



I-605 Freeway at Slauson looking south.



Scoping Summary Report

Interstate 605 (I-605) Corridor Improvement
Project PA&ED

EA # 298210 & EA # 3101U0

February 17, 2017

Prepared By: Arellano Associates, HDR & Parsons



This page intentionally left blank.

Contents

1.0	Introduction	4
1.1	Purpose of Scoping	4
1.2	Summary of the Project	5
1.3	Scoping Report Organization	7
2.0	Project Scoping	7
2.1	Notice of Intent/Notice of Preparation	7
2.2	Public Scoping Meetings	8
2.2.1	Meeting Locations and Collateral Materials	9
2.2.2	Newspaper Advertisements	10
2.2.3	Outreach	10
2.2.4	Social Media	11
3.0	Scoping Comments	12
3.1	Summary of Written Comments Received from Government Agencies and Special Districts	12
3.1.1	General	14
3.1.2	Purpose and Need	14
3.1.3	Alternatives & Design	14
3.1.4	Biological Resources	14
3.1.5	Cultural Resources	15
3.1.6	Community Health & Environmental Justice	15
3.1.7	Air Quality	15
3.1.8	Aesthetics	16
3.1.9	Noise & Vibration Impacts	16
3.1.10	Recreational Resources	16
3.1.11	Transportation/Traffic	16
3.1.12	Utility Impacts	17
3.1.13	Water	17
3.2	Summary of Comments Received from Private Citizens	18
3.2.1	General	18
3.2.2	Purpose and Need	18
3.2.3	Alternatives & Design	19
3.2.4	Air Quality	19
3.2.5	Aesthetics	20
3.2.6	Noise & Vibration Impacts	20
3.2.7	Community Safety Impacts	20
3.2.8	Recreational Resources	20
3.2.9	Right-of-Way	21
3.2.10	Transportation/Traffic	21
3.2.11	Construction Impacts	21
4.0	Next Steps in Environmental Process	21

Tables

Table 2-1	Public Scoping Meetings	9
Table 2-2.	List of Newspaper Publications & Run Dates	10
Table 3-1.	Summary of Comments Submitted by Type & Level of Support	12
Table 3.1-1.	Summary of Comments Submitted by Type & Level of Support	13
Table 3.2-1.	Summary of Comments by Topic – Private Citizens	18
Table 4-1.	Anticipated Environmental Schedule	22

Appendices

Appendix A – Environmental Notices

- A-1 Notice of Scoping/Initiation of Studies
- A-2 Notice of Preparation (NOP)
- A-3 Notice of Intent (NOI)

Appendix B – Meeting Handouts and Information Material

- B-1 Scoping Meeting Presentation
- B-2 Scoping Meeting Materials
 - Project Fact Sheet
 - Environmental Phase Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ)
 - Project Alternatives Fact Sheet
 - Comment Forms
 - Exhibit Boards
 - Property Acquisition Fact Sheet
- B-3 Newspaper Advertisements
- B-4 Website
- B-5 Social Media Advertisements
- B-6 Meeting Notice
- B-7 Distribution Lists
 - Parcel and Occupant Data
 - Stakeholder Database

Appendix C – Summary of All Comments

- C-1 Written Comments Received from Government Agencies & Special Districts
- C-2 Written Letters Received from Private Citizens
- C-3 Written Comments Received via Email from Private Citizens
- C-4 Written Comments Received via Social Media
- C-5 Written Comments Received from Comment Cards
- C-6 Oral Comments Received at Scoping Meetings

Appendix D –Copies of Comments Received & Sign-In Sheets

- D-1 Comment Letters Received from Government Agencies & Special Districts
- D-2 Comment Letters Received from Private Citizens
- D-3 Written Comments Received via Emails
- D-4 Written Comments Received via Social Media
- D-5 Written Comments Received from Comment Cards
- D-6 Sign-In Sheets

1.0 Introduction

The Interstate 605 (I-605) Corridor from the Interstate 10 (I-10) to the Interstate 105 (I-105) is one of the busiest and most congested in the Los Angeles area. Along this stretch, the I-605 intersects with both, the Interstate 5 (I-5) and State Route 60 (SR-60), freeways, which are major north-south and east-west freeway corridors, respectively. These two freeway to freeway interchanges include proposed improvements, which are a significant focus of this project. Population and goods movement are expected to place even greater demands on this corridor. Important operational and safety improvements are needed to ease current congestion and address future growth. The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) and the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) District 7, in collaboration with the Gateway Cities Council of Governments (GCCOG) and the San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments (SGVCOG), are partnering to improve the I-605 Corridor. Environmental studies are being initiated by Metro and Caltrans to evaluate various design options.

The goals of the Project are to:

- Enhance Mobility and Quality of Life for the Community
- Improve Public Safety
- Minimize Environmental and Property Impacts
- Minimize Disruptions during Construction

This Scoping Report documents the public scoping effort conducted by Metro and Caltrans during the public scoping period for the joint Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS).

