as part of this project will include aesthetic treatments to make the surface visually appealing and thus discourage graffiti. Graffiti removal is discussed in the Visual Impacts section (Section 3.1.4) of the FEIR.
WRITTEN COMMENT SHEET

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
INTERSTATE 10 HIGH OCCUPANCY LANE PROJECT
from Puente Avenue to State Routes 57/71

Thank you for attending this Public Hearing. Our purpose for hosting this
meeting is to provide information on the Draft Environmental Impact Report and
to give you an opportunity to provide comments on pertinent environmental
issues relevant to this project. You may use the back of this sheet if necessary.

Please print your comments below:

Date: 1-5-12

Most important issue is the increased accessibility for burglars. Your concern may well be that you
open the city, state, & Caltrans to liability (in the event
a burglary happens, especially if someone is hurt) in
that this project has made it possible, over our objections.

Your Name (please print): Michael Trubaker
Affiliation: Resident
Street Address: 1730 E. Marden St.
City, State, Zip: Upland, CA 91786

Phone Number and/or Email (optional): (909) 562-0730 markfam2003@yahoo.com

Please hand this form in tonight, or mail it to:
MR. RON KOSINSKI
DEPUTY DISTRICT DIRECTOR
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DIVISION OF ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING
100 SOUTH MAIN STREET MS 16A
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

Please Note: Your letter must be submitted by January 6, 2012
to receive consideration in the Final EIR
Response to Comment Sheet No. 20 - Michael Brubaker

#1 – See #A above (page J-129).
WRITTEN COMMENT SHEET

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
INTERSTATE 10 HIGH OCCUPANCY LANE PROJECT
from Puente Avenue to State Routes 57/71

Thank you for attending this Public Hearing. Our purpose for hosting this meeting is to provide information on the Draft Environmental Impact Report and to give you an opportunity to provide comments on pertinent environmental issues relevant to this project. You may use the back of this sheet, if necessary.

Please print your comments below:

Date: 1/5/12

Please do not put this wall up along the retail/commercial area along the I-10. These businesses are along the pay for exposure to the public. In these times any drop in business can mean failure. There is already a large vacancy rate. If there are more business closures I could lose my buildings to foreclosure. Right now one building is already

Your Name (please print): Paul Forgette
Affiliation: Building owner
Street Address: 1319-1349 E. Garvey Ave N & 2149-2155 S. Garvey Ave N
City, State, Zip: West Covina 91791
Phone Number and/or Email (optional): 626-339-5869 happy.17k@gmail.com

Please hand this form in tonight, or mail it to:
MR. RON KOSINSKI
DEPUTY DISTRICT DIRECTOR
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DIVISION OF ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING
100 SOUTH MAIN STREET MS 16A
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

Please Note: Your letter must be submitted by January 6, 2012 to receive consideration in the Final EIR.
Response to Comment Sheet No. 21 - Paul Forgette

#1 – Caltrans has worked with the City of West Covina to identify noise barrier (soundwall) lengths that would be included in the proposed project between Interstate Route 10 and businesses along Garvey Avenue. The soundwalls you mentioned are proposed to provide legally mandated noise mitigation for area residential properties and cannot be eliminated. However, as part of the cooperative effort between Caltrans and the City of West Covina additional efforts conducted for this project have indicated that the soundwalls could be reduced in length and still provide the required noise mitigation. Caltrans has, therefore, reduced the length of those soundwalls that could be shortened and still provide the required noise mitigation. The design layout sheets for the proposed project show the soundwalls with a reduced length. Project plans are available for review at the District 7 Caltrans office at 100 S. Main Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012.
Thank you for attending this Public Hearing. Our purpose for hosting this meeting is to provide information on the Draft Environmental Impact Report and to give you an opportunity to provide comments on pertinent environmental issues relevant to this project. You may use the back of this sheet if necessary.

Please print your comments below:

[Text of comments]

Your Name (please print): Maria L Lopez
Affiliation:
Street Address: 145 S. F. de Acosta St.
City, State, Zip: West Covina, CA 91791
Phone Number and/or Email (optional): (626) 879-2365 or maria_llopez@yahoo.com

Please hand this form in tonight, or mail it to:
MR. RON KOSINSKI
DEPUTY DISTRICT DIRECTOR
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DIVISION OF ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING
100 SOUTH MAIN STREET MS 16A
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

Please Note: Your letter must be submitted by January 6, 2012, to receive consideration in the Final EIR.
WRITTEN COMMENT SHEET (CONT'D)

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
INTERSTATE 10 HIGH OCCUPANCY LANE PROJECT
from Puente Avenue to State Routes 57/71

Continued from other side:

Very valuable:


Your Name (please print): 
Affiliation: 
Street Address: 
City, State, Zip:
Phone Number and/or Email (optional):
Response to Comment Sheet No. 22 – Maria L. Lopez

#1 – See #A above (page J-129).
WRITTEN COMMENT SHEET

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
INTERSTATE 10 HIGH OCCUPANCY LANE PROJECT
from Puente Avenue to State Routes 57/71

Thank you for attending this Public Hearing. Our purpose for hosting this meeting is to provide information on the Draft Environmental Impact Report and to give you an opportunity to provide comments on pertinent environmental issues relevant to this project. You may use the back of this sheet if necessary.

Please print your comments below:

Date: Jan 5 - 12

1955 Walt Disney introduce a wonderfull public transportation

I would like to suggest a similar alternative for my neighborhood

A comment from late LA Mayor Tom Bradley - On April 9th, 1993

President and Headed by Theodore Roosevelt - On Early 1960s

US President Thomas Jefferson - The government is the servant, not the master of the people. National Geographic, 1971

In the 21st century we got since the world's next century

Your Name (please print): Giancarlo Vassarotto

Affiliation: Resident of West Covina Since 1979 and Mayor Comm.

Street Address: 1026 So. Valley Ave

City, State, Zip: W. Covina 91790

Phone Number and/or Email (optional):

Please hand this form in tonight, or mail it to:
MR. RON KOSINSKI
DEPUTY DISTRICT DIRECTOR
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DIVISION OF ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING
100 SOUTH MAIN STREET MS 16A
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

Please Note: Your letter must be submitted by January 6, 2012 to receive consideration in the Final EIR

Commuters use fossil fuel with 500,000 trips a month in gasoline - LA is one of them
Response to Comment Sheet No. 23 – Giancarlo Massarotto

#1 – At the Public Hearing it was pointed out that a “Disney-Like” monorail was recently proposed by Caltrans to be constructed on State Route 101 in the San Fernando Valley. The public was adamantly opposed to such a public transportation system. However, an elevated structure alternative was considered for this project. Comment noted.

#2 – As it was pointed out at the Public Hearing the proposed HOV lanes are conducive to the increase use of bus transportation.

#3 – It was noted at the Public Hearing that this quote is exactly why Caltrans is having the Public Hearing: to get the comments, concerns, and input of the public of the proposed project.
WRITTEN COMMENT SHEET

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
INTERSTATE 10 HIGH OCCUPANCY LANE PROJECT
from Puente Avenue to State Routes 57/71

Thank you for attending this Public Hearing. Our purpose for hosting this meeting is to provide information on the Draft Environmental Impact Report and to give you an opportunity to provide comments on pertinent environmental issues relevant to this project. You may use the back of this sheet if necessary.

