

#	Time Period	Date	Method of Comment	Comment Received
1		04/15/22	Letter	<p>Dear Mr. Wang:</p> <p>The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) has received the Notice of Preparation [NOP] , Draft Environmental Impact Report [DEIR] or Early Consultation for the project referenced above. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Pub. Resources Code §21000 et seq.), specifically Public Resources Code §21084.1. states that a project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource. is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment. (Pub. Resources Code § 21084. 1; Cal. Code Regs .. tit .14, § 15064.5 (b) (CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5 (b)) . If there is substantial evidence. in light of the whole record before a lead agency, that a project may have a significant effect on the environment, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) shall be prepared. (Pub. Resources Code §21080 (d); Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 5064 subd.(a)(I) (CEQA Guidelines§ 15064 (a)(I)) . In order to determine whether a project will cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, a lead agency will need to determine whether there are historical resources within the area of potential effect (APE).</p> <p>CEQA was amended significantly in 2014. Assembly Bill 52 (Gallo, Chapter 532, Statutes of 2014) (AB 52) amended CEQA to create a separate category of cultural resources, "tribal cultural resources" (Pub. Resources Code §21074) and provides that a project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment. [Pub. Resources Code §21084.2). Public agencies shall, when feasible, avoid damaging effects to any tribal cultural resource. [Pub. Resources Code §21084.3 (a)) . AB 52 applies to any project for which a notice of preparation, a notice of negative declaration, or a mitigated negative declaration is filed on or after July 1, 2015. If your project involves the adoption of or amendment to a general plan or a specific plan. or the designation or proposed designation of open space, on or after March 1, 2005, it may also be subject to Senate Bill 18 (Burton, Chapter 905, Statutes of 2004) (SB 18). Both SB 18 and AB 52 have tribal consultation requirements. If your project is also subject to the federal National Environmental Policy Act [42 U.S.C. § 4321 et seq.) (NEPA), the tribal consultation requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 ( 154 U.S.C. 300101. 36 C.F.R. §800 et seq.) may also app...</p> <p>The NAHC recommends consultation with 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. Below is a brief summary of portions of AB 52 and SB 18 as well as the NAHC's recommendations for conducting cultural resources assessments. Consult your legal counsel about compliance with AB 52 and SB 18 as well as compliance with any other applicable laws.</p> <p>Page 1 of 5</p> <p>AB 52 has added to CEQA the additional requirements listed below, along with many other requirements:</p> <p>1. Fourteen Day Period to Provide Notice of Completion of an Application/Decision to Undertake a Project: Within fourteen ( 14) days of determining that an application for a project is complete or of a decision by a public agency to undertake a project, a lead agency shall provide formal notification to a designated contact of, or tribal representative of, traditionally and culturally affiliated California Native American tribes that have requested notice, to be accomplished by at least one written notice that includes:</p> <p>a. A brief description of the project.</p> <p>b. The lead agency contact information.</p> <p>c. Notification that the California Native American tribe has 30 days to request consultation. (Pub. Resources Code §21080.3.1 {d)) .</p> <p>(cont.)</p>
2	1:24pm	04/25/22	Online Comment Form	I support the ExpressLane / HOT lane alternatives because it will provide an effective uncongested time-savings alternative during times of congestion for those who are willing to pay the toll to save time.
3	2:25pm	04/25/22	Online Comment Form	How is Metro dealing with drivers who are already using the Expresslanes and not correctly marking Occupancy 1 on the Fastrak? I use the Expresslanes everyday and averaging almost \$10-11 Per Day using Expresslanes going From and To Work. Before starting this Extension Project, please work filtering drivers out of the Expresslanes who are not paying the correct Toll, and 2nd the Price point using Fastrak needs to be adjusted as is quite high compared to other cities.
4	8:55am	04/26/22	Online Comment Form	<p>Please do not consider any option that requires right-of-way acquisition and property takes. We do not want to lose our homes. The only option that should be considered is conversion of the existing HOV lane to an HOT/ExpressLane. If there is sufficient shoulder space to provide passing lanes for HOT without needing to build additional freeway width while still ideally providing some shoulder, that is fine. But this project must not be window dressing to cover up a general freeway widening/capacity enhancement that will most certainly induce VMT and cause a significant impact per CEQA. The passing lanes can alternative between sides.</p> <p>Conversion of existing lanes to HOT, short passing lanes where it is safe and space provides. This will also be the lowest cost option and fastest to implement.</p>
5	3:11pm	04/27/22	Email	<p>Saw that virtual scoping meetings for the I-10 ExpressLanes job from the 605 to the San Bernardino County Line will be taking place next week.</p> <p>Is there any kind of anticipated advertisement date for either the RFQ or construction bid? Is this a project that Metro plans to be completed in time for the 2028 Olympics?</p> <p>Is there a decision as to whether this will be a bid build or an alternative delivery project?</p> <p>I'd appreciate any info you can provide.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
6	11:36am	04/28/22	Online Comment Form	10 east from Santa Monica Mid City to downtown/ Alhambra. Why the hell hasnt it been done. Imagine the revenue!!!!
7	11:50pm	04/28/22	Online Comment Form	<p>Learn from the 405 expansion project.</p> <p>Waste of money .</p> <p>Solves nothing.</p> <p>BUILD A TRAIN !!</p> <p>and not take 10 years to do it.</p> <p>That is all.</p>

8	3:36pm	04/28/22	Online Comment Form	<p>I support Alternative 3, which would expand to two total ExpressLanes in each direction. I typically only use the 10 this far out en-route to vacation in Palm Springs and Joshua Tree, and would like to avoid local congestion when doing so. I usually have friends with me I can take the HOV if needed, but sometimes I do not and would prefer to pay a fair price to move faster. I enjoy paying for ExpressLanes because I know the money goes to support the transit system I use on a daily basis (I am a frequent user of the Red Line and the 2 and 4 busses in LA, and in fact very rarely use my car.)</p> <p>In the past (pre-COVID before WFH became so prevalent), I was a regular user of the Silver Line bus on the 110 and appreciated the ability for that bus to avoid traffic by using the ExpressLane. By extending the two-lane ExpressLane further east, I would be very supportive of more clean-air commuters benefiting from a theoretical extension of the Silver Line heading east. Alternative 3 sets Metro up for this success at a later date.</p>
9	10:01am	04/29/22	Online Comment Form	
10	10:35pm	04/29/22	Online Comment Form	<p>With displacement being such an issue these days, it is imperative that this project fully disclose all property impacts of each option. It should be noted that many of the properties had the freeway moved closer to them under the recently completed I-10 carpool lane project between Puente and SR-57, which opened to the public just two years ago and had construction impacts for several years.</p> <p>Metro needs to coordinate with the existing HOV-5 pilot program set to begin for the current El Monte Busway. I strongly support this pilot as peak hour traffic, especially in the segment from I-710 to Alameda, overwhelms available capacity. If I were to select a community preferred alternative, converting the existing HOV lane to HOT-5 in peak hours, HOT-3 in off peak, would be appropriate. There is not a need for an additional lane. The on and off ramps need to coordinate with Foothill Transit so that the Silver Streak can use these ramps. Currently most Silver Streak buses do not use the HOV lane east of El Monte due to the difficulty in changing through four lanes of traffic only to change back. Adding an additional lane could make it more difficult for Silver Streak to use this service. On ramps need to be placed so that Silver Streak can use the lanes.</p> <p>No Direct Access Ramps are proposed as part of the project but they should be studied as an option to allow for buses to go in and out. A DAR should be studied for El Monte Station on the east end to mitigate bus traffic moving in and out at Santa Anita.</p>
11		04/29/22	Comment Card	Great Idea! The more the better.
12		04/29/22	Comment Card	Carpool lanes help with congestion?
13		04/29/22	Comment Card	Would be great if Metro had limited hours of express/ carpool lanes like San Francisco
14		04/29/22	Comment Card	Yes to 4 HOV.
15		04/29/22	Comment Card	Invest in renewable energy and accommodate people with disabilities.
16		04/29/22	Comment Card	An extra express lane is a bad idea, it's congested as is already.
17	1:10pm	04/30/22	Online Comment Form	No more privatization of our HWY's help the flow of traffic and give people who carpool the quickest route.
18	10:32am	05/01/22	Online Comment Form	Too much construction! I already pay taxes for roads and should not have to pay. for car Pool lane.
19	10:50am	05/01/22	Online Comment Form	Paid lanes should include discounts or waivers for teachers. My mother lives in Tujunga and commutes to her high school in south la. Her commute would benefit significantly from this lane if the cost for her was reduced.
20	2:03pm	05/01/22	Online Comment Form	<p>More car lanes only make more car traffic and congestion. They waste taxpayer money and construction disrupts local residents' lives and creates unhealthy pollution and stress.</p> <p>Please allocate funds and planning away from highway expansion and toward faster, more comprehensive public transit networks. I don't want more freeway to get stuck on; I want better alternative options to driving!</p>
21	4:19pm	05/01/22	Online Comment Form	I support alternative 3 to extend the two HOT lanes further east. I use this corridor a lot and would benefit from alt. 3 the most as I use the existing HOT lanes when I can.
22	9:59am	05/01/22	Online Comment Form	More important than the extension of express lane is eliminating those merge lanes on freeway 10 from Santa Anita to 605. So many accidents and near accidents by that stretch of freeway due to lane merging.
23		05/01/22	Comment Card	Traveling on the 10 freeway yesterday in Baldwin Park construction was happening (Saturday 4/30/22). We do not want to pay for an HOV lane and removing residents from their homes. We are in the 21st Century can there be another solution. The 110 Freeway has a bridge overhead. But please don't make us pay for it. We are paying for the construction already.
24		05/01/22	Comment Card	Making people pay makes the 1% once again get what they want and leaves the 99% paying taxes for freeways we can't use. We will sit longer in traffic, have less time for families after a hard day at work. While those with money can get home faster. No problem with HOV lanes but this creates 2nd class car drivers and its not right!
25		05/01/22	Comment Card	Please keep freeway as is.
26		05/01/22	Comment Card	Don't want to pay for the carpool lane.

27		05/01/22	Comment Card	Thank you for asking. Make all options desirable for people juggling with multiple jobs and unfortunately long (distance) commutes.
28		05/01/22	Comment Card	I think people or the idea of it should be free and people should not pay.
29		05/01/22	Comment Card	I understand that widening the freeway would be best, but cutting into peoples' yards (the little land they have) sucks. I know we have earthquakes but with modern architecture, I would think building up could be a solution. Double-decker freeway? In modern first world Asian countries, they have them (ex. Japan and Korea).
30		05/01/22	Comment Card	More express lanes. Love congestion pricing.
31		05/01/22	Comment Card	I am on a fixed retirement income. Would prefer car pool, as opposed to having to pay for an express lane. High gas prices, rent increases. Do not need another expense.
32		05/01/22	Comment Card	Freeway expansion- NO NO NO History and statistics show that freeway expansion do not actually decrease traffic, they just increase it. And imminent domain land takeovers have unequal impact on minority and underprivileged communities. My husband is an urban designer and we're well aware of the impacts.
33		05/01/22	Comment Card	Prefer to keep carpool lanes- more equitable for those who are financially struggling.
34	4:40pm	05/02/22	Email	Hope you're well. I was reviewing the post about the project on the Source and have a question about the alternatives. Do any involve adding any new lane miles of highway lanes (HOV, HOT or general)? Namely options 3 and 4, it's not clear if the new HOT or HOV lanes are being converted from general or being added as new lane miles. 1.No build, i.e. leave the HOV lanes as they are. 2.Converting the existing HOV lane to a High Occupancy Toll (HOT) lane, also known as an ExpressLane 3.Converting the existing HOV lane to an ExpressLane, and adding an additional ExpressLane/HOT lane in each direction 4.Maintain the existing HOV lane and add a second HOV lane in each direction. Could you please add me to your email list for updates for when the scoping comments period opens?
35	12:08pm	05/04/22	Public Scoping Meeting	Will a copy of the presentation, comments, questions, and attendees be sent out to the attendees?
36	12:19pm	05/04/22	Public Scoping Meeting	Is a copy of the presentation available for download?
37	12:20pm	05/04/22	Public Scoping Meeting	On Side 8, the Speaker stated the express lanes were a success. What are the metrics of success?
38	12:21pm	05/04/22	Public Scoping Meeting	On Slide 11 the speaker stated that there were outreach efforts what are (or were) those efforts?
39	12:26pm	05/04/22	Public Scoping Meeting	What's the best way to express our opposition. We need carpool lanes. Not express lanes
40	12:27pm	05/04/22	Public Scoping Meeting	Many ask why are residents being asked to pay for these improvements when road tax funds from fuel and registration fees are intended to cover such costs. How do you justify this method of additional revenue and the financial impacts to communities and users in this proposed expansion?
41	12:31pm	05/04/22	Public Scoping Meeting	On Slide 25: The speaker stated that the public has a voice. What will Caltrans do if most comments are to reject this expansion of the express lanes?
42	12:33pm	05/04/22	Public Scoping Meeting	The I-10 has been under none stop construction for well over 15 years. It started with the 605 interchange and has yet to stop.
43	12:41pm	05/04/22	Public Scoping Meeting	I did not see an alternative that combines HOV with toll lanes like some managed lanes have. Will families have to pay?
44	12:43pm	05/04/22	Public Scoping Meeting	What i would like to see included in this project is extending the Metro Silver Line BRT to West Covina, Cal Poly Pomona, Downtown Pomona and Montclair. The existing bus stops on the i-10 at Puente and Azusa is uncomfortable, loud, dark and just feels unsafe. I'd like the project include stations similar to the I-110 Expresslanes. The Foothill Transit Silver Streak is too unreliable. Please also consider allowing Buses on Shoulder (like San Diego) to speed up buses on the freeway.
45	12:46pm	05/04/22	Public Scoping Meeting	I agree with a BRT stop at Cal Poly Pomona or a direct access ramp from the express lanes to campus. Cal State LA has a BRT stop and I'd like to see that for Cal Poly Pomona which has a larger student population. I know a lot of students that rely on buses to get to campus from Los Angeles
46	1:09pm	05/04/22	Online Comment Form	Why wasn't the express lane considered when the carpool lane was added? Why would this be another 2-3 year project after the fact?