As part of the project review process and in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), Metro and Caltrans will prepare an EIR/EIS that will evaluate the potential environmental impacts of the project.

In compliance with CEQA/NEPA, Metro and Caltrans held a 45-day public scoping period to allow the public and regulatory agencies an opportunity to comment on the scope of the EIR/EIS and to identify issues that should be addressed in the environmental document. This report documents the issues and concerns expressed during the public scoping meetings held in October and November of 2016 and the written comments received from the public, community organizations, and governmental agencies during the public scoping period from October 17, 2016 through December 1, 2016. Public and agency outreach efforts will continue throughout the project development process.

1.1 Purpose of Scoping

The process of determining the focus and content of the EIR/EIS is known as scoping. Scoping helps to identify the range of actions, alternatives and explains the environmental process that will analyze the proposed alternatives and eliminates issues that are not pertinent to the final decision on the proposed project. The scoping process allows all

interested parties to express their concerns regarding the proposed project and thereby ensures that all opinions and comments are considered in the environmental analysis. Scoping is an effective way to bring together and address the concerns of the public, affected agencies, and other interested parties. Members of the public, federal, state, regional and local agencies, interests groups, community organizations, and other interested parties may participate in the scoping process by providing comments or recommendations regarding issues to be evaluated in the EIR/EIS.

Comments received during the scoping process are part of the public record as documented in this scoping report. The comments and questions received during the public scoping process have been reviewed and considered by Metro and Caltrans and will be used in determining the appropriate scope of issues to be addressed in the EIR/EIS and in the selection of alternatives to be carried forward for further analysis.

The purpose of scoping for the I-605 Corridor Improvement Project was to:

- Inform Public of Proposed Project
- Identify Range of Alternatives
- Define Project Alternatives
- Outline Environmental Process
- Identify Issues of Concern
- Solicit Public Input

1.2 Summary of the Project

Metro and Caltrans are proposing improvements along I-605 between I-10 and I-105 as part of the I-605 Corridor Improvement Project (Project). In addition to improving the I-605 within the corridor, the proposed Project includes related improvements along State Route 60 (SR-60) from Santa Anita Avenue to east of Turnbull Canyon Road, and along Interstate 5 (I-5) from Florence Avenue to Paramount Boulevard. The cities that are adjacent to the project limits are Baldwin Park, El Monte, City of Industry, South El Monte, Whittier, Downey, Norwalk, Santa Fe Springs, Pico Rivera, and parts of unincorporated Los Angeles (LA) County. Proposed improvements include reconfiguring the interchanges; adding mixed-flow lanes and/or high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes, and auxiliary lanes; or completing other modifications that enhance freeway operations.

The proposed project currently has four alternatives:

Alternative 1: No Build

In this alternative, reconstruction or improvements to the I-605 corridor would not be proposed on the existing I-605 corridor between the I-10 and I-105. The I-605 would continue to have four mixed flow lanes that are 11-feet wide, with 2-foot-wide median shoulders, plus one high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lane and a 1-foot-wide HOV buffer.

Alternative 2: Standard Alternative (Lane/Shoulder Widths)

Alternative 2 would add mixed-flow or High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes as well as auxiliary lanes where additional capacity is required on southbound and northbound I-605

from I-10 to I-105, and along SR-60 from Santa Anita Avenue to east of Turnbull Canyon Road. This alternative would also add one HOV lane in each direction along I-5 from Florence Avenue to Paramount Boulevard, and add auxiliary lanes where necessary. These improvements would implement standard lane widths and shoulders on the mainline freeway, connectors, and ramps. Right-of-way (ROW) acquisitions would be necessary to accommodate these improvements. This alternative will have additional design variations, which would provide optional lane use such as general purpose, HOV, optional on and off ramp modifications, and other operational improvements.

Alternative 3: Reduced Standard Alternative (Lane/Shoulder Widths)

Alternative 3 would add mixed-flow or HOV lanes as well as auxiliary lanes, where additional capacity is required on southbound and northbound I-605 from I-10 to I-105. Alternative 3 also includes adding mixed-flow and auxiliary lanes, where additional capacity is required, along SR-60 from Santa Anita Avenue to east of Turnbull Canyon Road, and adding one HOV lane in each direction on I-5 from Florence Avenue to Paramount Boulevard. This alternative will have additional design variations, which provide optional lane use such as general purpose, HOV, optional on- and off-ramp modifications, and other operational improvements.

Alternative 4: Transportation Systems Management/Transportation Demand Management (TSM/TDM)

The TSM/TDM Alternative would add transportation system and demand management techniques to existing features within the project limits. Improvements that may be included as part of this alternative are additional ramp metering, improved signal timing, increased transit service, improved signage, development of rideshare/carpool programs, and installation of intelligent transportation systems (ITS).