Please print your comments below:

Date: 1/6/12

My family and I are concerned about the decision to cut down the current live trees in the backyards of many residents on Harding Street. The space between the current wall and the impending placement of the sound wall poses a concern to everyone in this space having unwanted noise.

Your Name (please print): SHEPHERD LAW

Affiliation: PRESIDENT

Street Address: 1620 E HARDING ST

City, State, Zip: WEST COVINA, CA 91791

Phone Number and/or Email (optional): 626-250-9292

Please hand this form in tonight, or mail it to:

MR. RON KOSINSKI
DEPUTY DISTRICT DIRECTOR
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DIVISION OF ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING
100 SOUTH MAIN STREET MS 16A
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

Please Note: Your letter must be submitted by January 6, 2012 to receive consideration in the Final EIR.
Continued from other side:

posts and possibly more problems to come.
If the wall stays, your “solution” of a fence to keep intruders such as burglars and
aggressive vendors will not work. Unless this fence is an electric one or comes with 24 hr security, it
will keep no one out of this space. My family and I believe the best and most durable solution would be to
take down the existing wall and give the extra 4 feet to the
residents, along with a guarantee of 4 ft walls being
built between every property to separate the backyards
of residents.

Your Name (please print): 
Affiliation:  
Street Address:  
City, State, Zip:  
Phone Number and/or Email (optional):
Response to Comment Sheet No. 24 – Shereen Lau

#1 – See #A above (page J-129).
WRITTEN COMMENT SHEET
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
INTERSTATE 10 HIGH OCCUPANCY LANE PROJECT
from Pecora Avenue to State Routes 57/71

Thank you for attending this Public Hearing. Our purpose for hosting this
meeting is to provide information on the Draft Environmental Impact Report and
to give you an opportunity to provide comments on pertinent environmental
issues relevant to this project. You may use the back of this sheet if necessary.
Please print your comments below:
Date: \( \frac{5}{12} \)

At 1319-1349 W Garvey Ave. North at Sunset, please
hold the wall back as far as you can to the East, for
the most view of the businesses at this location. Very
important for wellness sign of existing business.

Your Name (please print): Paul Forgetto
Affiliation: 
Street Address: 
City, State, Zip: 
Phone Number and/or Email (optional): 626-399-8369

Please hand this form in tonight, or mail it to:
MR. RON KOSINSKI
DEPUTY DISTRICT DIRECTOR
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DIVISION OF ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING
100 SOUTH MAIN STREET MS 16A
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

Please Note: Your letter must be submitted by January 6, 2012
to receive consideration in the Final EIR.
Response to Comment Sheet No. 25 – Paul Forgette

#1 – Caltrans has worked with the City of West Covina to identify noise barrier (soundwall) lengths that would be included in the proposed project between Interstate Route 10 and businesses that are along Garvey Avenue. The soundwalls the commenter mentioned are proposed to provide legally mandated noise mitigation for area residential properties and cannot be eliminated. However, as part of the cooperative effort between Caltrans and the City of West Covina additional efforts conducted for this project have indicated that the soundwalls could be reduced in length and still provide the required noise mitigation. Caltrans has, therefore, reduced the length of those soundwalls that could be shortened and still provide the required noise mitigation. The design layout sheets for the proposed project show the soundwalls with a reduced length. Project plans can be viewed at the District 7 Caltrans office at 100 S. Main Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012.
EMAILS RECEIVED PRIOR TO AND AFTER PUBLIC HEARINGS

----- Forwarded by Ron Kosinski/D97/Caltrans/CAGov on 12/22/2011 01:32 PM
-----

Chris Freeland
<Chris.Freeland@estcovina.org>  To  'Zareh Shahbazian'
12/22/2011 07:55 AM <zareh_shahbazian@dot.ca.gov>, 'Ron Kosinski' <ron_kosinski@dot.ca.gov>
cc  Shannon Vauchzee
Shannon.Vauchzee@estcovina.org  Subject  Fwd: I-10 Freeway expansion project
- Potential risk to resident safety and negative impact to neighborhood

This resident also asked that we forward this email of objection to the design to Caltrans because of the gap that will be created behind their homes. Have a great holiday.

Chris

From: nds24@verizon.net [mailto:nds24@verizon.net]
Sent: Wednesday, December 21, 2011 8:05 PM
To: assemblymember.hernandez@asm.ca.gov
Cc: Chris Freeland
Subject: I-10 Freeway expansion project - Potential risk to resident safety and negative impact to neighborhood

Dear Mr. Hernandez,

My name is Nohreen Villanueva. I'm a West Covina resident whose house borders the I-10 freeway. One of my neighbors informed me today about the upcoming I-10 expansion project. Since the project will be happening in my backyard, I was concerned about the construction and design. I was told that a new 14-foot sound wall would be built approximately four feet from the existing fence. From my understanding of the design, it includes placing a chain link fence at the end of the two walls as a barrier.

As a resident, I'm very concerned about the potential negative impact to the neighborhood and danger to residents. The four foot gap between the existing wall and the proposed sound wall could potentially bring unwanted guests to our backyard. The design may create a housing opportunity to homeless, invite taggers (graffiti), drugs users, and rodents among other things. The four foot gap invites crime and creates a potential access point into our backyards. In addition, the chain link fence could be easily destroyed with the use of wire cutters or similar tool.

I hope you will look into this issue in a timely manner and would appreciate your response to my concerns. I thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Nohreen Villanueva
Response to Email Comment No. 1 – Nohreen Villanueva

#1 – See replies to Nohreen Villanueva’s comments at the January 5, 2012 Public Hearing.
Gary Iverson/D67/Caltrans/CAGov@DOT
Hamid R Toossi/D67/Caltrans/CAGov@DOT,
Mohamed Ghannoun/D67/Caltrans/CAGov@DOT

Subject
Fw: City of West Covina Resident’s Question

Gary,

myself and Mohamed called Mr Richard Ramage a few minutes ago and this is a summary of what we discussed.

He mentioned that he was not aware of the Public Hearing that took place on 12/13/11. He just knew about it after the fact by one of the neighbors who attended. Then, he went door to door to talk to other neighbors and responses were similar. We told him notices were sent. He objects to the fact of having a soundwall four feet away from the existing block wall. His concerns are: who will maintain? Why have a gap that is a place where people can hide and access their properties? We told him we will look at the comments and then the Office of Design D will make a decision.

He also mentioned that he is sending letters to the Assemblyman and Local Senator voicing such opposition.

----- Forwarded by Refugio Dominguez/D67/Caltrans/CAGov on 12/27/2011 01:06 PM -----

Mario Gutierrez/D67/Caltrans/CAGov

Refugio Dominguez/D67/Caltrans/CAGov@DOT
Karen Fong/D67/Caltrans/CAGov@DOT,
Norma Acevedo/D67/Caltrans/CAGov@DOT

Subject
City of West Covina Resident’s Question

Refugio, We got a call from Mr. Richard Ramage (1538 E Mardina St, West Covina), who has a question in regard to Sound Wall planned in his neighborhood, as part of HOV Lane project. Please call him at 626-966-9802.

Thanks/Mario G.
Response to Comment Email No. 2 – Richard Ramage

#1 – See replies to Richard Ramage’s comments at the January 5, 2012 Public Hearing. Caltrans is looking into this issue and a resolution is in progress.

The maintenance of soundwalls is complicated. The maintenance of the structural element of the wall is the responsibility of Caltrans.