47	1:33pm	05/04/22	Public Scoping Meeting	signed on too late. where can I see see the presentation again?
48		05/04/22	Public Scoping Meeting	I wholly support adding actually -- well, yes, converting the existing HOV lane to an express lane, just that the alternative that I support is Alternative 3, dual express lane alternative primarily because, if you convert the existing HOV lane to an express lane and add an express lane to where you have the toll too, it will prevent driver confusion and bottlenecking when they go to the one express lane section. Plus it will provide continuity with San Bernardino County's ExpressLane system. Plus the additional addition of two express lanes I-10 will reduce congestion and improve safety as well.
49		05/04/22	Public Scoping Meeting	First is to make sure that in the environmental report we take into account the Metro Board approved HOV 5 conversion of the existing El Monte busway that is the express lanes that currently exists from Downtown LA to I-605. Metro is converting those to HOV 5 under a board action, and it's a pilot program. And whatever environmental study is done, it needs to make sure that's compatible w/ converting express lanes to HOV 5. I support Alternative 2, which is not an additional lane. Metro and Caltrans need to be very careful not to feel any pressure to add the additional lane jus to match the SBCTA double express lanes from the county line east to I-15 as Metro and Los Angeles County voters have different priorities than San Bernardino County voters, and our voters-- our voters should be respected, and we need to also be very careful about displacement, and displacement is an extremely important issue. We see that on other freeway projects like I-710, I-605, I-5 projects. There needs to be no eminent domain of homes. We need o recognize what eminent domain does and what displacement does to people's communities. Even though they may be - they may get funds to move to a different location, they lose the home equity that might have resulted from staying in the location. They lose communities like their churches their neighborhood friends and that sort of thing, and that's really devastating, especially to a lot of young people growing up. There are a lot of families that live in apartments and homes along the I-10 corridor. So there needs to be very careful-- Alternative 2 should reduce the amount of displacement, but we need to be very careful. There needs to be no displacement of homes at all along the corridor because of those negative impacts for people. Thank you.
50		05/04/22	Public Scoping Meeting	Yeah my concern is it still seems like a forgone conclusion. We just finished with the construction around the carpool lanes. More carpool lanes is good, but what we don't need is more express lanes. So I'd be in opposition to this. If we want -- whether it be additional lanes or trying to change up the settings, we should have done that while we were doing construction the last few years. We do need more carpool lanes, but we do not need more express lanes. Thank you so much.
51		05/04/22	Public Scoping Meeting	I think I really had a question, but I'll just try to rephrase it as a comment that on -- with the last Caltrans construction of the HOV lane, a large -- a long strip of my property was taken, and, now, I have a huge sound wall all along that border. So it seems awfully expensive that, if they will be taking more property, would they also be moving that -- or replacing that expensive sound wall for all the properties that would be affected by expansion of the side of the -- of the freeway? Okay. I'll just reiterate that I was concerned about the sound wall, the expense of it and also the replacement of it to make sure that we still have it replaced.
52		05/04/22	Public Scoping Meeting	Good afternoon. I want to reiterate Mr. Fung's comments regarding right of way and the protection of homes. Caltrans has a long history of environmental discrimination, including from the I-105 expansion and also the I-5 corridor near Disneyland and indiscriminately taking homes from the disadvantaged community, all while the expansions on the 405 were untouched. Homes were untouched. I'd like to -- first though, I do appreciate you advertising this on social media. That's how I found out about the meeting. On slide 8 the speaker states that the Express Lanes are a success. I'd like to the record indicate what were those metrics of successes? On slide 11, the speaker stated that there were outreach efforts. What were those outreach efforts, and explain what was done in detail. There are many people who ask why we are continued to ask to pay for toll roads when our road tax and fuel and registration costs are -- should be -- should cover this. How do you address that question? On slide 10 and 5, the speaker states that the public has a voice. If the majority of the comments reject the express lanes, will that mean that Caltrans will abandon the express lane option? And finally, on the -- the I-10 has been -- I've lived here for 20 years, and the I-10 has yet to stop construction. It started with the expansion of the interchange at 605-10, and it's been nonstop ever since. When does it end? Seriously.
53		05/04/22	Public Scoping Meeting	Good afternoon, and thank you for the opportunity to speak. I'm interested in the project as a whole, but a more specific focus as it relates to the City of El Monte, and , first, I want to start out with a similar concern that's been expressed. When I hear a blanket statement about right-of-way acquisition , especially as it relates to Alternative 2 where there's no additional lanes, that is concerning. So I think--not I think. There needs to be a little more explicit expression of what the right way acquisition entails and, again, concern being right-of-way takes were not necessary through disadvantaged communities and or communities as a whole. The second thing is the alternatives cut sheets do a good job of stating what's happening along the main line portion of the various alternatives, however, you have this transition area, and there's no identification of what happens during transition area. That is very confusing. There was also a statement about complete streets. That's a very open-ended statement when you talk about complete streets. What are you talking about? Where are you talking about? There are several needs within the City of El Monte as relates to complete streets and conflicts with current and any future build alternatives on the 10 freeway. Finally, outreach was mentioned. Is there a plan as part of the outreach program to reach out to local agencies, such as, the City of El Monte and attend either commission meetings or council meetings to do project presentations and really reach out, touch and feel the communities that are going to be impacted by these construction activities and the project as a whole?
54		05/04/22	Public Scoping Meeting	Hi. I am absolutely opposed to the idea of another pay express lane. We already have a problem with that along the 110 Freeway because what it does is it creates a second class of citizens, of drivers, the haves and the have-nots, and it allows people who have money to be able to get to where they need to go faster, and it is unfair. We all pay taxes. Between property taxes, government taxes we pay and our car taxes on gas and through our registration, we're all paying the same, but what it does is it creates a class of people of the haves who have the money to get home to their families sooner, to go wherever they have sooner, and I think that in this society, it is absolutely a hundred percent unfair to do that. I don't think it's right. I don't think it's ethical, and we need to stop creating classes of people who can do thinks when other people can't. Somebody shouldn't have the right to get home to their families after a hard day of work just because they have a little bit more money than some other person who doesn't. And even though they fill up cars -- and I see it regularly on the 110 Freeway, I see entire carloads of people who can't get in the ExpressLanes because they're not paying to get on there while I see cars going into the lanes that have one person and because they have finances to do it, they can do that. It's just unfair, and I'. absolutely a hundred percent opposed to this. Thank you. That's all I have to say.
55		05/04/22	Public Scoping Meeting	Thank you. Oh, there it goes. Thank you so much for going back as it did refresh some memories there. If in the report -- and this may be my own ignorance -- is identifying who the express lanes reports to. Is it a branch of Caltrans? Is it a branch of Metro? Is it a private entity or a -- some type of non-environmental agency? Where and how those -- the amount of funding collected is overseen and managed, I think that would help go a long way to explain where the money's going. Also, the -- I don't know if it's possible to explain why other areas that are more affluent have not had the process. I know that in one of the earlier presentations you stated that there is going to be an extension -o or the project -- the ExpressLanes projects will expand to other areas don't go first as they -- the economic impacts to those disadvantaged and low income community seems to be greater, and yet those are the first communities to see expanded requirements for access to the express lanes. Thank you.

56		05/04/22	Public Scoping Meeting	Just one thing that I thought about that would be good information to have whether you can put it on your website or share it on future additional meetings is to kind of differentiate between standard and nonstandard lanes and shoulder widths. We don't know what the standard measurements are. So it would just be good to have that information just for the comparison purposes. That's my comment. Thank you.
57		05/04/22	Public Scoping Meeting	Thank you. Well, this is kind of a related detail, but one of the other callers mentioned that there were nonstandard measurements of the lanes that were shown. I guess there's -- maybe they're shortening some of the lanes or narrowing them, but I noticed that, after we had the freeway expansion completed for the HOV lanes, that I noticed that there were a lot of on-ramps that seemed shorter and that you were in traffic sooner than you were used to, and some of them -- the lanes seemed narrower. And, also, the shoulders on the side were narrow, and sometimes they were right up against a wall or just seemed like there were some changes to -- as a motorist that I noticed after they made this construction. And I'm just -- I'm just wondering if these have changed over the years or is this is something that should be examined as far as like safety concerns. But it is noticeable, and it seemed to be in the areas where they had all the new construction for the additional lanes. That's all. It's just an observation that I had that I wanted to add because it seemed like another caller mentioned something that was related to that. Thank you.
58	6:35pm	05/05/22	Public Scoping Meeting	Could additional alternatives be explored? Metrolink San Bernardino line runs parallel to the corridor and Foothill Silver Streak runs on the freeway. Would additional funding of corridor transit service that would reduce congestion on the road be explored as an alternative?
59	6:40pm	05/05/22	Public Scoping Meeting	How do you stop people cheating and using expresslanes without paying?
60	6:46pm	05/05/22	Public Scoping Meeting	Why does Metro and CalTrans think they can keep widening freeways when they don't help at all?
61	6:53pm	05/05/22	Public Scoping Meeting	What outreach has been done considering there's only 3 speakers so far for a proposal this size.
62	7:03pm	05/05/22	Public Scoping Meeting	I live in Claremont and use the I-10 express lanes when I travel to LA, and I am an enormous fan of these lanes even though as a retiree I do not make the trip all that often. However, I also feel that widening the freeway is a terrible idea in many respects - environmental impact, and cost being the biggest. As a society we need to move beyond the single-occupant vehicle as the norm and accept that shared transit is an absolute necessity to preserve and even improve the quality of life in SoCal.
63		05/05/22	Public Scoping Meeting	Thank you. Thank you Metro for allowing me to comment on this project. I'm a user of this particular corridor from the 605 onto the -- along the 10 on up Cal Poly Pomona. I commute to school so I use this corridor about four times a week, and I'm kind of astonished at just the size, just how wide, how enormous this freeway is right now, and to imagine it being even larger, it's kind of -- it's kind of unbelievable that this is being considered. I understand that this project is meant to address some of this peak hour traffic congestion concerns, but that seems to be very ill-advised considering that the freeway widening is unlikely to actually induce any reduction in congestion. So I would respectfully consider -- or respectfully request that as much as it can be studied that alternatives to driving are explored as part of this project or to reduce the amount of people driving, not simply to accommodate just more traffic.
64		05/05/22	Public Scoping Meeting	Wonderful. Thank you so much for giving me the opportunity to comment. Wes Reutimann. I'm co-founder of Act San Gabriel Valley. We're headquartered in the City of El Monte. This corridor is of deep concern to ours. A lot of the communities this project would run through are among the most pollution burdened in the State of California. If you look at CalEnviroScreen, you'll recognize that these neighborhoods, these communities have amongst the worst air pollution in the state, and several of the alternatives you are proposing here would exacerbate that. The science on induced demand is very clear. If you widen the hallway, take more land, add more lanes, even if you're adding a toll as part of that, there are going to be more vehicle trips down these corridors. And then, you know, the other really serious concern we have is that almost ten years ago Metro and Caltrans did the first phase of the project and promised that the revenue from this project would be reinvested into those communities, into public transit improvements, and after a couple of years, you stopped doing that. There was no public engagement, virtually none. It went to the cog once, and there was really nothing, no outreach in terms of the revenue from toll lanes being re-purposed to expand the express lanes program and to bond against it versus actually reinvesting it into the neighborhoods as was promised to the community at the time. And as you probably will recall, that was a controversial project at the time. People didn't understand what the benefits were of charging for the use of the highway and the promises made that, you know, there would be a share of those benefits funneled back into the community. So I think that's a huge red flag that people really need to be aware of as you're considering design alternatives here as well as, you know, the very significant environmental impacts, particularly in terms of climate and air quality. We know that the number one source of greenhouse gas emissions in California are from vehicles and trucks, and this project would dig us into even a deeper hole if it is built out by expanding the footprint of the freeway versus re-purposing lanes. So organizationally, we strongly support re-purposing existing lanes to reduce congestion and manage the amount of traffic on the highway and not taking more homes, buildings and properties to expand the freeway in already very heavily pollution burdened neighborhoods and communities. So with that, we'll certainly submit comments -- written comments, and thank you for giving me the -- a couple of minutes to share. Appreciate it.
65		05/05/22	Public Scoping Meeting	Hi. Good evening. I'm a resident of Hacienda Heights. I've lived in El Monte and Monterey Park for most of my life. I really do not understand the need to continue widening our freeways. Somebody that has grown up near -- right next to the freeway on-ramps, I don't understand why we need to keep widening freeways. As you know, like a lot of the projects on widening freeways has not improved the time on -- how much time we spend on these freeways. For example, the 10 Freeway between 605 and the 57 has been under construction for years, and years ago I remember asking Caltrans officials, hey, why is construction not complete, and they just tell me, oh, because a contractor they can't work certain days. It's unacceptable, and for that to become such a long term project, I don't see continuing this type of freeway widening as something that the community wants. Please I really implore Metro and Caltrans to rethink projects like this, and like Wes has said before me, you know, there's been a lot of promises that were made and has not been delivered. So as a community resident, member, here in Hacienda Heights and I work in El Monte, we don't really appreciate these projects and the promises not being kept. So I really implore Metro and Caltrans to do better. Thank you.