Upon completion of the environmental and engineering technical studies, an EIR/EIS will be prepared and the preferred project alternative will be selected. The EIR/EIS is a legal environmental document required under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The EIR/EIS will include a comprehensive description of the Project and proposed alternatives, evaluate the Project's effects on the environment, and inform decision-makers and the public of reasonable avoidance, minimization, or mitigation measures, if any, that could remediate potential adverse impacts. A Draft Environmental Document (DED) will be publicly circulated for review and comment prior to completing the Final Environmental Document (FED). The Project Approval/Environmental Document (PA/ED) is anticipated to take about 48 months to complete, and the Project will then proceed into the final design phase based on the availability of funding.

1.3 Scoping Report Organization

This scoping summary report includes four main sections and appendices, as described below:

- Section 1 provides an introduction to the report and describes the purpose of scoping and a brief overview of the I-605 Corridor Improvement Project considered for analysis in the EIR/EIS.
- Section 2 provides information on the scoping meetings and outreach resources.
- Section 3 summarizes the comments received and issues raised during the scoping comment period.
- Section 4 describes the next steps in the EIR/EIS process.
- Appendices consist of all the supporting materials used during scoping as well as copies of comments received. The appendices include copies of the Notice of Initiation of Studies/ Notice of Preparation (NOP), Notice of Intent (NOI), meeting materials provided at the public scoping meetings, newspaper advertisements, and a summary of all comments received during the public scoping process.

2.0 Project Scoping

The scoping process is the means by which Caltrans conducts its initial outreach and notifies the public and governmental agencies. NEPA defines scoping as an early and open process for determining the scope of issues to be addressed and for identifying the significant issues related to a proposed action. Under CEQA/NEPA, scoping is designed to examine a proposed project early in the environmental analysis/review process and is intended to identify the range of issues pertinent to the proposed project and feasible alternatives or mitigation measures to avoid potentially significant environmental effects.

The scoping process inherently stresses early consultation with resource agencies, other state and local agencies, tribal governments, cooperating and responsible agencies as well as any federal agency whose approval or funding of the proposed project will be required for completion of the project. Scoping is considered an effective way to bring together and resolve the concerns of other agencies potentially affected by the project as well as other interested persons, such as the general public.

This section describes the methods used to notify the public and agencies about the scoping process conducted for the I-605 Corridor Improvement Project. It outlines how information was made available for public and agency review and identifies the different avenues available for providing comments on the Project (meetings, fax, email, mail, and phone).

2.1 Notice of Intent/Notice of Preparation

NEPA requires the lead agency to conduct an early and open process for determining the scope of issues to be addressed and for identifying the significant issues related to a proposed action (Section 1501.7, 40 CFR, 23 U.S.C. 139). As soon as practicable after its decision to prepare an EIS and before the scoping process, the lead agency shall

publish a Notice of Intent (NOI) (Section 1508.22, 40 CFR) in the Federal Register. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) published the NOI for this Project in the Federal Register/Volume 81, No. 202 on Wednesday, October 19, 2016.

Under CEQA (Guidelines), determination of the “scope” of an EIR incorporates consultation with responsible agencies, trustee agencies, federal agencies, and the general public. Once the lead agency has decided that an EIR is required for a project, it must send a Notice of Preparation (NOP) stating that an EIR will be prepared to each CEQA responsible agency and federal agency involved in approving or funding the project and to each state trustee agency responsible for natural resources affected by the project. The NOP was posted on October 18, 2016 at the State Clearinghouse (SCH#2016101049) and circulated to public agencies responsible for natural resources affected by the project and other interested parties in compliance with Section 15082 of the CEQA Guidelines.

On October 17, 2016, Metro and Caltrans sent the Notice of Scoping/Initiation of Studies letters, and copies of the NOP, to agencies, organizations, elected officials, and other interested parties. The Notice of Scoping/Initiation of Studies letter summarized the proposed Project, stated Metro’s and Caltrans’ intention to prepare an EIR/EIS, and requested comments from interested parties (see Notice of Scoping/Initiation of Studies and NOP in Appendix A). The letter included information on the dates, times, and locations of the public scoping meetings. A total of 579 Notice of Scoping/Initiation of Studies letters, and copies of the NOP, were distributed.

2.2 Public Scoping Meetings

Metro and Caltrans held six public scoping meetings and two agency scoping meetings in October and November of 2016. The scoping meetings provided an opportunity for the public, community and interest groups, media, and government agencies to obtain more information on the Project, to learn more about the CEQA and NEPA environmental review processes, to ask questions regarding the Project, and to provide comments on the Project. The following representatives and agencies participated in at least one of the meetings:

Federal Elected Offices:

- Griselda Ortiz, Office of California Congresswoman Linda Sanchez, District 38
- Yvette Shahinian, Office of California Congresswoman Linda Sanchez, District 38

State Elected Offices:

- Ray Wong, Office of California Senator Tony Mendoza, District 32
- Saeed Ali, Office of California Senator Tony Mendoza, District 32

Local Elected Officials:

- Gloria Olmos, South El Monte Mayor Pro Tem
- Joseph J. Gonzales, South El Monte Council Member

Government agencies and special districts:

- Caltrans
- Gateway Cities Council of Governments (GCCOG)
- San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments (SGVCOG)
- City of Baldwin Park
- City of Downey
- City of Industry
- City of Norwalk
- City of Pico Rivera
- City of Santa Fe Springs
- City of South El Monte
- City of Whittier
- Los Angeles County Sanitation District
- San Gabriel Valley Water Company
- Southern California Edison
-

2.2.1 Meeting Locations and Collateral Materials

Table 2-1 shows the scoping meetings held for the I-605 Corridor Improvement Project. This report includes oral and written comments presented at the public meetings as well as written comments submitted during the scoping comment period. The following list of collateral materials were available at each meeting. Refer to Appendix B for copies of these materials:

- Scoping Meeting Agenda
- Project PowerPoint Presentation
- Project Fact Sheet
- Project Alternatives Fact Sheet
- Project Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) Sheet
- Property Acquisition Fact Sheet
- Self-Addressed Comment Form

Table 2-1 Public Scoping Meetings

Date & Time	Location	Signed-in	Comment Cards
Monday, October 24, 2016 6:30 to 8:30 pm	Embassy Suites by Hilton Los Angeles Downey 8425 Firestone Bl. Downey, CA 90241	64	8
Wednesday, October 26, 2016 6:30 to 8:30 pm	Gus Velasco Neighborhood Center 9255 S Pioneer Bl. Santa Fe Springs, CA 90670	31	5
Thursday, October 27, 2016 6:30 to 8:30 pm	Norwalk Assembly of God Church 11129 Pioneer Bl. Norwalk, CA 90650	23	0

Tuesday, November 1, 2016 6:30 to 8:30 pm	Industry Hills Expo Center Avalon Room 16200 Temple Av. City of Industry, CA 91744	10	2
Wednesday, November 2, 2016 6:30 to 8:30 pm	South El Monte Senior Center 1556 Central Av. South El Monte, CA 91733	12	2
Thursday, November 3, 2016 6:30 to 8:30 pm	Palm Park 5703 Palm Av. Whittier, CA 90601	24	6

Agency Scoping Meetings

Wednesday, October 26, 2016 3:00 to 4:30 pm	Gus Velasco Neighborhood Center 9255 S Pioneer Bl. Santa Fe Springs, CA 90670	5	0
Thursday, November 3, 2016 3:00 to 4:30 pm	Palm Park 5703 Palm Av. Whittier, CA 90601	11	1
TOTAL		180	24

2.2.2 Newspaper Advertisements

The Notice of Preparation (NOP) and the dates and locations of the public scoping meetings were advertised in six local newspapers. Advertisement provided a brief synopsis of the proposed Project and encouraged attendance at the scoping meetings to share comments on the Project. Table 2-2 shows the published advertisements. See Appendix B-3 for proof of publication.

Table 2-2. List of Newspaper Publications & Run Dates

Newspaper Publication	Run Date
La Opinion	10/18/2016
Los Angeles Times	10/18/2016, 10/25/2016
Whittier Daily News	10/24/2016, 10/25/2016 11/1/2016
Downey Patriot	10/20/2016
Pasadena Star News	10/24/2016, 10/31/2016 11/1/2016
San Gabriel Valley Tribune	10/18/2016, 10/24/2016, 11/1/2016

2.2.3 Outreach

This Project is a collaborative effort between Metro, Caltrans District 7, GCCOG, SGVCOG, the individual cities within the proposed project, and unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County. The project team will continue briefing adjacent cities and maintaining their partnership for the duration of the project.

Metro and Caltrans provided various mechanisms and opportunities for the public and agencies to ask questions, comment, or request additional information on the Project beyond attending the public and/or agency scoping meetings. A designated Project information email address, website, and phone number were established and available during the public comment period and they will continue to be available as an informational resource for the public. Information on these additional outreach efforts are described below. In addition, postcards were mailed to property owners within 500 feet of the proposed Project area.

Email Address. A project email address (i605corridor@metro.net) was established to provide the public with another means of submitting comments on the scope and content of the EIR/EIS. The email address is in all collateral materials and posted on the website. Comments received by email have been considered and incorporated into this report.

Website. Metro established a Project-specific website to provide ongoing information. The website includes information on the Project and the scoping meeting details, the presentation discussed at the scoping meetings, electronic versions of the meeting handouts, and completed reports. The website will continue to remain a public information resource for the Project and will announce future public meetings and hearings. The website address is: <https://www.metro.net/projects/i-605/corridor-project/> (See Appendix B-4).

Phone Number. A Project-specific phone number was established for the public to provide comments and ask questions.

Mailing List. A Project-specific mailing list of stakeholders was generated. It included over 8,321 property owners and residents within the Project area. This mailing list will continue to be used throughout the environmental review process for the Project to distribute public notices and will continue to be updated to ensure all interested parties are notified of key Project milestones (see Appendix B-7 for full list).