For graffiti purposes Caltrans maintains the side of the wall facing the freeway. The side facing away from the freeway is maintained in accordance with legal agreement documents, and could be maintained by Caltrans or the City. However, if the soundwall side is within the property owners’ right-of-way, then the property owner is responsible for graffiti removal.

For additional information, please see #A above (page J-129).
Gentlemen, during the meeting one of you said several times that graffiti would be removed within 24 hours. We would like to make sure this is in the EIR and a condition of mitigation.

Consider this an official comment on the EIR.

Thanks
Shannon
Response to Comment Email No. 2 – Shannon Yauchzee

#1- It is both Caltrans policy and intention for this project to make a strong effort to remove objectionable graffiti within 24 hours of being notified. Funds have been provided as part of this project to remove graffiti. This issue of graffiti removal is hereby included in the project environmental documentation.
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Pomona, California, Tuesday, December 13, 2011
6:25 p.m.

MR. KOSINSKI: Thank you. The crowd went into a
hush.

This is really nice. Good afternoon. My name
is Ron Kosinski. I am Deputy District Director for
CalTrans, in charge of environmental planning, working
out of the Los Angeles office.

I'd like to thank you for taking the time to
come today.

Need Spanish translation.

Where are we? We'll take a little break here
while everybody gets hooked up.

They've got it? Oh, okay.

It's 6:30, so we're going to call this
officially the start of the public hearing.

Good evening, and I'd like to welcome you on
behalf of CalTrans to this hearing, which is really to
look at the carpool lane, the proposed extending from
where the construction is currently in Baldwin Park all
the way out here to the 57 so that we have one continuous
carpool lane in both directions on the 10 Freeway.

I'm going to try to keep this as informal as
possible and make you feel comfortable. I would appreciate it if you don’t interrupt the speakers. We’re going to have about a half-hour worth of presentations by people who are knowledgeable about the project and want to explain to you the details on it, so please let them give their presentation and then after that we’ll have an opportunity for everybody who wants to speak to make a statement, and we have a microphone over there (indicating) for you and so that’s how that’s going to work.

We’re situated here kind of locked into these locations because this is also being webcast simultaneously, so for people who couldn’t get here, they can go on their computer and watch a live stream of what’s happening and provide us comments via their computer. But to do that, then they have to be able to see us. That’s why we have the cameras here and to see the speakers. So it’s not good to kind of move around too much, so I’m pretty much trying to stay stable here.

We published notices of this public hearing in a variety of newspapers, San Gabriel Valley Tribune and local papers. West Covina sent out notices about this hearing also and we notified all the Federal, State, County, local elected officials about this, private organizations. Notices were sent to over 1,000 people.
within the corridor. So there's been a wide distribution
of information about the project and about this hearing
tonight.

Hopefully I'm talking very relatively slowly
because we are recording this. We have a court reporter
who is legally doing the shorthand transcript of this
hearing so that we have a formal record of it, and so if
you are going to speak, please do so in a manner that
is -- she is able to -- she is able to translate or to
type within the time that she's got.

We have a variety of handouts that you should
have got when you got here. If you don't, please raise
your hand and we can get them to you. We've got
comment -- most important is -- well, somebody will
provide that. We have a written comment sheet and what
we'd like to do is we'd appreciate it if you want to
speak, to fill this out, put your name and address; and
if you wish to speak, just fill this out and if you
want -- again, if you want to speak, then we'll be taking
this in a fairly orderly fashion during the comment
period and you'll be able to go up. We'll call your name
and you'll be able to go up and make your statements. and
it's important to have this so that we have a written
record because if you have some comments, that's great.
If you have some questions, we hope to be able to answer
those questions; but if we can’t answer them today, then
we have a record of what the question was and we’ll make
sure that in the Final Environmental Document that we do
that we do address your questions.

So the presentations are about -- like I said,
about 30 minutes and we’re going to be talking about a
variety of things. We’re going to be talking about the
project itself. We’re going to be talking about the
environmental impacts that we’ve identified. We’re going
to be talking about the right-of-way issues that are
pertinent to this particular corridor, why we’re
proposing to do our project, and we’re hoping that this
will give you an idea why we’re proceeding with this
particular study.

The document was also made available at the
local libraries.

Do we have CDs here today?

Yeah. We have CDs. If you don’t have a
document, we can give you a CD that you can take home and
take a look at. There are some hard copies.

Do we have the full hard copies here?

And we’ve got some hard copies here, which, you
know, it’s kind of a dying art that people actually read
hard copy, you know, large documents. Most people take
these things home on CDs and plug them into their

Kennedy Court Reporters, Inc.
800-231-2682
computer and off they go.

So I think we have this facility until probably
9:00, something like that, 8:00, so we have plenty of
time to make sure that everybody's comments are heard and
addressed and any kind of questions you have are
addressed.

So with that, I'm going to remind you about the
written sheet. I'll also remind you that you have until
the 6th of January to provide any kind of written
comments. That's really our target for getting all of
the comments in from the public. If for some reason, you
know, you run a couple days late, probably the best thing
to do is give me a call and we'll just make arrangements
to make sure we get your comments before we have to make
a decision.

The written comment also has an address there.
That's my address and how to send the written comments-
If for some reason you leave the meeting today and
tomorrow you think of some additional things that you'd
like to say, you can just fill this in, mail it in, and
we're all set.

So with that, the first -- we have our first
presentation on the project history, funding and schedule
from our colleagues in engineering. So we're going to
start with -- who's starting here first? Oh, it's a team
effort here.

MR. SALEHINIK: Good evening. My name is Mehdi Salehnik. I’m the project manager working for CalTrans.

MR. SHAHBAZIAN: Good evening. My name is Zareh Shahbazian. I’m the project manager also for CalTrans. I’m the project manager for segment two of the CalTrans I-10 project.

MR. SALEHINIK: The reason there are two – that’s okay. The reason there are two project managers standing here is because there are two segments.

The I-10 HOV projects start actually from 605 and go all the way to the 57. There are three segments. Segment one is from the 605 – segment one is from 605 to Puente and as you’ve noticed, it’s under construction already. If you look at the map up there, it goes from 605 to the Puente segment. Segment two is from Puente to Citrus, and segment three is from Citrus to the 57.

Segment one started back in 2009. It’s construction that began in 2009 and it’s supposed to finish by 2012, next year, around September, and it cost – it’s about a $110 million project and we’re almost finished with that.

Second segment, the project manager for that is Mr. Zareh Shahbazian. He can explain about that.
MR. SHAHBAZIAN: Segment two currently is in final design and it’s from Puente to Citrus, and beginning of construction is scheduled for December 2012 and the completion of construction in December 2016. It’s a total of 4.1 miles with 19 parcels being affected at a total cost of $184 million. Right-of-way acquisition is 70 percent complete, with the design about 95 percent complete and, as I mentioned at the beginning, it’s for a four-year construction project.

MR. SALEHINIK: And segment three is -- the project limit, as I said, is from Citrus to the 57. It’s about 4.9 miles. There are about 27 parcels to 26 parcels and the cost is about $192 million. Right-of-way acquisition is actually very slow. We haven’t started the process completely. We’re just beginning to prepare the right-of-way mass. The design is about 50 percent complete and we’re supposed to begin construction in March of 2014. Also, that’s a four-year construction, three years construction and one year is usually plant establishment and other activities. So open to traffic should be sometime around 2017.

If you have any questions or comments, there are some contact people there (indicating), e-mail, Ron Kosinski and also the website and also Twitter.