66		05/05/22	Public Scoping Meeting	<p>I'm a member if La Puente here in San Gabriel Valley, a long time resident, and I just found out about this meeting a couple of minutes ago through some folks, and, you know, I'm really concerned about this proposal to widen the 10 Freeway, which means less public transportation for our residents.</p> <p>I'm wondering what the outreach was to the community and why is it that we're just hearing about it now when you've already held meetings, you know, prior to this one being held today.</p> <p>Secondly, I also am hearing that money that was supposed to be given or allotted to community members along these freeways was instead used for freeway projects. Can you confirm whether that's true and why that happened? Those are my questions. Thank you.</p> <p>Yeah. Thank you all for your responses. I am -- like I said, I just heard about this. I'm pretty new to this proposal, and I wanted to ask in the first place why this proposal is being done and why you're conducting these public meetings. Obviously to consult with the community, but why the expansion? One -- that's one question.</p> <p>Secondly, what are some alternatives to, you know, expanding the freeway, and those are my two questions.</p> <p>If I can add, I know that you mentioned outreach, you know, 500 feet from the freeway. To be respectful, I don't think that's enough, and also some of our elected officials are extremely busy and don't have the time to, you know, even spread out what's happened with the Metro.</p> <p>So this -- what you did with going to the resource fair, that's great, but if we can have more public spaces or more announcements or outreach to local organizations, that would also be fantastic. That's all. Thank you.</p>
67	5:52 pm	05/06/22	Project Hotline	I think the I-10 express lane extension is extremely important. To provide better mobility in the region. I also hope there will be a discount or a promotion for our clean air vehicles. It can improve mobility and at the same time not to bring extra air pollution to the area. This corridor is extremely important especially for people living in the Inland Empire. Whether they go to work or other purposes to go to Downtown LA or Pasadena area, or any area west of Inland Empire. The express lane can solve congestions and the clean air vehicle discount can further provide incentives for people to switch to electric or hybrid cars and reduce the pollution over all. And my zip-code is 92507
68		05/06/22	Project Hotline	I support the I-10 project. I think it will be better for for traffic, especially when my business partners come in from LAX. Thank you. You have my full support
69	10: 58 am	05/07/22	Public Scoping Meeting	No for the HOV lane
70	10:52 am	05/07/22	Public Scoping Meeting	I'm in support for the Alternative that does NOT increase lanes, if I understood does not require ROW, nor increase in number of lanes. My concern is the vagueness in the added amenities if one of A2-A4 is chosen. That is, the incentives to improve public transit ridership as well as carpooling. This should be greatly expanded in terms of scope. Thank you for holding this meeting. Thank you Robert, Tito, Daniel.
71	10:56 am	05/07/22	Public Scoping Meeting	There needs to more entrance & exit lanes on th I10
72	10:57 am	05/07/22	Public Scoping Meeting	Hello, thank you for this public meeting. I'd like to state that I am strongly against adding lanes to the 10 fwy extension. Providing more lanes will drive up, pun-intended, driving as we've seen on the 405.
73	11:01 am	05/07/22	Public Scoping Meeting	"I know I'm dating myself, but when I was working for employers,employees' incentives to purchase their monthly Metro passes, it eliminated the single car riders and-pollution."
74	11:02 am	05/07/22	Public Scoping Meeting	I'd just like to echo what other commenters have said against alternatives 3 & 4. We need less cars on our roads, not more. Please keep induced demand in mind and do not add more lanes
75	11:04 am	05/07/22	Public Scoping Meeting	Please keep the HOV lanes and convert them to High Occupancy Toll lanes or Express lanes. We are living through a climate crisis and need to make every effort to reduce our emissions.
76	11:36 am	05/07/22	Public Scoping Meeting	I am a Resident of the city of Los Angeles, I do not support the widening of the 10 FWy. Have we not learned anything from the past? Displacing people from there homes is incredibly destructive. We need to start putting money into alternative modes of transportation.
77	11:43 am	05/07/22	Public Scoping Meeting	I am a resident and I do not support the widening of the 10 freeway. Induced demand is well known concept and 405 is a perfect example of the principal. More lanes equal more traffic worse congestion and additional air pollution. We need multimodal solutions!
78	11:44 am	05/07/22	Public Scoping Meeting	If Metro and Cal trans have an excess of Money making the 110 Fwy entrances and exits north of downtown into Pasadena safer would be a wise investment.
79	9:07am	05/07/22	Online Comment Form	This is ridiculous. Taxpayers footed the bill for this lane for years. YEARS. Now Metro wants us to pay to use something we built. No. Just no. Absolutely not.
80	9:59am	05/07/22	Online Comment Form	<p>It would be really nice if I could use the HOV lane on the I-10 going both east and west, there needs to be more opportunities to enter and exit the express lanes. My entrance and exit is Fremont, sometime I can get into the lane going east, but not always. Going west it only helps me for a few miles after the 605, which is pretty useless.</p> <p>I think more people use it if they could enter and exit at Fremont, I know I certainly would and so would my family.</p>
81		05/07/22	Public Scoping Meeting	<p>Okay. Thank you for taking time to have this hearing -- for holding this. I live in Pasadena. I spent my childhood in Temple City, in the Rosemead area, El Monte. I've seen the impacts of having too many cars on the 10 Freeway, the impacts of air quality.</p> <p>I appreciated earlier the conversation about equity and air quality and I -- so I -- I definitely want to support any type of increasing of the HOV ExpressLanes but not in service of increasing the number of lanes total.</p> <p>I would be -- you know, I would be in favor of increasing the number of express lanes and shrinking the number of general purpose lanes so we still maintain at five lanes in each direction.</p> <p>My concern here is because we -- as a person who wants to fight climate change, we need policies and infrastructure that encourages people to think outside just traveling alone in the car, you know, single occupancy vwhicles, and so I think, you know, keeping the status quo on a number of general purpose lanes, does not -- doesn't adhere to those principles that you've talked about in terms of equity and air -- improving air quality.</p> <p>So that is my concern is that I want -- I'm cool with any plans to increase those HOV ExpressLanes as long as we also do not increase the total number of lanes. So yes. Thank you for taking the time to listen.</p>

82		05/07/22	Public Scoping Meeting	I live in Claremont now, but in my working years, I lived in El Monte or Rancho, and I traveled by bus or via Metro to Downtown Los Angeles. So I experienced the large number of traffic going to and from work. I kind of agree with the previous caller that increasing the number of lanes would increase the number of cars and the traffic not only increasing the air quality, making it worse but also just too many people driving single cars. So I'm also all for the -- the lanes where the people would -- what are they called? -- HOV lanes, I'm all for that, but not really for increasing lanes where more people would be comfortable just driving alone to and from work. It would just increase too many cars and increase pollution, and we already have too much for that.
83	11:15am	05/09/22	Online Comment Form	my husband and i frequently drive from west LA to city of Hope for cancer treatment and your express lanes are a detriment to our drive. You have taken HOV lanes and converted the to toll roads which hardly anyone drives on, and meanwhile, everyone who doesn't pay is stuck in traffic! NO, you should not extend and you should give back the HOV lanes you took. You are discouraging people to carpool and allowing people who pay you to drive in single vehicles. You are acting against our environment and should be stopped immediately!
84	1:00pm	05/09/22	Email	PLEASE extend the express lanes to the San B county line! and do NOT make them HOV but only ExpressLanes. If they are HOV they get too crowded. Make people pay to use them and the traffic flows MUCH better! Thanks!
85	4:20 pm	05/09/22	Project Hotline	I want to make a payment on FastTrak that I have used on Saturday the 7th, around 1 pm. The license plate is 8UYR300. Just give me a call back at so I can give you my banking information to deduct the money. Thank you.
86	1:19am	05/10/22	Email	Hello,  I must say, I am not thrilled about this expresslane extension. My worry is over the fact that HOV's will no longer be able to use the HOV lane as it will be only an expresslane. For people like me who rely on the HOV lane from the 57 to the 605, this makes for traffic woes. I do not want to have to buy a transponder because of this. What I would recommend would be following the example of the expresslanes on the 15 in Escondido. Those lanes are for toll AND HOV, which can drive in the lanes for free without having to buy a transponder. This method would work well for these new expresslanes being built. Albeit that the 10 is far more densely travelled than the 15, I still believe this alternative idea would be a better solution. In my opinion anyway.
87	7:36am	05/10/22	Online Comment Form	Yes, please extend the expresslanes to the San Bernardino County line. I currently use the service from Covina to Downtown Los Angeles. It would speed up traveling East of the 605 Freeway. I hope this extension is done. I will sign up for it as soon as it is available. Thank you! We need these smart improvements to our Transportation systems to advance into the future that is coming our way.
88	5:30 pm	05/11/22	Comment Card	No toll lanes, we pay for the lanes and then have to pay again. Also, most of us don't use them because they become too expensive. This does not benefit the general public and only favors the rich.
89	6:00 pm	05/11/22	Comment Card	Prefer HOV and be added, not fast track which is great if you have no money- but for most folds (commuters) it's just another cost!
90	6:29pm	05/11/22	Online Comment Form	I'm for the two lane fast track. On the 10 fwy. I have no problem paying for fast track it saves me 10-20 minutes depending on what time of day I'm in it.
91	6:30 pm	05/11/22	Comment Card	Keep the Carpool (HOV) Lanes- begin to limit electric and hybrid access for high capacity vehicles for the 10 freeway.
92	2:43pm	05/12/22	Email	I oppose any part of this project that will lead to expansion of the highway system. There has been ample research that adding lanes does not reduce traffic, but causes MORE traffic via the induced demand principle. We need to take into consideration the irreversible environmental impacts caused by more CO2 in the atmosphere, more concrete which will add to the urban heat island effect, noise pollution, etc. This is a band-aid solution. As a tax paying resident of LA, I ask our city government start taking drastic measures to improve the lives of its people, not the fatten the wallets of oil and gas. Thank you.  Respectfully,
93	4:33 pm	05/12/22	Project Hotline	I was calling to give my thoughts on the I -10 expansion. I was hoping that you would do either options 3 or 4 which would include adding a lane to the carpool and/or converting both lanes into the new lane and the existing carpool lane into a fast track lane. Thank you. Good bye.
94	8:31am	05/12/22	Online Comment Form	Love the idea of fastrak.
95	6:28pm	05/13/22	Online Comment Form	Additional lane is short term fix and will just encourage more driving. Funds should be spent on making more regular mass transit options and extending rail network.
96		05/13/22	Comment Card	Alternative 3
97		05/13/22	Comment Card	Would like alternative #2
98		05/13/22	Comment Card	Putting a lane where it is pay to drive in communities that are not rich is not good for anybody except those benefiting monetarily. We don't need to extend this lane into BP and West Covina. We will only get more traffic for those that cant pay.
99		05/14/22	Comment Card	Against
100		05/14/22	Comment Card	No, we shouldn't have the express lane continued east or west bound. The citizens paid for this already!

101	8:35pm	05/16/22	Email	<p>Good evening,</p> <p>My neighbor just told me about this project, usually I wouldn't care but since my homes backyard wall is literally the 10 freeway off of Towne, this would affect me. I know this project is probably a couple years out if approved of any of the options 2-4. But how would this directly affect me and my home? I'm sure metro and cal trans have been in this predicament before with freeway widening and homes being in the way. What would be some examples that you can share. Anything would help.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Sent from my iPhone</p>
102	1:26pm	05/17/22	Online Comment Form	I support Alternatives 3 & 4 as more lanes are needed and as HOV or HOT will incentivise ride sharing.
103	1:16pm	05/19/22	Online Comment Form	Be sure to take into account the current tax payer money to make this project happen. Although the costs would be higher please make it affordable.
104	10:11am	05/20/22	Online Comment Form	I'm in favor of extending the Express Lanes. I've used the sparingly as I'm not a regular commuter. I would be more likely to travel this route when I have the option to pay for faster access.
105	1:09pm	05/20/22	Email	<p>Hi — I'm in favor of extending the I-10 toll lanes eastward from the 605.</p> <p>Perhaps just one lane would be enough?</p> <p>thanks,</p>
106	4:47pm	05/20/22	Online Comment Form	I drive the express lanes to/from work Monday-Friday. My HOV sticker is no longer good, so I do pay the full rates. I constantly see cars entering and exiting the lanes illegally daily. On the way to work today I saw 3 cars exit the carpool lanes illegally (in just a mile stretch!). I see cars enter the lanes illegally all the time on my drive home - they zoom into the lanes as soon as they are able and I enter as soon as legal but need to be careful of those who are zipping in before the entrance. Since the pandemic, everyone is in a hurry and the dangerous maneuvers they do on the road is mind boggling! I believe there were some type of cones or "sticks" installed to divide the lanes, but I think people just ran them over to enter/exit lanes.
107	9:56am	05/21/22	Online Comment Form	Leave the carpool the way it is. We don't need more construction on the 10 fwy.
108		05/21/22	Comment Card	I would like to know who pay for it! We the taxpayer pay for one and now its private.
109		05/21/22	Comment Card	Fix our damn potholes Stop putting po-po on the 10. Thanks.
110		05/21/22	Comment Card	Alternative 4-Dual HOV lanes too much traffic and California is already expensive. We are paying way too much with everything we to need something that doesn't charge to go to work.
111		05/21/22	Comment Card	Alt 3
112		05/23/22	Project Hotline	I use the Fast Track. I live in Pomona, and I go to Hollywood, every morning, to go to work for LA city. It's a very good thing for you guys to have the Fast Track all the way up to Pomona and maybe further. Because it helps me in the morning, when I go drive. It's really to help me avoid so much traffic and I'm paying my diligence in tactics and I greatly appreciate you guys. When you call the fast track the money, you can contribute it to schools, improve the community. I greatly appreciate it. Please, I am begging you guys, please extend this Fast Track. Let it go further from me and help me to have less stress in traffic. Thank you, and I greatly appreciate it. Have a good day.