2.2.4 Social Media

Facebook Ads were used as an additional tool to invite the public to the scoping meetings and to increase Project awareness. Facebook Ads appear in the top-right corner of the Facebook website and in user's timelines as "sponsored" posts in both desktop browsers and on mobile devices. The ad was strategically shown only to users residing in the Project area. The ad promoted the last three scoping meetings and included a link to the Project website. Though the advertisement did not receive any comments, it did garner Project awareness; the ad was shown to 71,850 people and achieved 2,824 clicks on the ad, which linked users to the Project meeting schedule page on the Project website. See Appendix B-5 for the Facebook advertisement.

Arellano Associates also published a Facebook post regarding the meetings and "boosted" it for additional reach. The post was shown to 56,726 distinct users and garnered 52 total comments and replies, ranging from questions about the Project, to criticisms of traffic and construction in general. The full range of comments can be found in Appendix D4 and they are also incorporated in Section 3.2.

3.0 Scoping Comments

This section summarizes the key issues raised during the public comment period. A total of 122 total participants submitted comments during the public scoping period. Most of the comments received were submitted as Facebook comments or as oral comments at the scoping meetings. Appendix C of this report includes a summary of all comments received on the I-605 Corridor Project including the oral comments presented at the public scoping meetings. Appendix D includes copies of the written comments submitted on the Project. The key issues that were brought up are discussed in this section. Table 3-1 below shows the breakdown of how comments were submitted and the level of support for the Project. Comments received from Facebook were screened and vetted through a process to determine if they were appropriate and/or relevant to the Project. “Neutral” indicates neither support nor opposition to the Project, but rather suggestions for improvement and further research.

Table 3-1. Summary of Comments Submitted by Type & Level of Support

Type	Generally Favorable	Generally Opposed	Neutral	Total
Comment cards (at scoping meeting or mailed in)	10	7	9	26
E-mails	6	7	6	19
Speakers at scoping meeting	6	8	20	34
Letters Received by US Mail (includes agencies)	2	2	11	15
Facebook Ad and Post	4	11	13	28
Total	28	35	59	122

3.1 Summary of Written Comments Received from Government Agencies and Special Districts

The following is a summarized list of the comments and questions received from agencies and special districts, written and oral, separated by topic. Agency and special district comments focused primarily on coordination with agencies, compliance with environmental law (i.e. air, water), alternatives, community concerns, and safety. For detailed information, please see Appendix D-1, which contains copies of the written comments submitted during the scoping period.

- United States (U.S.) Fish & Wildlife Service
- United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region IX
- State of California Native American Heritage Commission
- Office of the Sheriff, County of Los Angeles Hall of Justice

- State of California Natural Resources Agency, Department of Conservation, Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources – District 1
- City of Whittier, Public Works Department
- City of Baldwin Park
- The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California
- Southern California Association of Governments
- County of Los Angeles Department of Parks and Recreation
- South Coast Air Quality Management District
- County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County
- Governor’s Office of Planning and Research

Table 3.1-1 outlines the range of issue categories and comments presented by government agencies and special districts throughout the scoping process. A total of 311 comments were received.

Table 3.1-1. Summary of Comments Submitted by Type & Level of Support

Government Agency Comment Issues	# of Comments Received	
General	78	
Utility Impacts	62	
Air Quality	33	
Biological Resources	30	
Community Health & Environmental Justice	28	
Cultural Resources	25	
Water	20	
Alternatives & Design	18	
Recreational Resources	6	
Transportation/Traffic	5	
Purpose and Need	3	
Noise & Vibration Impacts	2	
Aesthetics	1	
Total	311	

3.1.1 General

- Southern California Association of Governments – Once the Project is deemed as financially constrained it should be amended as part of the constrained portion of the RTP/SCS Project List.
- County of Los Angeles Department of Parks and Recreation – Please include Puente Hills Park Master Plan Project (PHLPMP), Duck Farm River Park, and Whittier Greenway in the environmental analysis as these Projects may be impacted by construction and operation.
- EPA – Demonstrate the independent utility of the Project within its current geographic limits as it relates to the need for the Project.

3.1.2 Purpose and Need

- EPA – Focus on the underlying problems to address the reasons the project is considered, rather than prescribe or imply a predetermined solution such as an expansion of a freeway. Freeway capacity may be an included component of the potential solution; however, allow for the analysis of a full scope of alternatives.

3.1.3 Alternatives & Design

- City of Whittier – Encourages the Project to improve both northbound off ramps for Whittier Boulevard and Beverly Boulevard.
- EPA – Consider enhancing transit access and implementing a comprehensive Transportation System Management and Transportation Demand Management (TSM/TDM) plan as part of the build alternatives. Identify activities that can be undertaken to enhance transit ridership that will increase overall mobility within and through the corridor. Consider implementing measures to provide incentives for increased transit ridership as a means of decreasing single occupancy vehicle travel. Consider an additional HOV lane and toll lanes on northbound and southbound I-605 in the alternatives analysis.
- EPA – Conduct a thorough cumulative impact assessment and include a complete list of reasonable foreseeable actions, including non-transportation projects.