These are new for us, too. This is the first time I’ve
But in general, if you just bear with us, once the I-10 HOV projects are all complete, you're all going to benefit from them. Believe us because the first one, when it was under construction, was in El Monte and it was a mess when it was under construction. We understand that. But once it was completed, there was a lot of traffic congestion before that. Now it's very free flow a lot. Once you get to the 605, it's just jammed. Once these projects are finished, you are all going to benefit from them and hopefully we can answer any questions today. If not, we can get back to you later on.

With that, if you have any questions, please write them down and present it to us. Any questions?

MR. KOSINSKI: They will be taking questions at the end of the presentation.

The next person to talk will be from design... Are we going to do two design presentations, too?

There's two segments, so they're doing two design presentations, too. We've never done it this way, so it's kind of -- I guess we have a questionnaire, so at the end of the public hearing, you can say if you like this dual presentation and what you liked or didn't like about it so we can continue to refine and improve our
outreach process.

Charge ahead. This is Nader.

MR. DOMINGUEZ: Yes.

MR. GOBRAN: Good evening, everybody. My name is Nader Gobran. I am the design manager for segment two which starts east of Citrus -- east of Puente and goes all the way close to Citrus Avenue.

Like Mr. Shahbazian said, this segment stretches around about four miles long. This project is proposed to widen the freeway, to add the carpool lane to each direction to close the gap between the 605 and the 57. To do that, we're going to widen the roadway around 12 to 15 feet each direction. We have 23 ramps on this segment. We are realigning 22 of them to accommodate the widening and we are removing one ramp. We're closing one ramp. We are widening 8 bridges, 8 undercrossing bridges, in this area. We are lowering 3 streets. We're going to construct around 12 sound walls, for a total length of 24,000 feet, about 24,000 feet; and 16 retaining walls for a total length of about 9,000 feet.

The sound walls' height varies between 10 feet to 12 feet and in some locations 14 feet high to give the benefit, and the retaining wall varies up to 12 feet tall sometimes.

Again, the construction of this segment will be
done in three phases. The first phase will be the
lowering of the local streets. This takes about six
months. The second phase will be to widen the roadway,
the outside. It will take around two years to complete.
And then the third phase will be the median; reconstruct
the median and create the carpool lane, and that’s about
one year long with an establishment for the landscape,
one year overlapping with the third phase.

The construction will be a total of four years.

like in the presentation that Mr. Shahbazian said, from
December 2012 to December 2016. Thank you.

MR. DOMÍNGUEZ: Good evening, everyone. My name is
Refugio Domínguez. I am the design manager for segment
three, which is the segment from Citrus to the 57.

This segment is five miles long and the
construction of it is two added carpool lanes, similar to
segment two. We will be widening the freeway for an ..
average of 15 feet. We’ll be affecting seven structures
such as Citrus, Barranca, Via Verde, Kellogg, Grand
Avenue, and Holt, and we’ll be constructing sound walls
for the residential areas. There's a few sound walls
near some commercial properties, which we are still
evaluating and we’re waiting feedback from those
commercial properties, and we’re also working on
improving the drainage system; and regarding the
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 retaining walls — and this is in contrast with segment
two -- there's some major, big retaining walls between
Holt and Cal Poly and the difference is because the
freeway isn't cut.

   At Cal Poly, it's some field, but there'll be
big retaining walls and we'll be working with our
structures group and our technical group to make sure
that we design the best we can. While there are many
types, we might have soil walls, we might have type one
retaining walls.

   And regarding the staging for this project,
we're going to have four stages. Right now we are at the
50 percent stage, so we're trying to look at which is
which is the staging that best minimizes the impact to
the public. So right now we still don't have a final
answer on which -- the staging phases, but we're going to
have four phases of staging for construction, and --
construction will take four years, and I think that's --
I've covered mostly everything and if you have questions,
we'll answer them later.

   MR. KOSINSKI: These presentations are going by quite
quickly, aren't they, and they're talking relatively
slow.

   Okay. The next presentation is dealing with
right-of-way. And Zoltan?
MR. ELO: Right-of-way is the real estate on CalTrans and we'll be dealing with private property owners to ensure the property rights are acquired properly. There's a lot of these properties that are T.C. only. T.C. only is renting the land.

Some of them require easements, easement types like footing to hold the retaining walls or the sound walls in place. Footing easements are under the ground and it's like an underground concrete basically L-shaped type of footing in many cases where in that condition, the property owner won't really notice. We'll compensate for those type of things.

Generally with right-of-way, there's a few phases. Initially, it's the appraisal phase. When the appraiser comes along, they will send the property owners -- if you're directly affected by the project, they'll send you a Notice of Decision to Appraise. That Notice of Decision to Appraise will invite you to accompany the appraisers to inspect your property so they can see what type of impacts are caused by the project on your particular property. Things they'll notice are structures. They'll be able to explain the impacts to your property and kind of get some feedback from you. That's a CalTrans staff appraiser. The report that they will eventually generate will be given to you.
The person who will give it to you will be the acquisition agent. That’s the person that you’re going to negotiate with, the person that you’ll talk about all the details about how the rental rate will go, how the compensation for the various footings, those types of things. They’ll also be the person who will present the appraisal to you.

When you have a chance to review that appraisal, if you disagree with it, CalTrans, through the Streets and Highways Code, has a program where we will reimburse for an independent appraisal. If you disagree, you can get an independent appraisal. We’ll reimburse. The reason it’s a reimbursement is to separate CalTrans from that independent appraisal. When we do reimburse you for that, all we ask is for a copy of that appraisal. We will get that appraisal, review it with the staff appraisal, and see what needs to be reconciled.

Sometimes we might -- there might be data that we missed. There might be sales that we didn’t capture. There might be impacts that we saw a little differently that another outside perspective can help out. We’ll try to reconcile that. Eventually, though, there will be an offer and that offer, you’ll have the opportunity to review. You’ll have the fair negotiation for that. You can ask for what you wish. At a certain point in time,
It has to come, for project milestone reasons, where we would implement the court process. We just simply can’t have holdouts. We’ll try to work through court and in court will be judgments. The judge will decide what the fair market value for the particular rental rate or the acquisition or easement is on that particular property.

With a few people that I spoke with, they have a lot of personal property that’s right against the fence line of their property to the existing freeway. Because of the Uniform Act, it’s a Federal act that causes right-of-way to be uniform across the country. We have to pay to relocate that, so it won’t be any cost to relocate things like picnic tables and other things like that away from the right-of-way line and away from the rental area that we might need to construct things like footings and the sound walls and things like that.

You might deal with a property management person from CalTrans who comes out to see how things are going, easements and things like that. We don’t expect any persons to be displaced from their home in many of these projects with single families. Some businesses are impacted in the parking lot areas and we’re trying to compensate them. We’re trying to appraise and compensate them properly for those types of impacts.

With many of these projects, the right-of-way
taking is fairly narrow. It's generally just a lane-width wide, just for the HOV.

If you guys have any additional questions or would like to go into detail, 'cause there is significant amounts of detail in this, that if you are directly impacted, you will speak to a different right-of-way agent in the process that will go into detail; but if you have any detailed questions now, please see me afterwards. I'll write down your name and we can talk on the phone. I'm the project coordinator for both of these segments, for segment two and segment three. I won't be doing any of the actual work, but I coordinate the agents that will be doing the work.