113	11:15 am	05/24/22	Email	<p>South Coast Air Quality Management District (South Coast AQMD) staff appreciates the opportunity to comment on the above-mentioned document. Our comments are recommendations on the analysis of potential air quality impacts from the Proposed Project that should be included in the Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Assessment (EIR/EA). Please send a copy of the EIR/EA upon its completion and public release directly to South Coast AQMD as copies of the EIR/EA submitted to the State Clearinghouse are not forwarded. In addition, please send all appendices and technical documents related to the air quality, health risk, and greenhouse gas analyses and electronic versions of all emission calculation spreadsheets, and air quality modeling and health risk assessment input and output files (not PDF files). Any delays in providing all supporting documentation for our review will require additional review time beyond the end of the comment period.</p> <p>CEQA Air Quality Analysis</p> <p>Staff recommends that the Lead Agency use South Coast AQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook and website<sup>1</sup> as guidance when preparing the air quality and greenhouse gas analyses. It is also recommended that the Lead Agency use the CalEEMod2 land use emissions software, which can estimate pollutant emissions from typical land use development and is the only software model maintained by the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association.</p> <p>South Coast AQMD has developed both regional and localized significance thresholds. South Coast AQMD staff recommends that the Lead Agency quantify criteria pollutant emissions and compare the emissions to South Coast AQMD's CEQA regional pollutant emissions significance thresholds<sup>3</sup> and localized significance thresholds (LSTs)<sup>4</sup> to determine the Proposed Project's air quality impacts. The localized analysis can be conducted by either using the LST screening tables or performing dispersion modeling.</p> <p>The Lead Agency should identify any potential adverse air quality impacts that could occur from all phases of the Proposed Project and all air pollutant sources related to the Proposed Project. Air quality impacts from both construction (including demolition, if any) and operations should be calculated. Construction-related air quality impacts typically include, but are not limited to, emissions from the use of heavy-duty equipment from grading, earth-loading/unloading, paving, architectural coatings, off-road mobile sources (e.g., heavy-duty construction equipment) and on-road mobile sources (e.g., construction worker vehicle trips, material transport trips, and hauling trips). Operation-related air quality impacts may include, but are not limited to, emissions from stationary sources (e.g., boilers and air pollution control devices), area sources (e.g., solvents and coatings), and vehicular trips (e.g., on- and off-road tailpipe emissions and entrained dust). Air quality impacts from indirect sources, such as sources that generate or attract vehicular trips, should be included on the analysis. Furthermore, emissions from the overlapping construction and operational activities should be combined and compared to South Coast AQMD's regional air quality CEQA operational thresholds to determine the level of significance.</p> <p>If the Proposed Project generates diesel emissions from long-term construction or attracts diesel-fueled vehicular trips, especially heavy duty diesel-fueled vehicles, it is recommended that the Lead Agency perform a mobile source health risk assessment.</p> <p>In the event that implementation of the Proposed Project requires a permit from the South Coast AQMD, South Coast AQMD should be identified as a Responsible Agency for the Proposed Project in the EIR/EA. The assumptions in the air quality analysis in the EIR will be the basis for evaluating the permit under CEQA and imposing permit conditions and limits. Questions on permits should be directed to South Coast AQMD's Engineering and Permitting staff at 909-396-3385.....</p>
114	10:15am	05/25/22	Online Comment Form	N/A
115	10:15am	05/25/22	Online Comment Form	N/A
116	2:43pm	05/25/22	Online Comment Form	I strongly oppose expanding our freeways. Tolls are inequitable. Please find an equitable, environmentally sensitive solution that does not involve adding lanes or tolls.
117	2:47pm	05/25/22	Online Comment Form	I really think we should not expand the freeway anymore because it's bad for the environment. I also think the express lanes are only for wealthy people and disadvantage lower income residents. I think if there is money to be spent we should spend it on public transportation or bus lanes or something that is for everyone.
118	3:09pm	05/25/22	Online Comment Form	<p>The I-10 ExpressLanes Extension Project Suggestion:</p> <p>Alternative 1: Existing conditions (no build)</p> <p>We need to look at alternative forms of transit, not expanding our freeways that we can't properly maintain.</p>
119	5:49 pm	05/25/22	Email	<p>I fully support option #3: Adding an additional ExpressLane/HOT lane in each direction and converting the existing HOV lane to an ExpressLane</p> <p>As a family, we fully utilize the existing HOV/Toll lanes. We find the two HOV/Toll lanes on the 110 to be so helpful (and wish those would be extended through DTLA), but we find the I-10 lanes to be far too short as they are currently configured. We would love to see them extended to the San Berdoo Co. Line. We are MetroExpress Fast Pass holders. Thanks for considering our input.</p>
120	5:49 pm	05/25/22	Email	<p>I fully support option #3: Adding an additional ExpressLane/HOT lane in each direction and converting the existing HOV lane to an ExpressLane</p> <p>As a family, we fully utilize the existing HOV/Toll lanes. We find the two HOV/Toll lanes on the 110 to be so helpful (and wish those would be extended through DTLA), but we find the I-10 lanes to be far too short as they are currently configured. We would love to see them extended to the San Berdoo Co. Line. We are MetroExpress Fast Pass holders. Thanks for considering our input.</p>

121	8:01am	05/25/22	Online Comment Form	I am a resident of Chino Hills but a frequent traveler to Los Angeles. While I love living in Chino Hills, the fact is that there are much better opportunities for people with my educational background in Los Angeles. I recently booked a job in LA and when I discovered the I-10 expressway, it was like finding a mini miracle. It easily shaves off ten to fifteen minutes off my commute. When I read the plan to expand it to the San Bernardino County line, my heart sang with hope. As someone who lives on the county line, this expressway would open up more opportunity for jobs within my desired field by making my commutes safer, more efficient, and shorter. Thank you for considering this option.
122	10:23 am	05/26/22	Email	Dear Metro, I am an SGV resident who cares about my community, the people who live in it, and the air we breathe. I therefore do not support any I-10 ExpressLanes "extension" projects that will destroy people's homes, encourage more vehicle trips, and further pollute some of the most pollution-burdened communities in California. Vehicle trips, including on freeways like I-10, are the main source of local air pollution in southern California, which remains one of the most polluted regions in the United States. The outcomes of such poor air quality are devastating, especially to the most vulnerable members of inland and frontline communities. High rates of asthma and other respiratory illnesses, as well as cognitive impairments, some cancers, and even obesity have all been linked to exposure to high levels of air pollution. The cost of these health disparities -- particularly longterm, chronic illnesses associated with air pollution such as asthma -- is billions in associated healthcare and diminished productivity to LA County. Vehicles on roads and highways are primarily responsible for over half of all GHG emissions in California when one accounts for emissions related to the extraction, processing, and distribution of oil. Los Angeles County and California will not reach their climate goals unless future transportation investments reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) per capita. Adding more lanes doesn't reduce traffic, but it does increase VMT. The outcome of roadway widening and expansion is settled science. In 2017 the Governor's Office of Planning and Research advised agencies that "each percent increase in lane miles results in a 1.03 percent increase in vehicle travel" (Source: pg. 29 - <a href="http://opr.ca.gov/docs/20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf">http://opr.ca.gov/docs/20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf</a> ). Even Caltrans has acknowledged this fact in its "Rethinking How We Build So Californians Can Drive Less" (webpage Caltrans states that "[w]hen highways are expanded, a series of changes occur, often resulting in more trips and longer travel times, as people are forced to drive farther to get to work and other destinations. Induced demand creates more traffic at greater cost to people and the environment, while worsening congestion." (Source: <a href="https://dot.ca.gov/programs/sustainability/sb-743">https://dot.ca.gov/programs/sustainability/sb-743</a> )). Metro projects should not increase GHG emissions. You have a chance to prevent this. In light of the above, only Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 are viable options. Displacement, more pollution, and more GHG emissions can not be an option. Please eliminate Alternatives 3 and 4 from consideration. Thank you,
123	10:23 am	05/26/22	Email	Dear Metro, It is astonishing to me that freeway widening projects are still being considered. Widening displaces residents, increases pollution, and can reasonably be described as climate arson. I beg you to strike alternatives 3 and 4 from consideration. I live near the 10 and use it to travel fairly often and I do not want it widened. Thank you,  SGV Resident
124	10:40 am	05/26/22	Email	Dear Metro, I am an LA resident who cares about my community, the people who live in it, and the air we breathe. I therefore do not support any I-10 ExpressLanes "extension" projects that will destroy people's homes, encourage more vehicle trips, and further pollute some of the most pollution-burdened communities in California. Vehicle trips, including on freeways like I-10, are the main source of local air pollution in southern California, which remains one of the most polluted regions in the United States. The outcomes of such poor air quality are devastating, especially to the most vulnerable members of inland and frontline communities. High rates of asthma and other respiratory illnesses, as well as cognitive impairments, some cancers, and even obesity have all been linked to exposure to high levels of air pollution. The cost of these health disparities -- particularly longterm, chronic illnesses associated with air pollution such as asthma -- is billions in associated healthcare and diminished productivity to LA County. Vehicles on roads and highways are primarily responsible for over half of all GHG emissions in California when one accounts for emissions related to the extraction, processing, and distribution of oil. Los Angeles County and California will not reach their climate goals unless future transportation investments reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) per capita. Adding more lanes doesn't reduce traffic, but it does increase VMT. The outcome of roadway widening and expansion is settled science. In 2017 the Governor's Office of Planning and Research advised agencies that "each percent increase in lane miles results in a 1.03 percent increase in vehicle travel" (Source: pg. 29 - <a href="http://opr.ca.gov/docs/20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf">http://opr.ca.gov/docs/20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf</a> ). Even Caltrans has acknowledged this fact in its "Rethinking How We Build So Californians Can Drive Less" (webpage Caltrans states that "[w]hen highways are expanded, a series of changes occur, often resulting in more trips and longer travel times, as people are forced to drive farther to get to work and other destinations. Induced demand creates more traffic at greater cost to people and the environment, while worsening congestion." (Source: <a href="https://dot.ca.gov/programs/sustainability/sb-743">https://dot.ca.gov/programs/sustainability/sb-743</a> )). Metro projects should not increase GHG emissions. You have a chance to prevent this. In light of the above, only Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 are viable options. Displacement, more pollution, and more GHG emissions can not be an option. Please eliminate Alternatives 3 and 4 from consideration. Thank you,
125	10:50 am	05/26/22	Email	Dear Metro, I am an Alhambra (SGV) resident who cares about my community, the people who live in it, and the air we breathe. I therefore do not support any I-10 ExpressLanes "extension" projects that will destroy people's homes, encourage more vehicle trips, and further pollute some of the most pollution-burdened communities in California. Vehicle trips, including on freeways like I-10, are the main source of local air pollution in southern California, which remains one of the most polluted regions in the United States. The outcomes of such poor air quality are devastating, especially to the most vulnerable members of inland and frontline communities. High rates of asthma and other respiratory illnesses, as well as cognitive impairments, some cancers, and even obesity have all been linked to exposure to high levels of air pollution. The cost of these health disparities -- particularly longterm, chronic illnesses associated with air pollution such as asthma -- is billions in associated healthcare and diminished productivity to LA County. Vehicles on roads and highways are primarily responsible for over half of all GHG emissions in California when one accounts for emissions related to the extraction, processing, and distribution of oil. Los Angeles County and California will not reach their climate goals unless future transportation investments reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) per capita. Adding more lanes doesn't reduce traffic, but it does increase VMT. The outcome of roadway widening and expansion is settled science. In 2017 the Governor's Office of Planning and Research advised agencies that "each percent increase in lane miles results in a 1.03 percent increase in vehicle travel" (Source: pg. 29 - <a href="http://opr.ca.gov/docs/20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf">http://opr.ca.gov/docs/20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf</a> ). Even Caltrans has acknowledged this fact in its "Rethinking How We Build So Californians Can Drive Less" (webpage Caltrans states that "[w]hen highways are expanded, a series of changes occur, often resulting in more trips and longer travel times, as people are forced to drive farther to get to work and other destinations. Induced demand creates more traffic at greater cost to people and the environment, while worsening congestion." (Source: <a href="https://dot.ca.gov/programs/sustainability/sb-743">https://dot.ca.gov/programs/sustainability/sb-743</a> )). Metro projects should not increase GHG emissions. You have a chance to prevent this. In light of the above, only Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 are viable options. Displacement, more pollution, and more GHG emissions can not be an option. Please eliminate Alternatives 3 and 4 from consideration.