3.1.4 Biological Resources

- U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service – Consider native habitats along the San Gabriel River, and the potential for the Project to impact the least Bell's vireo, coastal California gnatcatcher, and migratory birds.
- EPA - Recommend that Caltrans identify all petitioned and listed threatened and endangered species and critical habitat within the project area and assess the direct and indirect impacts of each alternative.
- EPA - Identify if the project will affect waters of the U.S.

3.1.5 Cultural Resources

- Native American Heritage Commission – It is recommended that lead agencies consult with all California Native American tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of your proposed Project as early as possible in order to avoid inadvertent discoveries of Native American human remains and best protect tribal cultural resources.

3.1.6 Community Health & Environmental Justice

- EPA - Include in the Draft EIS a discussion of the potential direct, indirect, and cumulative project impacts on children's health.
- EPA – Provide public education programs about environmental health impacts to better enable residents to make informed decisions about their health and community.
- EPA – Include discussion on childhood asthma and other relevant health data.
- EPA - Recommend that Caltrans consider *Promising Practices for EJ Methodologies in NEPA Reviews* when developing the EJ section of the Draft EIS.
- EPA - Recommend the Draft EIS discuss potential environmental justice concerns, including any environmental justice issues raised during scoping meetings. Discuss the key issues where environmental justice is potentially a concern, such as relocation, air quality, noise, vibration, access to property, pedestrian safety, etc.
- EPA – Include a discussion about health impacts associated with living near freeways and identify whether there are disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental impacts.
- EPA - Recommend the Draft EIS identify whether the proposed project may disproportionately and adversely affect low income or minority populations in the surrounding area and provide appropriate mitigation measures for any adverse impacts.

3.1.7 Air Quality

- County of Los Angeles Department of Parks and Recreation – Construction and operations would likely create air quality impacts.
- South Coast Air Quality Management District – Lead Agency should identify any potential adverse air quality impacts that could occur from construction and operations during all phases of the Project.
- South Coast Air Quality Management District – Lead Agency should use CEQA Air Quality Handbook as guidance when preparing its air quality analysis. Recommends quantifying criteria pollutant emissions and compare the results to the recommended regional significance thresholds and calculating localized air quality impacts and comparing the results to localized significance thresholds.

- South Coast Air Quality Management District – Recommend performing a mobility source health risk assessment if necessary. A permit may be required if the Project includes equipment that generates or controls air contaminants.
- EPA – Include a detailed discussion of ambient air conditions, the area’s attainment or nonattainment status for all NAAQS, and potential air quality impacts from construction and operation of the project for each fully evaluated alternative. Include estimates of all criteria pollutants emissions and diesel particulate matter (DPM). Disclose information about the health risks associated with construction and truck emissions and how the proposed project will affect current emission levels. Ensure that the emissions from both the construction and the operational phases of the project conform to the approved State Implementation Plan and do not cause or contribute to violations to the NAAQS.
- EPA – Estimate the direct and indirect GHG emissions that would be caused by the proposal and its alternatives. Incorporate measures to reduce or avoid GHG emissions associated with the project, including reasonable alternatives and practicable mitigation opportunities, and disclose the estimated GHG emissions.

3.1.8 Aesthetics

- County of Los Angeles Department of Parks and Recreation – Construction and operations would likely create aesthetic impacts.

3.1.9 Noise & Vibration Impacts

- County of Los Angeles Department of Parks and Recreation – Construction and operations would likely create noise impacts.
- EPA – Discuss potential noise impacts to health and learning, especially near schools, homes, and childcare centers.

3.1.10 Recreational Resources

- County of Los Angeles Department of Parks and Recreation – Notify Trail Planning Section a minimum of 60 days in advance of any work that may affect County multi-use trails.
- County of Los Angeles Department of Parks and Recreation – Trails must be maintained free from debris to ensure safety to users.
- County of Los Angeles Department of Parks and Recreation – If temporary trail closures are required during construction, the Project proponent must coordinate with the Department to identify multi-use trail detours if possible.

3.1.11 Transportation/Traffic

- City of Whittier – Concerned with traffic loads and detours during construction.

- County of Los Angeles Department of Parks and Recreation – Construction and operations would likely create traffic impacts.
- EPA – Describe how any traffic estimates were developed and how these traffic estimates relate to regional transportation estimates.
- EPA – Explore the extent to which proposed alternatives will integrate with existing transportation facilities. Discuss how the project will impact existing vehicle lanes, or any bicycle lanes/pedestrian paths, due to project construction or operation.

3.1.12 Utility Impacts

- Department of Conservation, Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources, District 1 – Any wells, including any plugged, abandoned or unrecorded wells, are damaged or uncovered during excavation or grading, remedial plugging operations may be required. Avoid building over any plugged and abandoned wells.
- The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California – Potential impact to Metropolitan's Lower Feeder pipeline. Metropolitan must be allowed to maintain its rights-of-way and requires unobstructed access to its facilities in order to maintain and repair its system. Plans must be submitted to Metropolitan's Substructures Team for review and approval.
- The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California – Use "Guidelines for Developments in the Area of Facilities, Fee Properties, and/or Easement of The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California" when preparing designs and plans.
- County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County – The proposed Project may impact existing and/or proposed Districts' facilities (e.g. trunk sewers, recycled waterlines, etc.) over which it will be constructed. Districts' facilities are located directly under and/or cross directly beneath the proposed Project alignment.