MR. KOSINSKI: Again, the last time I checked, we had the citizens that we deal with, because of the fairness of the appraisals, 90 to 95 percent of the citizens that we deal with do accept the first offer. So I think we'd be -- when you're dealing with our right-of-way people, you'll be pleasantly surprised with the agreements and the rental rates for your portion of the property that would be involved in this project.

Okay. Then lastly we've got Gary Iverson to talk about the environmental process and then, again, we're collecting the cards and the ones that we have, we'll be launching right into your statements and
questions.

So Gary?

MR. IVerson: Thanks, Ron.

If you have any comment cards, if you hold them
up, we'll start to collect those now so we can get them
to the appropriate person to respond to you.

So why are we here tonight? We all came out on
a cold December morning -- evening here. We're here to
get your input about our proposed project. It's not too
late to start making some changes to this project, but
what we want is input from you on the project, the
impacts.

If you think it's a good project, we want to
hear from you. If you think there's something that you
have a concern about, we want to hear about that, too.
We'll take your comments and we'll incorporate them into
the environmental document and we'll address those questions, and trust me that we take every question
seriously because that's what we need to do and that's
the moral and ethical thing to do.

So what did we do in the past? Well, in the
past, we did an environmental document for this project
already and we completed that in January 2003.

So why do we need to go through this again?

Well, since 2003, there have been some changes to the
project, most notably at Vincent Avenue. When you get into the final design, there's some areas where you need a little bit more right-of-way, a little bit less.

I'm proud to say, as I've told many of you, that I'm amazed how much our design people have shoehorned this project into the area to avoid taking residential properties, I mean, and provide those sound walls that are mostly needed in this community. I think it's a good project and if I lived along this corridor, I would be in favor of it. I know I have a little bit of bias because it's my agency that's proposing this, but I still think that it is a good project and it'll help move the traffic through this area faster and safer.

So, again, they talked about there's three segments. Segment one is under construction. Segment two is going to be next, and then segment three.

Segment two and three, there's a little bit of changes and we're still doing some changes, especially on segment three, that cause us to go back and look at the environmental document again. And we said there were some impacts that we needed to address. Some of those specifically are in the area of Vincent Avenue where we are now taking two business buildings that we weren't taking before. So we needed an update on our environmental document to make sure that it matches the...
Let's see. So we -- just as a note, we are taking -- Ron mentioned that we are taking comments. We will be taking comments on this project all the way to January 6th of 2012, so if you have -- there are several ways for you to do that. You can actually write them an old-fashioned letter or you can -- and his address is on the comment form. You can send them an e-mail. You can -- and you can -- everything and all the questions that come through, for the audience on Twitter and the webcast, we will be taking your comments, too, and addressing those.

And, again, we will be here this evening and answer all the questions that you have; and if you're not comfortable about coming up, if you just want us to read your question, we can do that for you, too.

I can't read with them (indicating) on and I can't see with them on.

I just gave like my whole speech here and didn't even know it.

So, again, we're here to get your input. We really, seriously, consider every comment that we get, whether there's problems in the community that exist that we need to take care of or if there's something that you have a question about this project.
So at this time, does anybody have any comment cards so far? So if you have one, maybe we can get that from her and address that.

Ron, did you want to take over now?

This is Ron. He's my boss. We always put the boss in the line of fire so you can get a promotion.

MR. KOSINSKI: Thank you, Gary.

Yeah. So really, now is the opportunity for you to get up and make any comments that you have; and if you don't, then we will be wrapping this up and then going back to the maps. Really, a lot of times in hearings like this, there are individual questions people have about their specific property and those are the types of questions that probably everybody doesn't necessarily want to hear. So if you want to make a statement, please feel free.

Do we have -- what have we got, Gary?  

MR. IVERSON: We do have some comments. I think we'll start out with Janice.

Janice, did you want to come up, or we can read it for you.

MS. KAPPMEYER: That's fine.

MR. IVERSON: Okay. I'll go over and read it for you, and then we'll see if you guys (indicating) have a good answer for you.
MS. KAPPMeyer: You can read it.

MR. IVerson: So I'm on the other side now. I'm on your side. I'm always on your side.

So Janice's comment was What time of the day will most of the construction take place?

MR. GOBRAN: Okay. That's a good question.

MR. IVerson: That's why she asked it.

MR. GOBRAN: We plan to do the widening of the freeway behind IKEA and when we do that, the contractor will have to work day and night, but I think environmentally we are -- we have window limits of construction. We will abide by that. So if there is a noise problem in the night, it will be limited to day only.

Some locations, when it comes to ramp closures to minimize the impact of the closure, I think we will extend the work time; but definitely if there is a noise problem during the construction, again, all these comments will be -- we'll hear from you and we will accommodate those.

MR. IVerson: And something else that wasn't mentioned, our plan is for no two consecutive ramps to be closed, no two on-ramps, no two off-ramps, and that's our plan so you can have access in your communities continuously.
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MR. GOBRAN: I didn't mention that because it wasn't part of the question.

MR. IVerson: And I'm answering questions that aren't even asked.

MR. GOBRAN: Yes.

MR. IVerson: And in the areas of the malls, we're planning to try not to have any closed ramps in the holiday shopping season.

MR. GOBRAN: Absolutely, yes.

MR. IVerson: We have some -- okay.

Tom Brubaker. Tom, do you want me to read your question or do you want to come up?

MR. BRUBAKER: Well, I've got another question.

MR. IVerson: If you can write that one down for me, I can do this one first. How's that, if somebody can help us?

MR. BRUBAKER: It's kind of drawn out.

MR. IVerson: Let me do this one first.

Okay. There's a drainage problem in his backyard that needs addressed, and I know we talked about this before the meeting began. What are you going to do?

MR. GOBRAN: Mr. Tom has a problem that his backyard doesn't drain the water, or the soil from watering his backyard; and what he did, he dug a hole under the property wall or the freeway wall and it drains into the
State right-of-way to clear that.

What I promised to do is we're going to send
maintenance people to look into that location, because we
have -- our plan is to have the two walls and in between
we can pave the area to reduce the maintenance and to
help the water drain out in this area, because it's
confined between the two walls.

We are going to send somebody out to assess the
situation and try to get a solution to what's the
drainage and the situation behind the two walls.

MR. IVERSON: So we're going to look at it and try to
fix it?

MR. GOBRAN: Yes, absolutely. But I can promise you
whatever -- your solution might not be the best solution,
but we'll try to find a solution to the problem.

MR. BRUBAKER: Thank you.

MR. IVERSON: Okay. Great.

And after I get done with this next question,
we'll take you, absolutely.

The next one is from Joanne Anderson.

Hi, Joanne. Did you want to come up or did you
want me to read it? Sure.

MS. ANDERSON: I'll explain it. I don't know how
clear it is. You mentioned that you'll be adding 15
feet of --
MR. GOBAN: 12 to 15 feet.
MS. ANDERSON: 12 to 15 all along the freeway.
MR. GOBAN: It might be more or less, because the issue is that we have a certain number of lanes on the freeway now. We're trying not to take any of the room available for a maintenance road, but in order for us to provide the HOV lane or carpool lanes. So we're adding that length more or less all over the place, yes.
MS. ANDERSON: And would that be on segment three also?
MR. GOBAN: I believe that's --
MR. DOMINGUEZ: Yeah. For segment three, as I mentioned before, the outreach is 15 feet. It varies throughout, so in order to make things less confusing and give you numbers, throughout the five miles, the average is 15 feet, as I mentioned before.
MS. ANDERSON: And so then it's actually closer to the line of the property then?
MR. DOMINGUEZ: You are correct. You are correct. Throughout -- for these five miles, there's many locations where we are going to be constructing retaining walls at the State property line, which is the fence; and for doing that we will be requiring many times footing casements. The footing will be on the owner's side --
MS. ANDERSON: Oh, just for the footing.
MR. DOMINGUEZ: -- for the footing easement. In some places we will be requiring temporary construction easements, which the outreach is five feet. That means on the owner's side we need space to work, to step on, while we do the construction of the retaining walls so that's why we also need temporary construction easements.