126	11:08 am	05/26/22	Email	<p>Dear Metro,</p> <p>I am an SGV resident who cares about my community, the people who live in it, and the air we breathe. I therefore do not support any I-10 ExpressLanes "extension" projects that will destroy people's homes, encourage more vehicle trips, and further pollute some of the most pollution-burdened communities in California.</p> <p>Vehicle trips, including on freeways like I-10, are the main source of local air pollution in southern California, which remains one of the most polluted regions in the United States. The outcomes of such poor air quality are devastating, especially to the most vulnerable members of inland and frontline communities. High rates of asthma and other respiratory illnesses, as well as cognitive impairments, some cancers, and even obesity have all been linked to exposure to high levels of air pollution. The cost of these health disparities -- particularly longterm, chronic illnesses associated with air pollution such as asthma -- is billions in associated healthcare and diminished productivity to LA County.</p> <p>Vehicles on roads and highways are primarily responsible for over half of all GHG emissions in California when one accounts for emissions related to the extraction, processing, and distribution of oil. Los Angeles County and California will not reach their climate goals unless future transportation investments reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) per capita.</p> <p>Adding more lanes doesn't reduce traffic, but it does increase VMT. The outcome of roadway widening and expansion is settled science. In 2017 the Governor's Office of Planning and Research advised agencies that "each percent increase in lane miles results in a 1.03 percent increase in vehicle travel" (Source: pg. 29 - <a href="http://opr.ca.gov/docs/20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf">http://opr.ca.gov/docs/20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf</a>). Even Caltrans has acknowledged this fact In its "Rethinking How We Build So Californians Can Drive Less" ( webpage Caltrans states that "[w]hen highways are expanded, a series of changes occur, often resulting in more trips and longer travel times, as people are forced to drive farther to get to work and other destinations. Induced demand creates more traffic at greater cost to people and the environment, while worsening congestion." (Source: <a href="https://dot.ca.gov/programs/sustainability/sb-743">https://dot.ca.gov/programs/sustainability/sb-743</a>).</p> <p>Metro projects should not increase GHG emissions. You have a chance to prevent this. In light of the above, only Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 are viable options. Displacement, more pollution, and more GHG emissions can not be an option. Please eliminate Alternatives 3 and 4 from consideration.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>
127	11:14 pm	05/26/22	Email	<p>Dear Metro,</p> <p>I am an SGV resident who cares about my community, the people who live in it, and the air we breathe. I therefore do not support any I-10 ExpressLanes "extension" projects that will destroy people's homes, encourage more vehicle trips, and further pollute some of the most pollution-burdened communities in California.</p> <p>Vehicle trips, including on freeways like I-10, are the main source of local air pollution in southern California, which remains one of the most polluted regions in the United States. The outcomes of such poor air quality are devastating, especially to the most vulnerable members of inland and frontline communities. High rates of asthma and other respiratory illnesses, as well as cognitive impairments, some cancers, and even obesity have all been linked to exposure to high levels of air pollution. The cost of these health disparities -- particularly longterm, chronic illnesses associated with air pollution such as asthma -- is billions in associated healthcare and diminished productivity to LA County.</p> <p>Vehicles on roads and highways are primarily responsible for over half of all GHG emissions in California when one accounts for emissions related to the extraction, processing, and distribution of oil. Los Angeles County and California will not reach their climate goals unless future transportation investments reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) per capita.</p> <p>Adding more lanes doesn't reduce traffic, but it does increase VMT. The outcome of roadway widening and expansion is settled science. In 2017 the Governor's Office of Planning and Research advised agencies that "each percent increase in lane miles results in a 1.03 percent increase in vehicle travel" (Source: pg. 29 - <a href="http://opr.ca.gov/docs/20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf">http://opr.ca.gov/docs/20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf</a>). Even Caltrans has acknowledged this fact In its "Rethinking How We Build So Californians Can Drive Less" ( webpage Caltrans states that "[w]hen highways are expanded, a series of changes occur, often resulting in more trips and longer travel times, as people are forced to drive farther to get to work and other destinations. Induced demand creates more traffic at greater cost to people and the environment, while worsening congestion." (Source: <a href="https://dot.ca.gov/programs/sustainability/sb-743">https://dot.ca.gov/programs/sustainability/sb-743</a>).</p> <p>Metro projects should not increase GHG emissions. You have a chance to prevent this. In light of the above, only Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 are viable options. Displacement, more pollution, and more GHG emissions can not be an option. Please eliminate Alternatives 3 and 4 from consideration.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>
128	11:57 am	05/26/22	Email	<p>Dear Metro, I am an SGV resident who cares about my community, the people who live in it, and the air we breathe. I therefore do not support any I-10 ExpressLanes "extension" projects that will destroy people's homes, encourage more vehicle trips, and further pollute some of the most pollution-burdened communities in California.</p> <p>Vehicle trips, including on freeways like I-10, are the main source of local air pollution in southern California, which remains one of the most polluted regions in the United States. The outcomes of such poor air quality are devastating, especially to the most vulnerable members of inland and frontline communities. High rates of asthma and other respiratory illnesses, as well as cognitive impairments, some cancers, and even obesity have all been linked to exposure to high levels of air pollution. The cost of these health disparities -- particularly longterm, chronic illnesses associated with air pollution such as asthma -- is billions in associated healthcare and diminished productivity to LA County.</p> <p>Vehicles on roads and highways are primarily responsible for over half of all GHG emissions in California when one accounts for emissions related to the extraction, processing, and distribution of oil. Los Angeles County and California will not reach their climate goals unless future transportation investments reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) per capita.</p> <p>Adding more lanes doesn't reduce traffic, but it does increase VMT. The outcome of roadway widening and expansion is settled science. In 2017 the Governor's Office of Planning and Research advised agencies that "each percent increase in lane miles results in a 1.03 percent increase in vehicle travel" (Source: pg. 29 - <a href="http://opr.ca.gov/docs/20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf">http://opr.ca.gov/docs/20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf</a>). Even Caltrans has acknowledged this fact In its "Rethinking How We Build So Californians Can Drive Less" ( webpage Caltrans states that "[w]hen highways are expanded, a series of changes occur, often resulting in more trips and longer travel times, as people are forced to drive farther to get to work and other destinations. Induced demand creates more traffic at greater cost to people and the environment, while worsening congestion." (Source: <a href="https://dot.ca.gov/programs/sustainability/sb-743">https://dot.ca.gov/programs/sustainability/sb-743</a>).</p> <p>Metro projects should not increase GHG emissions. You have a chance to prevent this. In light of the above, only Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 are viable options. Displacement, more pollution, and more GHG emissions can not be an option. Please eliminate Alternatives 3 and 4 from consideration. Thank you,</p>
129	12:11pm	05/26/22	Online Comment Form	<p>I think changing to HOV or FastTrack makes sense; however, any increase in lanes or other widening of the freeway is a complete non-starter for men and should be for you as well. Time and time again, Metro has been wasting money attempting to push through freeway widening projects that not only are not wanted by many groups of people, but do not work at alleviating the problem. At least rail and BRT project that might not be wanted can still achieve the desired effect of reducing VMT, the number of cars on the street, reducing GHG emissions, and pushing LA to a more sustainable future. Freeway project do nothing like that. Stop spending the money on Freeway and move it to transit.</p>
130	1:35pm	05/26/22	Online Comment Form	<p>I think having two regular hov lanes on the 10 freeway from the 605 to Pomona is a great idea. It doesn't get congested enough to make it a toll hov lanes.</p>

131	2:03 pm	05/26/22	Email	<p>Dear Metro,</p> <p>As a San Gabriel Valley resident who cares about my community, the people who live in it, and the air we breathe. I therefore do not support any I-10 ExpressLanes "extension" projects that will destroy people's homes, encourage more vehicle trips, and further pollute some of the most pollution-burdened communities in California.</p> <p>Vehicle trips, including on freeways like I-10, are the main source of local air pollution in southern California, which remains one of the most polluted regions in the United States. The outcomes of such poor air quality are devastating, especially to the most vulnerable members of inland and frontline communities. High rates of asthma and other respiratory illnesses, as well as cognitive impairments, some cancers, and even obesity have all been linked to exposure to high levels of air pollution. The cost of these health disparities -- particularly longterm, chronic illnesses associated with air pollution such as asthma -- is billions in associated healthcare and diminished productivity to LA County.</p> <p>Vehicles on roads and highways are primarily responsible for over half of all GHG emissions in California when one accounts for emissions related to the extraction, processing, and distribution of oil. Los Angeles County and California will not reach their climate goals unless future transportation investments reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) per capita.</p> <p>Adding more lanes doesn't reduce traffic, but it does increase VMT. The outcome of roadway widening and expansion is settled science. In 2017 the Governor's Office of Planning and Research advised agencies that "each percent increase in lane miles results in a 1.03 percent increase in vehicle travel" (Source: pg. 29 - <a href="http://opr.ca.gov/docs/20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf">http://opr.ca.gov/docs/20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf</a>). Even Caltrans has acknowledged this fact In its "Rethinking How We Build So Californians Can Drive Less" ( webpage Caltrans states that "[w]hen highways are expanded, a series of changes occur, often resulting in more trips and longer travel times, as people are forced to drive farther to get to work and other destinations. Induced demand creates more traffic at greater cost to people and the environment, while worsening congestion." (Source: <a href="https://dot.ca.gov/programs/sustainability/sb-743">https://dot.ca.gov/programs/sustainability/sb-743</a>).</p> <p>Metro projects should not increase GHG emissions. You have a chance to prevent this. In light of the above, only Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 are viable options. Displacement, more pollution, and more GHG emissions can not be an option.</p> <p>Please eliminate Alternatives 3 and 4 from consideration.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>
132	2:15 pm	05/26/22	Email	<p>Dear Metro,</p> <p>I am an SGV resident who cares about my community, the people who live in it, and the air we breathe. I therefore do not support any I-10 ExpressLanes "extension" projects that will destroy people's homes, encourage more vehicle trips, and further pollute some of the most pollution-burdened communities in California.</p> <p>Vehicle trips, including on freeways like I-10, are the main source of local air pollution in southern California, which remains one of the most polluted regions in the United States. The outcomes of such poor air quality are devastating, especially to the most vulnerable members of inland and frontline communities. High rates of asthma and other respiratory illnesses, as well as cognitive impairments, some cancers, and even obesity have all been linked to exposure to high levels of air pollution. The cost of these health disparities -- particularly longterm, chronic illnesses associated with air pollution such as asthma -- is billions in associated healthcare and diminished productivity to LA County.</p> <p>Vehicles on roads and highways are primarily responsible for over half of all GHG emissions in California when one accounts for emissions related to the extraction, processing, and distribution of oil. Los Angeles County and California will not reach their climate goals unless future transportation investments reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) per capita.</p> <p>Adding more lanes doesn't reduce traffic, but it does increase VMT. The outcome of roadway widening and expansion is settled science. In 2017 the Governor's Office of Planning and Research advised agencies that "each percent increase in lane miles results in a 1.03 percent increase in vehicle travel" (Source: pg. 29 - <a href="http://opr.ca.gov/docs/20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf">http://opr.ca.gov/docs/20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf</a>). Even Caltrans has acknowledged this fact In its "Rethinking How We Build So Californians Can Drive Less" ( webpage Caltrans states that "[w]hen highways are expanded, a series of changes occur, often resulting in more trips and longer travel times, as people are forced to drive farther to get to work and other destinations. Induced demand creates more traffic at greater cost to people and the environment, while worsening congestion." (Source: <a href="https://dot.ca.gov/programs/sustainability/sb-743">https://dot.ca.gov/programs/sustainability/sb-743</a>).</p> <p>Metro projects should not increase GHG emissions. You have a chance to prevent this. In light of the above, only Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 are viable options. Displacement, more pollution, and more GHG emissions can not be an option.</p> <p>Please eliminate Alternatives 3 and 4 from consideration.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>
133	4:30 pm	05/26/22	Email	<p>Dear Metro,</p> <p>I am an SGV resident who cares about my community, the people who live in it, and the air we breathe. I therefore do not support any I-10 ExpressLanes "extension" projects that will destroy people's homes, encourage more vehicle trips, and further pollute some of the most pollution-burdened communities in California.</p> <p>Vehicle trips, including on freeways like I-10, are the main source of local air pollution in southern California, which remains one of the most polluted regions in the United States. The outcomes of such poor air quality are devastating, especially to the most vulnerable members of inland and frontline communities. High rates of asthma and other respiratory illnesses, as well as cognitive impairments, some cancers, and even obesity have all been linked to exposure to high levels of air pollution. The cost of these health disparities -- particularly longterm, chronic illnesses associated with air pollution such as asthma -- is billions in associated healthcare and diminished productivity to LA County.</p> <p>Vehicles on roads and highways are primarily responsible for over half of all GHG emissions in California when one accounts for emissions related to the extraction, processing, and distribution of oil. Los Angeles County and California will not reach their climate goals unless future transportation investments reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) per capita.</p> <p>Adding more lanes doesn't reduce traffic, but it does increase VMT. The outcome of roadway widening and expansion is settled science. In 2017 the Governor's Office of Planning and Research advised agencies that "each percent increase in lane miles results in a 1.03 percent increase in vehicle travel" (Source: pg. 29 - <a href="http://opr.ca.gov/docs/20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf">http://opr.ca.gov/docs/20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf</a>). Even Caltrans has acknowledged this fact In its "Rethinking How We Build So Californians Can Drive Less" ( webpage Caltrans states that "[w]hen highways are expanded, a series of changes occur, often resulting in more trips and longer travel times, as people are forced to drive farther to get to work and other destinations. Induced demand creates more traffic at greater cost to people and the environment, while worsening congestion." (Source: <a href="https://dot.ca.gov/programs/sustainability/sb-743">https://dot.ca.gov/programs/sustainability/sb-743</a>).</p> <p>Metro projects should not increase GHG emissions. You have a chance to prevent this. In light of the above, only Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 are viable options. Displacement, more pollution, and more GHG emissions can not be an option.</p> <p>Please eliminate Alternatives 3 and 4 from consideration.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>
134		05/26/22	Comment Card	Alternativo 4
135		05/26/22	Comment Card	En nuestra opinion el carpool de 2 carriles para mejoras el trafico.
136		05/26/22	Comment Card	I think Alternative 4-Dual HOV Lanes would be better and easier for us to get to places.