3.1.13 Water

- EPA - Recommend the Draft EIS discuss techniques proposed for minimizing Surface water contamination due to increased runoff from additional highway surfaces.
- EPA - Recommend that the Draft EIS explain how each alternative would be consistent with the directives in Executive Order 13690.
- EPA - Recommend the Draft EIS identify if the project will involve the discharge of dredged or fill material into jurisdictional wetlands and waterways and impact water quality or hydrology.
- EPA – Recommend the Draft EIS discuss techniques proposed for minimizing Surface water contamination due to increased runoff from additional highway surfaces.
- EPA –Include a summary of the project's impacts to hydrology. Identify specific locations where runoff is expected, along with a map indicating where specific design features for stormwater management will be placed. Include stormwater performance

standards for both construction site sediment control and post-construction project design standards

3.2 Summary of Comments Received from Private Citizens

Table 3.2-1 outlines the range of issue categories and comments presented by private citizens throughout the scoping process. A total of 195 comments were received.

Table 3.2-1. Summary of Comments by Topic – Private Citizens

Public Comment Issues	# of Comments Received	
Alternatives & Design	76	
Transportation/Traffic	48	
General	25	
Right-of-Way	12	
Construction Impacts	11	
Noise & Vibration Impacts	9	
Community Safety	6	
Recreational Resources	3	
Aesthetics	2	
Air Quality	2	
Purpose and Need	1	
Total	195	

3.2.1 General

- All three projects are being worked on at the same time and if there is a way to accelerate construction.
- A focus on fixing the streets that are broken up, such as, potholes should be addressed first, for example, on Ramona entering & exiting Baldwin Park, and on Valley Blvd going to & coming from Alhambra & Valley Blvd. Heading to La Puente from El Monte, going & coming. Too many streets under construction at the same time during rush hour is not feasible.
- Streets were supposedly fixed but now it's worse than before.

3.2.2 Purpose and Need

- Expansions in L.A have already been made in the past few years and a recent study showed that the I-405 expansion, that caused "Carmaggedon," did not actually improve traffic flow. Suggestion was made to look at previous projects for lessons learned.

3.2.3 Alternatives & Design

- Consider alternatives that mitigate truck traffic. There was no research or input provided for an alternative for mitigation of truck traffic – either via time separation or designated truck lanes. Consider traffic mitigation like getting trucks off the freeways in the day, making the Alameda Corridor more efficient. There needs to be more done.
- Consider transportation solutions other than building more freeways. Caltrans' proposals to pour still more concrete is not a solution until the agencies bite the bullet and implement truly innovative transportation solutions. This Project will simply play out as another Band-Aid.
- Provide an analysis showing the benefit of carpool lanes. Carpool lanes sometimes have very few riders. Everyone should be sharing the lanes. Statements were made that there is no real benefit from carpools. And questioned whether there was any benefit to the environment.
- Consider an option that allows continuous access to carpool lanes. The carpool lane needs broken lines to go in or out of carpool lane safely, like on the SR-22.
- Expand No Build Alternative and TSM/TDM Alternative. Proposed alternatives may alleviate congestion, but wanted to know what no-build options are being pursued to help ease congestion and possibly encourage public transportation and if Metro is pursuing other options other than freeway expansion.
- Adjust lanes that lead to the I-5 Freeway north and south. This was a location that was identified as the source of where gridlock starts.
- Provide continuous lanes on 605 Freeway southbound past Slauson Av. and Telegraph Rd goes from four lanes down to three lanes at the 5 Freeway causing a bottleneck, then opens up to four lanes again south of the 5 freeway interchange. Add that 4th lane at that section to help eliminate the bottleneck.
- Lengthen on ramp lane on Pioneer H.S. on-ramp and Saragosa St. This will allow more time and lane to enter freeway.
- Reduced Lane Width Alternative. Will trucks will be able to travel on the right lanes if you go with the reduced lane width alternative?
- Ensure continuous lanes. The lanes go from four lanes to three lanes. If you add that fourth lane at that section, you would eliminate the bottleneck. Consider adding a fourth lane there first. Then work on the fifth lane if needed.
- Increase lighting for better visibility. More lighting is needed similar to the SR-91 by Disney as it would improve visibility.

3.2.4 Air Quality

- A greenway consideration would offset the pollution factor. Planting trees would provide shade. The air has gotten dirtier in past years. The installed new white fans over the summer had little impact, after only a month or two they looked as if they had not been cleaned in years. Will this get better or worse?

- Air quality analyses will take into account dust from tires. Lawn chairs are blackened from the dust from the freeways.