Also, we have drainage easements. So there's many types of easements, either drainage, footing, temporary construction, or if you need to buy a little piece of land, but it all depends on your location. It all depends on what type of work, what type of construction, or what we're doing specifically at this point.

So in general, it all depends on which property and probably after the meeting, the presentation here, we can go over and I can tell you exactly for which property what type of footing easements or different types of easements we're getting.

MS. ANDERSON: But then for the actual lanes, you're not going to take property to put those two lanes in?

MR. DOMINGUEZ: No, No, No. All future widening is within the State right-of-way. I mean, if we're buying five feet, ten feet, it's -- it's not for your property. I have already looked at it and you will be fine.

MR. SALEHINIK: Yeah. I think we went through that,
your specific property. There is a utility easement and also a footing easement.

MS. ANDERSON: When you said 15 feet, I was thinking, "Wait." I thought, "Wait a minute."

MR. DOMINGUEZ: No. We're not going everything around it. We're going to be working around it, with the many easements, but sometimes there's no way you can avoid taking some easements, temporary construction easements, and you have it.

MS. ANDERSON: Thank you.

MR. GOBRAN: Before we go, let me clarify that. The 15 feet is not we're adding to the State right-of-way. The 15 feet is adding to the roadway. So if there is a gap for draining or landscape area or the edge of the pavement and the right-of-way, that is most probably where the lane will go. What I meant by "adding" and "widening," not widening to the State right-of-way but widening to the roadway, the roadway itself.

So if there is a road between the existing roadway and the property line, most probably that's where the lane can go.

MR. IVESON: Thank you.

Again, I'm amazed how much our engineers have shoehorned this project into the existing right-of-ways.
that CalTrans already owns and how little impact this
project actually has. I know we have no full residential
takes. We're not taking anybody's homes on the project
and I think that's, if you take a look at something --
there are other projects that have happened on locals and
other, they go in, and we really fit this in to our
existing right-of-way to the most extent that we can. So
I think these guys are really to be commended.

We have one more question from Albert Bailon.

MR. BAILON: Bailon.

MR. IVERSON: Sorry. Excuse me.

Fencing behind properties between Azusa and
Lark Avenue.

MR. BAILON: Lark Ellen. Well, that's what it was --

MR. IVERSON: I can't read with them on and I can't
read with them on. Go ahead.

MR. BAILON: Well, that's in the westbound direction.

MR. IVERSON: You want to come up so they can --

MR. BAILON: Sure. No problem.

MR. IVERSON: That way you can get you on the webcam,
become famous, and make movies together.

MR. BAILON: My question is -- you know, I explained
and we had a little discussion earlier regarding the
design in the back of the sound wall and there was
concern, along with my neighborhood there, that they're
going to create a highway for a lot of juveniles running
back there with that fence sitting so high and I don't
want anybody running behind my backyard, and that's
what's going to happen. If they -- they'll do anything.
They'll go from one end to the other and run it all the
way down. That'll happen.

They're going to have the infestation with
rodents down there. CalTrans isn't going to clear it out
every day or every month or every three months. I know
that from personal experience. But, I mean, something
like that, I think that has to be -- have a second look.

MR. GOBRAN: Absolutely. It's going too.

MR. BAILON: Absolutely. It's going to be a problem
and you're going to get phone calls from a lot of
residents.

MR. GOBRAN: Absolutely. Your concern is legitimate
and Mr. Tom's concern is legitimate.

What I am going to do, and the design engineer I
believe agrees with me, for the safety or the security of
the property, by all means, when we go to look at the
beginning of that, the sound wall, which is his property,
we'll look into that and we'll design something to make
it fit.

MR. BAILON: It may not be a -- I mean, I would like
to go back because we had a discussion I believe it was
in 2004 --


MR. BAILON: -- 2003 in West Covina, and all of that property -- all of the properties led to behind the houses and they had issues there. They were supposed to be relinquished to the homeowners so they could avoid the trash issue that occurred back there and has occurred. So that's why I'm going back on that.

MR. GOBRAN: To be honest with you, I can't comment on this one. All I can say is --

MR. BAILON: Well, let me say this. The first plan sounds better. I mean, like I said, it's a good project, but it's far from perfect, but the thing is the first proposed project was probably better. So we're going to have to go through this.

MR. GOBRAN: Like Mr. Ron Kosinski said, he said that we're here to hear your concerns and we'll look into it and, again, I said I can't comment on this right now.

MR. BAILON: I'm aware you can't. But like I said, it is something that absolutely has to really be looked at because it's going to be a safety issue.

MR. GOBRAN: Absolutely.

MR. BAILON: There's a lot of upset residents there.

MR. GOBRAN: Thank you.

MR. IVerson: I do -- yeah, I can comment, and Zoltan
can probably throw something at me if I'm wrong, but the current trend is for CalTrans not to hold on to any excess parcels so I know -- I previously worked on my end in environmental planning on providing our clearance to get rid of all the excess parcels and those little parcels you're talking behind; but, again, this is something that we worked on and I know we talked to the City of West Covina already on this issue. I don't know if it was in this area or another area, but we'll come up with a solution and something that should work.

Did anybody have any other comments? Great.

MR. BRUBAKER: Besides me?

MR. IVerson: Tom, I almost forgot you. Come on up.

Tom:

He wants to make movies with his buddy here, Albert.

MR. BRUBAKER: Well, my concern is that we're getting a 14-foot sound wall. Okay? And so no one's going to be able to see what's going on in our backyards besides us and whoever is planning on -- you said that there could be a chain-link fence a foot below the top level of our wall. Well, that just creates a -- that creates an easy escape route for anyone who wants to break in to our houses. For 50 years we've had a wall behind our house or -- you know, we haven't lived there for 50, but close
to 40 or whatever. We've always had the freeway wall, so there's always been an easement kind of owned by the State or government or whatever it is.

I don't see why we need to -- and you're saying you put that chain-link fence a foot low so we don't see it. We're not interested in that. We're interested in our safety of our homes and not having people at night, transients or whoever, climbing on top of that one-foot fence below the wall and looking in our windows or, you know, having access to our backyards. All they've got to do is jump off that chain-link fence. You said there's going to be a chain-link fence on each end and people know how to climb fences, you know.

The other issue is you say that it's in the budget for cleaning. You know, right now with all the budget cuts and we were talking about it to another gentleman here, the tree trimming has been cut, you know. It's down to -- you know, Code Enforcement is down to one person in Code Enforcement. With all these budget cuts, how can you say that we're going to have a clean easement behind your wall, you know?