137	10:15 am	05/27/22	Email	<p>Hi there,</p> <p>I would like to enter a public comment regarding scoping of the I-10 ExpressLanes Extension Project. From an environmental perspective, we need to be reducing greenhouse gas emissions. To do so, we need to find ways to move people out of cars and more into public transportation. From that perspective, Alternative 2, converting the existing HOV lane to an HOT lane, is clearly the best option. By performing this conversion, and changing the HOV rules of the lane to require 3+ passengers instead of just 2, we can increase the speed of traffic in the existing HOV lane, and generate funding for better public transportation alternatives like more frequent bus service. Alternative 3 is an inferior option since it requires highway widening, which we know will increase the total number of cars on the highway and hence will increase greenhouse emissions. Alternatives 1 and 4 are even worse since they do not introduce tolling to manage demand and generate revenue for public transportation.</p> <p>I believe Alternative 2 should be strongly considered, even though it does not exactly match what has already been done on other segments of I-10. At some point, for the sake of future generations, we need to draw the line and say no to more highway widening.</p> <p>Best regards,</p>
138	10:21 am	05/27/22	Email	<p>Dear Metro,</p> <p>I am an SGV resident who cares about my community, the people who live in it, and the air we breathe. I therefore do not support any I-10 ExpressLanes "extension" projects that will destroy people's homes, encourage more vehicle trips, and further pollute some of the most pollution-burdened communities in California.</p> <p>Vehicle trips, including on freeways like I-10, are the main source of local air pollution in southern California, which remains one of the most polluted regions in the United States. The outcomes of such poor air quality are devastating, especially to the most vulnerable members of inland and frontline communities. High rates of asthma and other respiratory illnesses, as well as cognitive impairments, some cancers, and even obesity have all been linked to exposure to high levels of air pollution. The cost of these health disparities -- particularly longterm, chronic illnesses associated with air pollution such as asthma -- is billions in associated healthcare and diminished productivity to LA County.</p> <p>Vehicles on roads and highways are primarily responsible for over half of all GHG emissions in California when one accounts for emissions related to the extraction, processing, and distribution of oil. Los Angeles County and California will not reach their climate goals unless future transportation investments reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) per capita.</p> <p>Adding more lanes doesn't reduce traffic, but it does increase VMT. The outcome of roadway widening and expansion is settled science. In 2017 the Governor's Office of Planning and Research advised agencies that "each percent increase in lane miles results in a 1.03 percent increase in vehicle travel" (Source: pg. 29 - <a href="http://opr.ca.gov/docs/20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf">http://opr.ca.gov/docs/20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf</a>). Even Caltrans has acknowledged this fact In its "Rethinking How We Build So Californians Can Drive Less" ( webpage Caltrans states that "[w]hen highways are expanded, a series of changes occur, often resulting in more trips and longer travel times, as people are forced to drive farther to get to work and other destinations. Induced demand creates more traffic at greater cost to people and the environment, while worsening congestion." (Source: <a href="https://dot.ca.gov/programs/sustainability/sb-743">https://dot.ca.gov/programs/sustainability/sb-743</a>).</p> <p>Metro projects should not increase GHG emissions. You have a chance to prevent this. In light of the above, only Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 are viable options. Displacement, more pollution, and more GHG emissions can not be an option.</p> <p>Please eliminate Alternatives 3 and 4 from consideration.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>
139	10:39 am	05/27/22	Email	<p>Dear Metro,</p> <p>I am an SGV resident who cares about my community, the people who live in it, and the air we breathe. I therefore do not support any I-10 ExpressLanes "extension" projects that will destroy people's homes, encourage more vehicle trips, and further pollute some of the most pollution-burdened communities in California.</p> <p>Vehicle trips, including on freeways like I-10, are the main source of local air pollution in southern California, which remains one of the most polluted regions in the United States. The outcomes of such poor air quality are devastating, especially to the most vulnerable members of inland and frontline communities. High rates of asthma and other respiratory illnesses, as well as cognitive impairments, some cancers, and even obesity have all been linked to exposure to high levels of air pollution. The cost of these health disparities -- particularly longterm, chronic illnesses associated with air pollution such as asthma -- is billions in associated healthcare and diminished productivity to LA County.</p> <p>Vehicles on roads and highways are primarily responsible for over half of all GHG emissions in California when one accounts for emissions related to the extraction, processing, and distribution of oil. Los Angeles County and California will not reach their climate goals unless future transportation investments reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) per capita.</p> <p>Adding more lanes doesn't reduce traffic, but it does increase VMT. The outcome of roadway widening and expansion is settled science. In 2017 the Governor's Office of Planning and Research advised agencies that "each percent increase in lane miles results in a 1.03 percent increase in vehicle travel" (Source: pg. 29 - <a href="http://opr.ca.gov/docs/20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf">http://opr.ca.gov/docs/20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf</a>). Even Caltrans has acknowledged this fact In its "Rethinking How We Build So Californians Can Drive Less" ( webpage Caltrans states that "[w]hen highways are expanded, a series of changes occur, often resulting in more trips and longer travel times, as people are forced to drive farther to get to work and other destinations. Induced demand creates more traffic at greater cost to people and the environment, while worsening congestion." (Source: <a href="https://dot.ca.gov/programs/sustainability/sb-743">https://dot.ca.gov/programs/sustainability/sb-743</a>).</p> <p>Metro projects should not increase GHG emissions. You have a chance to prevent this. In light of the above, only Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 are viable options. Displacement, more pollution, and more GHG emissions can not be an option.</p> <p>Please eliminate Alternatives 3 and 4 from consideration.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>
140	10:44am	05/27/22	Online Comment Form	<p>Please do not add more lanes to the 10 freeway. Metro should be looking at ways to help commuters find alternative means of transportation. The 10 freeway is ALWAYS under construction and even though we are promised more lanes, better traffic flow, etc; commuters will be stuck in traffic for another 2 years due to construction!</p> <p>I do not agree with trying to make extra HOV Fast pass lanes either as they appear to be a money grab for Metro. They exclude many commuters who are not able to retain a running balance and direct debit withdrawals every so often. Not everyone can maintain a bank account to have extra funds for commuting, especially with inflation affecting so many people.</p> <p>So please, again, do not widen the 10 freeway. It won't alleviate traffic, we need to change our culture to accept more alternative means of public transportation.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>

141	11:18 am	05/27/22	Email	<p>I am an SGV resident who cares about my community, the people who live in it, and the air we breathe. I therefore do not support any I-10 ExpressLanes "extension" projects that will destroy people's homes, encourage more vehicle trips, and further pollute some of the most pollution-burdened communities in California.</p> <p>Vehicle trips, including on freeways like I-10, are the main source of local air pollution in southern California, which remains one of the most polluted regions in the United States. The outcomes of such poor air quality are devastating, especially to the most vulnerable members of inland and frontline communities. High rates of asthma and other respiratory illnesses, as well as cognitive impairments, some cancers, and even obesity have all been linked to exposure to high levels of air pollution. The cost of these health disparities -- particularly long-term, chronic illnesses associated with air pollution such as asthma -- is billions in associated healthcare and diminished productivity to LA County.</p> <p>Vehicles on roads and highways are primarily responsible for over half of all GHG emissions in California when one accounts for emissions related to the extraction, processing, and distribution of oil. Los Angeles County and California will not reach their climate goals unless future transportation investments reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) per capita.</p> <p>Adding more lanes doesn't reduce traffic, but it does increase VMT. The outcome of roadway widening and expansion is settled science. In 2017 the Governor's Office of Planning and Research advised agencies that "each percent increase in lane miles results in a 1.03 percent increase in vehicle travel" (Source: pg. 29 - <a href="http://opr.ca.gov/docs/20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf">http://opr.ca.gov/docs/20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf</a>). Even Caltrans has acknowledged this fact In its "Rethinking How We Build So Californians Can Drive Less" ( webpage Caltrans states that "[w]hen highways are expanded, a series of changes occur, often resulting in more trips and longer travel times, as people are forced to drive farther to get to work and other destinations. Induced demand creates more traffic at greater cost to people and the environment, while worsening congestion." (Source: <a href="https://dot.ca.gov/programs/sustainability/sb-743">https://dot.ca.gov/programs/sustainability/sb-743</a>).</p> <p>Metro projects should not increase GHG emissions. You have a chance to prevent this. In light of the above, only Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 are viable options. Displacement, more pollution, and more GHG emissions can not be an option.</p> <p>Please eliminate Alternatives 3 and 4 from consideration.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
142	11:18 am	05/27/22	Email	<p>Dear Metro,</p> <p>I am an SGV resident who cares about my community, the people who live in it, and the air we breathe. I therefore do not support any I-10 ExpressLanes "extension" projects that will destroy people's homes, encourage more vehicle trips, and further pollute some of the most pollution-burdened communities in California.</p> <p>Vehicle trips, including on freeways like I-10, are the main source of local air pollution in southern California, which remains one of the most polluted regions in the United States. The outcomes of such poor air quality are devastating, especially to the most vulnerable members of inland and frontline communities. High rates of asthma and other respiratory illnesses, as well as cognitive impairments, some cancers, and even obesity have all been linked to exposure to high levels of air pollution. The cost of these health disparities -- particularly longterm, chronic illnesses associated with air pollution such as asthma -- is billions in associated healthcare and diminished productivity to LA County.</p> <p>Vehicles on roads and highways are primarily responsible for over half of all GHG emissions in California when one accounts for emissions related to the extraction, processing, and distribution of oil. Los Angeles County and California will not reach their climate goals unless future transportation investments reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) per capita.</p> <p>Adding more lanes doesn't reduce traffic, but it does increase VMT. The outcome of roadway widening and expansion is settled science. In 2017 the Governor's Office of Planning and Research advised agencies that "each percent increase in lane miles results in a 1.03 percent increase in vehicle travel" (Source: pg. 29 - <a href="http://opr.ca.gov/docs/20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf">http://opr.ca.gov/docs/20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf</a>). Even Caltrans has acknowledged this fact In its "Rethinking How We Build So Californians Can Drive Less" ( webpage Caltrans states that "[w]hen highways are expanded, a series of changes occur, often resulting in more trips and longer travel times, as people are forced to drive farther to get to work and other destinations. Induced demand creates more traffic at greater cost to people and the environment, while worsening congestion." (Source: <a href="https://dot.ca.gov/programs/sustainability/sb-743">https://dot.ca.gov/programs/sustainability/sb-743</a>).</p> <p>Metro projects should not increase GHG emissions. You have a chance to prevent this. In light of the above, only Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 are viable options. Displacement, more pollution, and more GHG emissions can not be an option.</p> <p>Please eliminate Alternatives 3 and 4 from consideration.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>
143	2:50 pm	05/27/22	Email	<p>I am an SGV resident who cares about my community, the people who live in it, and the air we breathe. I therefore do not support any I-10 ExpressLanes "extension" projects that will destroy people's homes, encourage more vehicle trips, and further pollute some of the most pollution-burdened communities in California.</p> <p>Vehicle trips, including on freeways like I-10, are the main source of local air pollution in southern California, which remains one of the most polluted regions in the United States. The outcomes of such poor air quality are devastating, especially to the most vulnerable members of inland and frontline communities. High rates of asthma and other respiratory illnesses, as well as cognitive impairments, some cancers, and even obesity have all been linked to exposure to high levels of air pollution. The cost of these health disparities -- particularly long-term, chronic illnesses associated with air pollution such as asthma -- is billions in associated healthcare and diminished productivity to LA County.</p> <p>Vehicles on roads and highways are primarily responsible for over half of all GHG emissions in California when one accounts for emissions related to the extraction, processing, and distribution of oil. Los Angeles County and California will not reach their climate goals unless future transportation investments reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) per capita.</p> <p>Adding more lanes doesn't reduce traffic, but it does increase VMT. The outcome of roadway widening and expansion is settled science. In 2017 the Governor's Office of Planning and Research advised agencies that "each percent increase in lane miles results in a 1.03 percent increase in vehicle travel" (Source: pg. 29 - <a href="http://opr.ca.gov/docs/20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf">http://opr.ca.gov/docs/20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf</a>). Even Caltrans has acknowledged this fact In its "Rethinking How We Build So Californians Can Drive Less" ( webpage Caltrans states that "[w]hen highways are expanded, a series of changes occur, often resulting in more trips and longer travel times, as people are forced to drive farther to get to work and other destinations. Induced demand creates more traffic at greater cost to people and the environment, while worsening congestion." (Source: <a href="https://dot.ca.gov/programs/sustainability/sb-743">https://dot.ca.gov/programs/sustainability/sb-743</a>).</p> <p>Metro projects should not increase GHG emissions. You have a chance to prevent this. In light of the above, only Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 are viable options. Displacement, more pollution, and more GHG emissions can not be an option.</p> <p>Please eliminate Alternatives 3 and 4 from consideration.</p> <p>Thank you</p>
144	3:27 pm	05/27/22	Email	<p>Dear Metro,</p> <p>I'm writing to oppose the 10 freeway widening proposal. This project would only lead to more displacement, destruction, and pollution. The widening alternatives (3 and 4) are non-starters and would negatively affect our community. Only alternatives 1 and 2 are aligned with official commitments to protecting public health, people's homes, and the climate. I really hope you take the people and community in mind when making your decisions. Thank you.</p>