3.2.5 Aesthetics

- Ensure beautification of the freeway system reflect the communities (e.g. showing through art/murals the San Gabriel Valley River).

3.2.6 Noise & Vibration Impacts

- Vibration and noise from the I-5 freeway is already too high and that this noise disturbs their sleep and is awakened every morning at 4:00AM. Cracks are appearing in the tiles and walls of their house due to constant vibration. Suggested that better sound walls are needed.
- Vibrations on home are intolerable and adding a new lane will make things worse and that is not acceptable. Vibration causing elderly residents problems.
- Experiencing vibration and shaking of their home. Indicated that visitors think it's an earthquake when a truck passes and they have sent engineers to test the vibration of the freeway.
- On the southbound side of Whittier Blvd, when the trucks roll down the third and fourth lane off the bridge on the southbound side of Whittier Bl., they crash down and cause major noise in the neighborhood. They have made several complaints to Caltrans over a year due to foundation cracks. There are nights where they cannot even sleep because it sounds like a warzone. They hope that someone goes out there and fixes that dip off the northbound third and fourth lanes.
- When the freeways are widened, the sound walls will be broken down. When they rebuild, will the rebuilt sound walls be the same height?

3.2.7 Community Safety Impacts

- Will the project include a pedestrian walkway for those who walk on Paramount Blvd under the I-5 Freeway?
- Will a pedestrian bridge that connects north of I-5 Freeway to south of the I-5 freeway be replaced during expansion of the I-5 freeway. Students who live north of the I-5 freeway need that bridge more than anyone else.
- Pedestrian travel on Lakewood and Paramount is unsafe. Those are the only way pedestrians can get on the other side of the freeway.

3.2.8 Recreational Resources

- Improve bike facilities in the project area.
- Will there be discussions to reduce impact on the San Gabriel Valley River bike path?

3.2.9 Right-of-Way

- Desire to keep home because of a lot of memories, would be hard to move family with young kids. Please consider the other side of the freeway.
- For the next meeting, bring a team of real estate agents/experts who could answer questions about what happens when property is purchased by Caltrans, when you need to disclose when selling, do interest rates transfer onto new property, and many more questions?
- Ensure that there is no impact to property values.
- Ensuring that homes along the 605 are not affected – e.g. having to sell their property in the name of Metro.

3.2.10 Transportation/Traffic

- Will there be additional traffic congestion over time?
- Since a section of the 60 east touches the future Puente Hills Habitat Preserve, project should address increased traffic as the Preserve is developed. Will the new development have future concerts onsite?

3.2.11 Construction Impacts

- Concern about the impact that the construction of this Project would have on surface streets in surrounding communities, specifically Rosemead Bl. and Valley Bl.
- Concerned about the traffic that will be increased when the Project begins. Cars will get off the 605 and get on the surface streets, mainly Norwalk Bl. Resident stated that traffic on this street is very busy with truck traffic and said that there are 5 sets of railroad tracks on Norwalk Bl. between Perkins Av. and Los Nietos Rd. The trains run every day causing a traffic jam, many times backing traffic up to Slauson Av.
- Will the interchange be closed during construction?
- Making sure San Gabriel River Parkway bike path is not affected by construction.

4.0 Next Steps in Environmental Process

While scoping is the initial step in the environmental review process, additional opportunities to comment on the I-605 Corridor Project will be provided. Metro and Caltrans will provide opportunities for additional public input when the EIR/EIS is released and during public meetings for the Draft EIR/EIS. Table 4-1 presents a proposed schedule for the EIR/EIS, and identifies future opportunities for the public and agencies to provide additional input in the environmental review process.

Table 4-1. Anticipated Environmental Schedule

Event/Document	Purpose	Approximate Date
Notice of Initiation of Studies NOP/NOI (Completed)	Notified interested parties and agencies of Metro and Caltrans intent to prepare an EIR/EIS.	10/17/2016
Scoping Meetings (Completed)	45-day public scoping period for the proposed Project to provide for public comments on the scope of the EIR/EIS.	Fall 2016
Scoping Report Prepared (Completed)	Documents public and agency comments on the I-605 Corridor Project and environmental issues of concern to the public and agencies.	Winter 2016
Coordinating and Participating Agency Meetings	Early engagement with coordinating and participating agencies, to review proposed range of alternatives, methodologies for screening of alternatives, review proposed Draft EIS alternatives and recommend Preferred Alternative.	Ongoing
Community Information Meetings	Throughout the project process, Community Open House Meetings will remain an option for consideration.	Potential TBD
Draft EIR/EIS	Release of Draft EIR/EIS. Presents Project alternatives, impacts, and avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures.	Spring 2019
Public Hearings	The public will be invited to comment on the draft environmental report before the preferred alternative is selected.	Spring 2019
Final EIR/EIS	Release of Final Environmental Document with responses to comments included.	Summer 2020
Decision on Project	Final Environmental Document is certified and the Decision is published.	Late Summer 2020
Project Approval/Environmental Document (PA/ED)	Project is approved.	Fall 2020