The other issue is we're going to have a 14-foot sound wall. What about the mildew issue? You know, right now with our walls only being so high, along the wall we have problems with growing grass because it turns
into moss, you know, because of the shade. It never gets
sun, you know, those issues. I think that years ago it
was said that we are going to -- like was said, we were
going to gain that four-foot access in our backyard which
would be great for me because I'd be able to go on both
sides of my house, which I can't do right now, and that
would be then our issue to keep our backyard clean
instead of hoping that the State or whoever takes care of
cleaning that back issue, which I don't think it's ever
going to get cleaned. The only time that freeway gets
cleaned is when we complain about how tall the trees are
growing or if the roots are coming up on our side of our
fence and creating little trees in our backyard.

I'm just concerned. I think it would be a
better plan to get rid of that six-foot wall and not have
that four-foot easement access, whatever you want to call
it, from -- and it appears to me the only place we're going to have that section is in the residential areas.

You know, that's all I've got.

MR. GOBRAN: Thank you, Tom.

I'd be lying if I told you I can answer every
point of your questions, but you write it down and I will
answer it to make sure.

Just to highlight a few things, the chain-link
fence on the top, that will be -- we can slope it.
mean, your concern is legitimate. What we can look for
when I go -- not me, but when whoever is going to go look
at that drainage, the one in the back, we'll look into
how to design this area to maintain whatever you have now
as a security or make it better at least. That's all I
can tell you.

The other issue about the growing moss or
growing grass with that shade area, we talked and I
mentioned that this area is going to be paved, either
concrete or A.C. -- I'm not sure now -- but it's going to
be paved there for drainage issues and those problems
that you mentioned. So this is going to be looked at and
solved, too.

And the other few items, can you please write it
down in the comments and we can go through each one of
them?

MR. IVERSON: Actually, what's nice about this is--we
have a court reporter that's taking down all your
comments and we are going to get a transcript of that and
we'll pull your questions from those and then we'll
address those comments in the environmental document
after we make sure that these guys do their due
diligence.

Okay. I have one more. Sure.

MS. JOHNSON: Some of them we've discussed, but I
just want to get them --

MR. IVerson: Okay. For segment three, is it possible to extend the sound wall on the north side of the freeway between Holt and Via Verde to the point where the actual hill starts and then start the retaining wall? So fill in that gap with the --

MR. DOMINGUEZ: Yeah. When I go back, I'll talk to my engineer. We're going to evaluate what's in the -- presently I know where the sound wall is and there is a possibility, you know, that we can extend it. You know, we want to do a good job. If we extend it another hundred feet, the price is the same, so why leave a gap that is going to affect the resident or owner? We're going to go back, evaluate it, and see if there is a need based on the elevation, based on the property site, based on the freeway elevation. We will extend it, no problem. We'll make sure that it's taken care of. We don't want to construct most of it correctly and by leaving a little gap, it is going to create a noise problem. We'll solve it.

MR. IVerson: The next question is kind of a general question.

Will CalTrans work with Los Angeles County in unincorporated areas of Covina, Covina Hills, in lieu of the City of Covina?
CalTrans is tasked to work with all the different agencies so we are working with the County of Los Angeles and the City of West Covina and West Covina, Baldwin Hills, and Pomona. So we work with all those different agencies and yes, we do work with Los Angeles County. We have a really good working relationship with them in that area. So, yeah.

The next question is will CalTrans work with traffic control, CHP, when ramps close or freeway traffic overflows to the side streets, especially between Via Verde, Holt -- and Holt on Via Verde?

The -- actually, we don’t have anybody here from traffic here, but I’ll tell you that during the project -- we do? Somebody’s coming up.

So we’re going to make a THP for this project?

MR. YOUNG: Good evening, everyone. My name is Ken Young. I’m with Traffic Investigations.

I guess -- can you repeat the question, please?

I believe it’s a DTM-related question.

MR. IVERSON: Will CalTrans work with traffic control, CHP, when ramps close or freeway traffic overflows onto the side streets, specifically between Via Verde and Holt on Via Verde? Over in their neighborhood, people get off on Via Verde and they use it as a shortcut and the traffic really backs up in their
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neighborhood and going into Holt, so --

MS. JOHNSON: And I brought pictures of accidents of

cars that have reemed into our backyards and fences

and --

MR. YOUNG: With regards to traffic control, we have

an all-encompassing Traffic Management Plan that takes

care of every location, including the location that we're

speaking of. So when those occurrences happen and we're

notified of it, we'll work diligently with the

appropriate agencies and with our construction people to

alleviate the traffic control on the freeway and onto the

local streets.

As far as -- I think her second question was in

relation to accident locations in relation to, I guess,

past accidents with drivers errantly going into your

properties.

Through this process of the -- through the

design process, we take the opportunity to review

accident patterns, concentrations, and where it's deemed

necessary, we'll provide the necessary safety

enhancements. That could be in the form of guardrail

placed if there's nothing at that location. If there is

a guardrail there, we may put a concrete barrier to not

only protect or -- I lost my word, but basically to --

for those -- to protect the property owners from those
errant vehicles, but also to protect the maintenance
workers that are out there who are constantly doing
repairs at locations where you have a concentration of
accidents.

MR. IVerson: So also, besides working with the CHP,
we also work with what we call the emergency service
providers and that's Los Angeles County Sheriff and the
local city sheriffs, you know, and so we make them aware
of what's going on and if that happens as a result of our
project, we have construction resident engineers that
monitor those things and we'll contact them and they'll
help take care of the problem if it happens during
construction. If it happens -- because we know it's
going to happen ahead of time, I know that Ken is going
to work with those agencies to straighten that out.

Refugio?

MR. DOMINGUEZ: Yeah. I just want to add that if
this is an issue, you know, what we've done with other
projects, we will only let the residents who live in that
area, that stretch of the road, only they will be allowed
to drive through and we will be checking, you know, their
addresses and we'll -- CHP will help us on that, and we
will have a detour plan for the rest of the drivers so
they don't go through your streets. So it all depends.
We have to manage it, we have to look at it; and if we
have to do that, then we have to apply that.

MR. IVerson: And that's all part of that Traffic
Management Plan. I mean, one thing CalTrans does is
traffic.

Was there anybody else that had any other
questions?

MS. JOHNSON: There's more on the back.

MR. IVerson: Great. Thank you. I missed that.

Where can we get a speaker or a project contact
information?

You can always contact Ron, my boss, and we'll
be glad to continue to act as a point of contact with the
public and, you know -- so there's that information.
There is also the information that's in the handouts, and
really we want to continue working with the public.

You know, did anybody else write anything on the
back?

Anything else that we can answer for tonight for
you?

Great. Well, Ron, did you want to do a
conclusion?

MR. KOSINSKI: I'm just going to do a wrap-up.

MR. IVerson: Sure.

MR. KOSINSKI: Going once, going twice, we might have
one more comment here, but if you want to speak, you're
going to have to get up there.

MS. JOHNSON: Well, it's just a question if you're going to have more meetings.

MR. IVESON: Are we going to have more meetings?

I'll just answer. This is the only public hearing that we have planned for this project right now, but --

MR. KOSINSKI: But you might write us and say that during construction and encourage the City to have an ongoing community meeting process and then we could do that if there's enough interest. Otherwise, we just deal with the one-on-one situation.

MR. IVESON: Just remember that we are accepting written comments, oral comments, e-mails, until January 6th and that's when we need to close the comment period for the environmental document. That doesn't mean you can't contact us after that if you have any questions. That just means that is the cutoff time that we have for the environmental documents.

So, again, going, going, okay. Great.

Thanks, Ron.