145	5:14 pm	05/27/22	Email	<p>Dear Metro,</p> <p>I am an SGV resident who cares about my community, the people who live in it, and the air we breathe. I therefore do not support any I-10 ExpressLanes "extension" projects that will destroy people's homes, encourage more vehicle trips, and further pollute some of the most pollution-burdened communities in California.</p> <p>Vehicle trips, including on freeways like I-10, are the main source of local air pollution in southern California, which remains one of the most polluted regions in the United States. The outcomes of such poor air quality are devastating, especially to the most vulnerable members of inland and frontline communities. High rates of asthma and other respiratory illnesses, as well as cognitive impairments, some cancers, and even obesity have all been linked to exposure to high levels of air pollution. The cost of these health disparities -- particularly longterm, chronic illnesses associated with air pollution such as asthma -- is billions in associated healthcare and diminished productivity to LA County.</p> <p>Vehicles on roads and highways are primarily responsible for over half of all GHG emissions in California when one accounts for emissions related to the extraction, processing, and distribution of oil. Los Angeles County and California will not reach their climate goals unless future transportation investments reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) per capita.</p> <p>Adding more lanes doesn't reduce traffic, but it does increase VMT. The outcome of roadway widening and expansion is settled science. In 2017 the Governor's Office of Planning and Research advised agencies that "each percent increase in lane miles results in a 1.03 percent increase in vehicle travel" (Source: pg. 29 - <a href="http://opr.ca.gov/docs/20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf">http://opr.ca.gov/docs/20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf</a>). Even Caltrans has acknowledged this fact In its "Rethinking How We Build So Californians Can Drive Less" ( webpage Caltrans states that "[w]hen highways are expanded, a series of changes occur, often resulting in more trips and longer travel times, as people are forced to drive farther to get to work and other destinations. Induced demand creates more traffic at greater cost to people and the environment, while worsening congestion." (Source: <a href="https://dot.ca.gov/programs/sustainability/sb-743">https://dot.ca.gov/programs/sustainability/sb-743</a>).</p> <p>Metro projects should not increase GHG emissions. You have a chance to prevent this. In light of the above, only Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 are viable options. Displacement, more pollution, and more GHG emissions can not be an option.</p> <p>Please eliminate Alternatives 3 and 4 from consideration.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>
146	6:26 am	05/27/22	Email	<p>Dear Metro,</p> <p>I am an SGV resident who cares about my community, the people who live in it, and the air we breathe. I therefore do not support any I-10 ExpressLanes "extension" projects that will destroy people's homes, encourage more vehicle trips, and further pollute some of the most pollution-burdened communities in California.</p> <p>Vehicle trips, including on freeways like I-10, are the main source of local air pollution in southern California, which remains one of the most polluted regions in the United States. The outcomes of such poor air quality are devastating, especially to the most vulnerable members of inland and frontline communities. High rates of asthma and other respiratory illnesses, as well as cognitive impairments, some cancers, and even obesity have all been linked to exposure to high levels of air pollution. The cost of these health disparities -- particularly longterm, chronic illnesses associated with air pollution such as asthma -- is billions in associated healthcare and diminished productivity to LA County.</p> <p>Vehicles on roads and highways are primarily responsible for over half of all GHG emissions in California when one accounts for emissions related to the extraction, processing, and distribution of oil. Los Angeles County and California will not reach their climate goals unless future transportation investments reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) per capita.</p> <p>Adding more lanes doesn't reduce traffic, but it does increase VMT. The outcome of roadway widening and expansion is settled science. In 2017 the Governor's Office of Planning and Research advised agencies that "each percent increase in lane miles results in a 1.03 percent increase in vehicle travel" (Source: pg. 29 - <a href="http://opr.ca.gov/docs/20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf">http://opr.ca.gov/docs/20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf</a>). Even Caltrans has acknowledged this fact In its "Rethinking How We Build So Californians Can Drive Less" ( webpage Caltrans states that "[w]hen highways are expanded, a series of changes occur, often resulting in more trips and longer travel times, as people are forced to drive farther to get to work and other destinations. Induced demand creates more traffic at greater cost to people and the environment, while worsening congestion." (Source: <a href="https://dot.ca.gov/programs/sustainability/sb-743">https://dot.ca.gov/programs/sustainability/sb-743</a>).</p> <p>Metro projects should not increase GHG emissions. You have a chance to prevent this. In light of the above, only Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 are viable options. Displacement, more pollution, and more GHG emissions can not be an option.</p> <p>Please eliminate Alternatives 3 and 4 from consideration.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>
147	6:51 pm	05/27/22	Email	<p>Dear Metro,</p> <p>I am an SGV resident who cares about my community, the people who live in it, and the air we breathe. I therefore do not support any I-10 ExpressLanes "extension" projects that will destroy people's homes, encourage more vehicle trips, and further pollute some of the most pollution-burdened communities in California.</p> <p>Vehicle trips, including on freeways like I-10, are the main source of local air pollution in southern California, which remains one of the most polluted regions in the United States. The outcomes of such poor air quality are devastating, especially to the most vulnerable members of inland and frontline communities. High rates of asthma and other respiratory illnesses, as well as cognitive impairments, some cancers, and even obesity have all been linked to exposure to high levels of air pollution. The cost of these health disparities -- particularly longterm, chronic illnesses associated with air pollution such as asthma -- is billions in associated healthcare and diminished productivity to LA County.</p> <p>Vehicles on roads and highways are primarily responsible for over half of all GHG emissions in California when one accounts for emissions related to the extraction, processing, and distribution of oil. Los Angeles County and California will not reach their climate goals unless future transportation investments reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) per capita.</p> <p>Adding more lanes doesn't reduce traffic, but it does increase VMT. The outcome of roadway widening and expansion is settled science. In 2017 the Governor's Office of Planning and Research advised agencies that "each percent increase in lane miles results in a 1.03 percent increase in vehicle travel" (Source: pg. 29 - <a href="http://opr.ca.gov/docs/20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf">http://opr.ca.gov/docs/20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf</a>). Even Caltrans has acknowledged this fact In its "Rethinking How We Build So Californians Can Drive Less" ( webpage Caltrans states that "[w]hen highways are expanded, a series of changes occur, often resulting in more trips and longer travel times, as people are forced to drive farther to get to work and other destinations. Induced demand creates more traffic at greater cost to people and the environment, while worsening congestion." (Source: <a href="https://dot.ca.gov/programs/sustainability/sb-743">https://dot.ca.gov/programs/sustainability/sb-743</a>).</p> <p>Metro projects should not increase GHG emissions. You have a chance to prevent this. In light of the above, only Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 are viable options. Displacement, more pollution, and more GHG emissions can not be an option.</p> <p>Please eliminate Alternatives 3 and 4 from consideration.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>

148	7:41 am	05/27/22	Email	<p>Dear Metro,</p> <p>I am an SGV resident who cares about my community, the people who live in it, and the air we breathe. I therefore do not support any I-10 ExpressLanes "extension" projects that will destroy people's homes, encourage more vehicle trips, and further pollute some of the most pollution-burdened communities in California.</p> <p>Vehicle trips, including on freeways like I-10, are the main source of local air pollution in southern California, which remains one of the most polluted regions in the United States. The outcomes of such poor air quality are devastating, especially to the most vulnerable members of inland and frontline communities. High rates of asthma and other respiratory illnesses, as well as cognitive impairments, some cancers, and even obesity have all been linked to exposure to high levels of air pollution. The cost of these health disparities -- particularly long-term, chronic illnesses associated with air pollution such as asthma -- is billions in associated healthcare and diminished productivity to LA County.</p> <p>Vehicles on roads and highways are primarily responsible for over half of all GHG emissions in California when one accounts for emissions related to the extraction, processing, and distribution of oil. Los Angeles County and California will not reach their climate goals unless future transportation investments reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) per capita.</p> <p>Adding more lanes doesn't reduce traffic, but it does increase VMT. The outcome of roadway widening and expansion is settled science. In 2017 the Governor's Office of Planning and Research advised agencies that "each percent increase in lane miles results in a 1.03 percent increase in vehicle travel" (Source: pg. 29 - <a href="http://opr.ca.gov/docs/20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf">http://opr.ca.gov/docs/20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf</a>). Even Caltrans has acknowledged this fact In its "Rethinking How We Build So Californians Can Drive Less" ( webpage Caltrans states that "[w]hen highways are expanded, a series of changes occur, often resulting in more trips and longer travel times, as people are forced to drive farther to get to work and other destinations. Induced demand creates more traffic at greater cost to people and the environment, while worsening congestion." (Source: <a href="https://dot.ca.gov/programs/sustainability/sb-743">https://dot.ca.gov/programs/sustainability/sb-743</a>).</p> <p>Metro projects should not increase GHG emissions. You have a chance to prevent this. In light of the above, only Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 are viable options. Displacement, more pollution, and more GHG emissions can not be an option.</p> <p>Please eliminate Alternatives 3 and 4 from consideration.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>
149	9:04 am	05/27/22	Email	<p>Dear Metro,</p> <p>I am an SGV resident who cares about my community, the people who live in it, and the air we breathe. I therefore do not support any I-10 ExpressLanes "extension" projects that will destroy people's homes, encourage more vehicle trips, and further pollute some of the most pollution-burdened communities in California.</p> <p>Vehicle trips, including on freeways like I-10, are the main source of local air pollution in southern California, which remains one of the most polluted regions in the United States. The outcomes of such poor air quality are devastating, especially to the most vulnerable members of inland and frontline communities. High rates of asthma and other respiratory illnesses, as well as cognitive impairments, some cancers, and even obesity have all been linked to exposure to high levels of air pollution. The cost of these health disparities -- particularly long-term, chronic illnesses associated with air pollution such as asthma -- is billions in associated healthcare and diminished productivity to LA County.</p> <p>Vehicles on roads and highways are primarily responsible for over half of all GHG emissions in California when one accounts for emissions related to the extraction, processing, and distribution of oil. Los Angeles County and California will not reach their climate goals unless future transportation investments reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) per capita.</p> <p>Adding more lanes doesn't reduce traffic, but it does increase VMT. The outcome of roadway widening and expansion is settled science. In 2017 the Governor's Office of Planning and Research advised agencies that "each percent increase in lane miles results in a 1.03 percent increase in vehicle travel" (Source: pg. 29 - <a href="http://opr.ca.gov/docs/20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf">http://opr.ca.gov/docs/20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf</a>).</p> <p>Even Caltrans has acknowledged this fact In its "Rethinking How We Build So Californians Can Drive Less" ( webpage Caltrans states that "[w]hen highways are expanded, a series of changes occur, often resulting in more trips and longer travel times, as people are forced to drive farther to get to work and other destinations. Induced demand creates more traffic at greater cost to people and the environment, while worsening congestion." (Source: <a href="https://dot.ca.gov/programs/sustainability/sb-743">https://dot.ca.gov/programs/sustainability/sb-743</a>).</p> <p>Metro projects should not increase GHG emissions. You have a chance to prevent this. In light of the above, only Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 are viable options. Displacement, more pollution, and more GHG emissions can not be an option.</p> <p>Please eliminate Alternatives 3 and 4 from consideration.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>
150	9:35 am	05/28/22	Email	<p>Dear Metro,</p> <p>I am an SGV resident who cares about my community, the people who live in it, and the air we breathe. I therefore do not support any I-10 ExpressLanes "extension" projects that will destroy people's homes, encourage more vehicle trips, and further pollute some of the most pollution-burdened communities in California.</p> <p>Vehicle trips, including on freeways like I-10, are the main source of local air pollution in southern California, which remains one of the most polluted regions in the United States. The outcomes of such poor air quality are devastating, especially to the most vulnerable members of inland and frontline communities. High rates of asthma and other respiratory illnesses, as well as cognitive impairments, some cancers, and even obesity have all been linked to exposure to high levels of air pollution. The cost of these health disparities -- particularly long-term, chronic illnesses associated with air pollution such as asthma -- is billions in associated healthcare and diminished productivity to LA County.</p> <p>Vehicles on roads and highways are primarily responsible for over half of all GHG emissions in California when one accounts for emissions related to the extraction, processing, and distribution of oil. Los Angeles County and California will not reach their climate goals unless future transportation investments reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) per capita.</p> <p>Adding more lanes doesn't reduce traffic, but it does increase VMT. The outcome of roadway widening and expansion is settled science. In 2017 the Governor's Office of Planning and Research advised agencies that "each percent increase in lane miles results in a 1.03 percent increase in vehicle travel (Source: pg. 29 - <a href="http://opr.ca.gov/docs/20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf">http://opr.ca.gov/docs/20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf</a>). Even Caltrans has acknowledged this fact In its "Rethinking How We Build So Californians Can Drive Less" ( webpage Caltrans states that "[w]hen highways are expanded, a series of changes occur, often resulting in more trips and longer travel times, as people are forced to drive farther to get to work and other destinations. Induced demand creates more traffic at greater cost to people and the environment, while worsening congestion." (Source: <a href="https://dot.ca.gov/programs/sustainability/sb-743">https://dot.ca.gov/programs/sustainability/sb-743</a>).</p> <p>Metro projects should not increase GHG emissions. You have a chance to prevent this. In light of the above, only Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 are viable options. Displacement, more pollution, and more GHG emissions can not be an option.</p> <p>Please eliminate Alternatives 3 and 4 from consideration.</p> <p>Also add additional Fast Trak entry/exits locations on Metro Express Lanes on 1-10 E and W between Fremont Av. and and Rosemead Bl.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>