MR. KOSINSKI: Okay. I think what you've heard today is some real interesting challenges to our design people and the great thing about this process is we've recorded all this and sometime after January 6th, we'll be sending out a Final Environmental Document with your comments and
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how they are going to be addressed by the design
engineers. So we will have in writing answers to these
questions and suggested changes to the design based on
your comments, and I'm hoping that this double-wall issue
which we run across periodically can be creatively
resolved.

So thank you for putting the engineers' feet to
the fire and getting their creative juices flowing to
solve this problem, and I'm optimistic that they will
come up with a very good plan.

Keep in mind, as Gary mentioned, you have until
the 6th of January to provide comments and all those
comments would be recorded in the Environmental Document
and in the public record.

So with that, no more comments or questions?

MR. IVerson: We welcome you to -- we're going to be
here for a while. If you have any additional comments
that you do want to bring up, we'll be here for a while
with the design people and the project management to
answer any questions that may have popped up in your
mind. So thank you very much and have a nice evening.

Drive safely home.

(Proceedings concluded at 7:20 p.m.)
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Response to Public Hearing Transcript Comments – December 13, 2011

#1 – Section 3.4.4.2 of the EIR refers to the standard specifications and procedures with regard to noise control, one of which requires that the Contractor minimize construction activities during evening, nighttime, weekend, and holiday periods. The Contractor will be required to control noise levels generated during construction to comply with applicable local, state, and federal regulations. As stated in the public hearing, while most of the construction will occur during daylight hours, some nighttime work will be required during ramp closures and in the vicinity of the IKEA store in order to minimize the effects on traffic congestion.

#2 – The current project design documents did not create any changes to existing drainage conditions on the property behind the existing block wall. If any future design changes occur, the designer will address any issue that may be required by the new design.

#3 – The area required for this project varies throughout the project study area. In some locations the project can be constructed with the existing Caltrans right-of-way. In other locations property outside the existing Caltrans is needed. The exact area needed for project implementation varies from location to location but is limited to only that area needed to implement the project. The project plans show the areas required for project implementation. Project plans can be viewed at the District 7 Caltrans office at 100 S. Main Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012.

#4 – Yes, the project will only require a “minor” strip of property to be obtained from the commenter’s property to construct a noise barrier (soundwall) extension. All property acquisition made as part of this project will conform to the Uniform Relocation and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act.

#5 – See #A above (page J-129).

#6 – See #A above (page J-129).

#7 – See #A above (page J-129).

#8 – See #A above (page J-129).

#9 – Current plans are to extend the existing noise barrier (soundwall) to the “point where the actual hill starts” as indicated in this comment.

#10 – Caltrans will work with the County of Los Angeles in the unincorporated sections of the project study area. Caltrans will also work with the City of Covina and all other jurisdictions within the project study area to conduct consultation and obtain cooperation for the project.
#11 – Caltrans works closely with the California Highway Patrol (CHP) to identify roadway traffic pattern alterations and closures. Caltrans also works closely with the applicable law enforcement agencies when traffic pattern alterations and closures are implemented. One “tool” to conduct this coordination effort is the Traffic Management Plan (TMP) which is formulated with the CHP and local law enforcement agencies. This ensures constant communication between the Caltrans Resident Engineer and the applicable law enforcement agencies as the need arises.

#12 – At the January 5, 2012 Public Hearing you were given the contact information for Mr. Ron Kosinski. Mr. Kosinski can arrange for speakers’ or project information contacts. Contact the Public Information Office at the District 7 Caltrans office at 100 S. Main Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012 for more information.

#13 – Meetings are continuing with specific interested parties. If you are interested in attending any of those future meetings, you were directed to contact Ron Kosinski using the information provided. Once there is a strategy to address the “double wall” issue, then another meeting with concerned the property owners on Mardina Avenue could be held.
March 14, 2012 Meeting Comments and Responses

Attendees at the meeting were - Gateway Crescent representatives, Ryan M. Leaderman (LLC, DLA Piper) and Natalia Nunes (Property Manager - CBRE), and Caltrans Representatives- Zareh Shahbazian (Project Manager), Nader Gobran (Design Manager), Gary Iverson (Senior Environmental Planner), Kirk Hsu (Right of Way), Anthony Agusaulio (Right of Way), William Uribe (Traffic), Zoltan Elo (Right of Way), and Elizabeth Pollock (Caltrans Legal – by phone).

On March 14, 2012, a meeting was held at the Caltrans Offices at 100 S. Main Street, Los Angeles, CA. During that meeting primary concerns were identified regarding potential impacts to the Gateway Crescent properties. Here are those concerns and a response to those concerns:

Potential Impacts to Parking:

The proposed parking concerns were discussed with those in attendance and are addressed in #2 and #12 of the Gateway Crescent letter dated January 12, 2012, above. Again, the parking lot areas are owned by the City of West Covina and negotiations are ongoing related to those parking area potential impacts.

Noise Generation at the Gateway Crescent exterior area used by medical patients:

It was determined that the Gateway Crescent Property is not considered a noise sensitive land use and that there are no exterior frequent human use areas within the property. Therefore, no noise mitigation is proposed as part of this project.

Compressed Construction Schedule

The Gateway Crescent representatives expressed a desire to have the construction adjacent to the Gateway Crescent properties to be as short in duration as feasible. Caltrans originally identified the construction period in this area to be 24 months. However, Caltrans has now reduced the construction period in the area adjacent to the Gateway Crescent properties to be approximately 18 months in duration.

Landscaping in Parking Lot Area:

As was discussed, the parking lot areas are owned by the City of West Covina and negotiations are ongoing related to those parking area potential impacts. This includes any potential landscaping to be installed by the property owner after the proposed project is constructed.
Height of Safety Barriers between Interstate Route 10 and the Gateway Crescent Properties:

As was discussed, the existing chain-link fence would be removed and replaced with a retaining wall in the area mentioned above. On top of the retaining wall a safety barrier would be constructed, and on top of the safety barrier a chain-link fence would be constructed.

The Gateway Crescent representatives expressed concern that this proposed configuration would not be satisfactory to stop the current errant vehicle problem (vehicles hitting the existing chain-link fence and intruding onto the parking lot area).

Caltrans has included safety barriers into this proposed project which have been designed, tested, and proven effective to address the exact errant driver concerns expressed by the Gateway Crescent representatives.

Additionally, the area between the proposed safety barrier and the Interstate Route 10 (Route 10) is occupied by the southbound Vincent Avenue to eastbound Route 10 on-ramp. It is of note to mention here that the onramp speeds are expected to be slower than the speeds on the mainline of Route 10. Furthermore, the expanse between the safety barrier and the Gateway Crescent buildings are estimated after the project is completed to be approximately 71 feet from one of the Gateway Crescent buildings, and 75 feet from another of the Gateway Crescent buildings, which provides an additional safety buffer. At no time in the meeting did the Gateway Crescent representatives discuss errant vehicles hitting the Gateway Crescent buildings.

The safety barriers proposed as part of the project are sufficient to provide the requested protection – even for the closest structure in the area (the parking structure which is estimated to be 4 feet from the safety barrier).

Final Inclusion to This Response as a Result of This Meeting

It was specifically mentioned that the Traffic Management Plan (TMP) which will be prepared for this project is mandatory. The TMP will include consultation with emergency service providers (among other parties), and include a notification about the widths between the existing access passage at the Gateway Crescent properties and the TCE (proposed construction area for this project). This area is identified by Caltrans as proposed to be 25 feet and will be sufficient for emergency vehicle use.