151	9:50 am	05/28/22	Email	<p>I am an SGV resident who cares about my community, the people who live in it, and the air we breathe. I therefore do not support any I-10 ExpressLanes "extension" projects that will destroy people's homes, encourage more vehicle trips, and further pollute some of the most pollution-burdened communities in California.</p> <p>Vehicle trips, including on freeways like I-10, are the main source of local air pollution in southern California, which remains one of the most polluted regions in the United States. The outcomes of such poor air quality are devastating, especially to the most vulnerable members of inland and frontline communities. High rates of asthma and other respiratory illnesses, as well as cognitive impairments, some cancers, and even obesity have all been linked to exposure to high levels of air pollution. The cost of these health disparities -- particularly long-term, chronic illnesses associated with air pollution such as asthma -- is billions in associated healthcare and diminished productivity to LA County.</p> <p>Vehicles on roads and highways are primarily responsible for over half of all GHG emissions in California when one accounts for emissions related to the extraction, processing, and distribution of oil. Los Angeles County and California will not reach their climate goals unless future transportation investments reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) per capita.</p> <p>Adding more lanes doesn't reduce traffic, but it does increase VMT. The outcome of roadway widening and expansion is settled science. In 2017 the Governor's Office of Planning and Research advised agencies that "each percent increase in lane miles results in a 1.03 percent increase in vehicle travel" (Source: pg. 29 - <a href="http://opr.ca.gov/docs/20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf">http://opr.ca.gov/docs/20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf</a>). Even Caltrans has acknowledged this fact In its "Rethinking How We Build So Californians Can Drive Less" ( webpage Caltrans states that "[w]hen highways are expanded, a series of changes occur, often resulting in more trips and longer travel times, as people are forced to drive farther to get to work and other destinations. Induced demand creates more traffic at greater cost to people and the environment, while worsening congestion." (Source: <a href="https://dot.ca.gov/programs/sustainability/sb-743">https://dot.ca.gov/programs/sustainability/sb-743</a>).</p> <p>Metro projects should not increase GHG emissions. You have a chance to prevent this. In light of the above, only Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 are viable options. Displacement, more pollution, and more GHG emissions can not be an option. Please eliminate Alternatives 3 and 4 from consideration.</p>
152	9:50 am	05/28/22	Email	<p>I am an SGV resident who cares about my community, the people who live in it, and the air we breathe. I therefore do not support any I-10 ExpressLanes "extension" projects that will destroy people's homes, encourage more vehicle trips, and further pollute some of the most pollution-burdened communities in California.</p> <p>Vehicle trips, including on freeways like I-10, are the main source of local air pollution in southern California, which remains one of the most polluted regions in the United States. The outcomes of such poor air quality are devastating, especially to the most vulnerable members of inland and frontline communities. High rates of asthma and other respiratory illnesses, as well as cognitive impairments, some cancers, and even obesity have all been linked to exposure to high levels of air pollution. The cost of these health disparities -- particularly long-term, chronic illnesses associated with air pollution such as asthma -- is billions in associated healthcare and diminished productivity to LA County.</p> <p>Vehicles on roads and highways are primarily responsible for over half of all GHG emissions in California when one accounts for emissions related to the extraction, processing, and distribution of oil. Los Angeles County and California will not reach their climate goals unless future transportation investments reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) per capita.</p> <p>Adding more lanes doesn't reduce traffic, but it does increase VMT. The outcome of roadway widening and expansion is settled science. In 2017 the Governor's Office of Planning and Research advised agencies that "each percent increase in lane miles results in a 1.03 percent increase in vehicle travel" (Source: pg. 29 - <a href="http://opr.ca.gov/docs/20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf">http://opr.ca.gov/docs/20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf</a>). Even Caltrans has acknowledged this fact In its "Rethinking How We Build So Californians Can Drive Less" ( webpage Caltrans states that "[w]hen highways are expanded, a series of changes occur, often resulting in more trips and longer travel times, as people are forced to drive farther to get to work and other destinations. Induced demand creates more traffic at greater cost to people and the environment, while worsening congestion." (Source: <a href="https://dot.ca.gov/programs/sustainability/sb-743">https://dot.ca.gov/programs/sustainability/sb-743</a>).</p> <p>Metro projects should not increase GHG emissions. You have a chance to prevent this. In light of the above, only Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 are viable options. Displacement, more pollution, and more GHG emissions can not be an option. Please eliminate Alternatives 3 and 4 from consideration.</p>
153	2:12 pm	05/29/22	Email	<p>I am an SGV resident who cares about my community, the people who live in it, and the air we breathe. I therefore do not support any I-10 ExpressLanes "extension" projects that will destroy people's homes, encourage more vehicle trips, and further pollute some of the most pollution-burdened communities in California.</p> <p>Vehicle trips, including on freeways like I-10, are the main source of local air pollution in southern California, which remains one of the most polluted regions in the United States. The outcomes of such poor air quality are devastating, especially to the most vulnerable members of inland and frontline communities. High rates of asthma and other respiratory illnesses, as well as cognitive impairments, some cancers, and even obesity have all been linked to exposure to high levels of air pollution. The cost of these health disparities -- particularly long-term, chronic illnesses associated with air pollution such as asthma -- is billions in associated healthcare and diminished productivity to LA County.</p> <p>Vehicles on roads and highways are primarily responsible for over half of all GHG emissions in California when one accounts for emissions related to the extraction, processing, and distribution of oil. Los Angeles County and California will not reach their climate goals unless future transportation investments reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) per capita.</p> <p>Adding more lanes doesn't reduce traffic, but it does increase VMT. The outcome of roadway widening and expansion is settled science. In 2017 the Governor's Office of Planning and Research advised agencies that "each percent increase in lane miles results in a 1.03 percent increase in vehicle travel" (Source: pg. 29 - <a href="http://opr.ca.gov/docs/20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf">http://opr.ca.gov/docs/20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf</a>). Even Caltrans has acknowledged this fact In its "Rethinking How We Build So Californians Can Drive Less" ( webpage Caltrans states that "[w]hen highways are expanded, a series of changes occur, often resulting in more trips and longer travel times, as people are forced to drive farther to get to work and other destinations. Induced demand creates more traffic at greater cost to people and the environment, while worsening congestion." (Source: <a href="https://dot.ca.gov/programs/sustainability/sb-743">https://dot.ca.gov/programs/sustainability/sb-743</a>).</p> <p>Metro projects should not increase GHG emissions and air pollution. You have a chance to prevent this. In light of the above, only Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 are viable options. Displacement, more pollution, and more GHG emissions can not be an option. Please eliminate Alternatives 3 and 4 from consideration.</p> <p>Thank you</p>
154	11:18 am	05/31/22	Email	<p>Dear Metro,</p> <p>I am an SGV resident who cares about my community, the people who live in it, and the air we breathe. I therefore do not support any I-10 ExpressLanes "extension" projects that will destroy people's homes, encourage more vehicle trips, and further pollute some of the most pollution-burdened communities in California.</p> <p>Vehicle trips, including on freeways like I-10, are the main source of local air pollution in southern California, which remains one of the most polluted regions in the United States. The outcomes of such poor air quality are devastating, especially to the most vulnerable members of inland and frontline communities. High rates of asthma and other respiratory illnesses, as well as cognitive impairments, some cancers, and even obesity have all been linked to exposure to high levels of air pollution. The cost of these health disparities -- particularly longterm, chronic illnesses associated with air pollution such as asthma -- is billions in associated healthcare and diminished productivity to LA County.</p> <p>Vehicles on roads and highways are primarily responsible for over half of all GHG emissions in California when one accounts for emissions related to the extraction, processing, and distribution of oil. Los Angeles County and California will not reach their climate goals unless future transportation investments reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) per capita.</p> <p>Adding more lanes doesn't reduce traffic, but it does increase VMT. The outcome of roadway widening and expansion is settled science. In 2017 the Governor's Office of Planning and Research advised agencies that "each percent increase in lane miles results in a 1.03 percent increase in vehicle travel" (Source: pg. 29 - <a href="http://opr.ca.gov/docs/20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf">http://opr.ca.gov/docs/20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf</a>). Even Caltrans has acknowledged this fact In its "Rethinking How We Build So Californians Can Drive Less" ( webpage Caltrans states that "[w]hen highways are expanded, a series of changes occur, often resulting in more trips and longer travel times, as people are forced to drive farther to get to work and other destinations. Induced demand creates more traffic at greater cost to people and the environment, while worsening congestion." (Source: <a href="https://dot.ca.gov/programs/sustainability/sb-743">https://dot.ca.gov/programs/sustainability/sb-743</a>).</p> <p>Metro projects should not increase GHG emissions. You have a chance to prevent this. In light of the above, only Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 are viable options. Displacement, more pollution, and more GHG emissions can not be an option. Please eliminate Alternatives 3 and 4 from consideration.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>
155	7:47am	05/31/22	Online Comment Form	<p>Most logical selection would be to build Alternative 3. Two HOT lanes in each direction. This will continue the two lane trend from downtown LA to I 605 and through the two lanes which are being built on the San Bernardino county side.</p>

156	11:06pm	06/01/22	Online Comment Form	Choose the no-build. Don't widen or expand the freeway. It's 2022, we know this won't solve anything and will only create more VMT and GHG. We are in a climate emergency, we can't keep widening freeways.
157		06/02/22	Comment Card	Alternative 3- is a good fast track with- alone or passenger
158		06/02/22	Comment Card	#4
159		06/03/22	Email	<p>Dear Metro,</p> <p>I am an SGV resident who cares about my community, the people who live in it, and the air we breathe. I therefore do not support any I-10 ExpressLanes "extension" projects that will destroy people's homes, encourage more vehicle trips, and further pollute some of the most pollution-burdened communities in California.</p> <p>Vehicle trips, including on freeways like I-10, are the main source of local air pollution in southern California, which remains one of the most polluted regions in the United States. The outcomes of such poor air quality are devastating, especially to the most vulnerable members of inland and frontline communities. High rates of asthma and other respiratory illnesses, as well as cognitive impairments, some cancers, and even obesity have all been linked to exposure to high levels of air pollution. The cost of these health disparities -- particularly long-term, chronic illnesses associated with air pollution such as asthma -- is billions in associated healthcare and diminished productivity to LA County.</p> <p>Vehicles on roads and highways are primarily responsible for over half of all GHG emissions in California when one accounts for emissions related to the extraction, processing, and distribution of oil. Los Angeles County and California will not reach their climate goals unless future transportation investments reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) per capita.</p> <p>Adding more lanes doesn't reduce traffic, but it does increase VMT. The outcome of roadway widening and expansion is settled science. In 2017 the Governor's Office of Planning and Research advised agencies that "each percent increase in lane miles results in a 1.03 percent increase in vehicle travel" (Source: pg. 29 - <a href="https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Fopr.ca.gov%2Fdocs%2F20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf&amp;data=05%7C01%7Ci10extension%40metro.net%7Cd3b7a615bc6342d4c48408da45ccfa38%7Cab57129bdbfd4caca77fc74c40364af%7C1%7C0%7C637899044054541150%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6I1haWwLjJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&amp;sd=087WAAT%2Bi7O58%2BIMGF5uaEJuy15IV9P6QFOLF%2BnZqpQ%3D&amp;reserved=0">https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Fopr.ca.gov%2Fdocs%2F20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf&amp;data=05%7C01%7Ci10extension%40metro.net%7Cd3b7a615bc6342d4c48408da45ccfa38%7Cab57129bdbfd4caca77fc74c40364af%7C1%7C0%7C637899044054541150%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6I1haWwLjJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&amp;sd=087WAAT%2Bi7O58%2BIMGF5uaEJuy15IV9P6QFOLF%2BnZqpQ%3D&amp;reserved=0</a>). Even Caltrans has acknowledged this fact In its "Rethinking How We Build So Californians Can Drive Less" ( webpage Caltrans states that "[w]hen highways are expanded, a series of changes occur, often resulting in more trips and longer travel times, as people are forced to drive farther to get to work and other destinations. Induced demand creates more traffic at greater cost to people and the environment, while worsening congestion." (Source: <a href="https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fdot.ca.gov%2Fprograms%2Fsustainability%2Fsb-743&amp;data=05%7C01%7Ci10extension%40metro.net%7Cd3b7a615bc6342d4c48408da45ccfa38%7Cab57129bdbfd4caca77fc74c40364af%7C1%7C0%7C637899044054541150%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6I1haWwLjJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&amp;sd=IUUkE0altmAj%2BwVQDOszjDaorZkGAXvJgvWTjN3keY%3D&amp;reserved=0">https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fdot.ca.gov%2Fprograms%2Fsustainability%2Fsb-743&amp;data=05%7C01%7Ci10extension%40metro.net%7Cd3b7a615bc6342d4c48408da45ccfa38%7Cab57129bdbfd4caca77fc74c40364af%7C1%7C0%7C637899044054541150%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6I1haWwLjJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&amp;sd=IUUkE0altmAj%2BwVQDOszjDaorZkGAXvJgvWTjN3keY%3D&amp;reserved=0</a>).</p> <p>Metro projects should not increase GHG emissions. You have a chance to prevent this. In light of the above, only Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 are viable options. Displacement, more pollution, and more GHG emissions can not be an option. Please eliminate Alternatives 3 and 4 from consideration.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>
160		06/04/22	Comment Card	I would like to see alternative 4 toll without destroying or uprooting trees and/ or people's homes.
161		06/04/22	Comment Card	I would like alternative #4.
162		06/04/22	Comment Card	No bills.
163		06/04/22	Comment Card	1 Express 1 HOV lanes
164		06/04/22	Comment Card	Alternative 3 seems like it would help alleviate traffic so that my pick-- but I'd want to know more about how long it would take and impact the neighborhood. Alternative 2 is also a good option.
165		06/04/22	Comment Card	I like it how it is with the 1 HOV lane.
166		06/04/22	Comment Card	Fast track is meant on for the rich. The signs are not always easy to read when driving fast with two people to use carpool. I find the payment process for fast track is not user friendly on purpose. Fast track is a rip-off add more carpool lanes.
167		06/04/22	Comment Card	Alt 2 ExpressLane extension.
168		06/04/22	Comment Card	<p>Please do not widen the highway.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Widening highways does not reduce congestion over the long term</li> <li>- Fundamentally, congestion locally happens with getting on/ off the highway, so more lanes on the left don't help.</li> </ul> <p>The dangerous part of travel comes with the number of trucks care must weave around when getting on/off, since trucks are restricted to travel in the right 2 lanes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- efforts to separate cars or trucks traffic would be more helpful!</li> </ul> <p>Either leaving the existing setup or converting existing HOV into FastTrack sound fine to me.</p>
169	2:48pm	06/06/22	Online Comment Form	I am excited at the prospect of adding 2 Express Lanes in each direction to the LA/San Bernadino county line. I strongly urge the addition of the HOT lanes. Thank you for your consideration.

170	2:56PM	06/07/22	Online Comment Form	I would like to express my support for alternative number 3, and provide a suggestion for a fifth alternative. Alternative number 5 could be to keep the existing HOV lane and add an express lane.
171	7:24AM	06/07/22	Online Comment Form	<p>I have had the benefit of using my Transponder to navigate the I-10 Freeway Covina to Downtown Los Angeles and back. This was a Transportation Fix for the congested I-10 Freeway. Carpooling is economical, a trusted value and a faster means to get to the Doctors Offices on a regular basis.</p> <p>Extending this feature will ease the overall congestion on the I-10 Freeway East of Covina heading out to Ontario Airport. This enhances the utility of Ontario Airport. Twenty min. to the Airport is to me a dream and makes the Ontario Airport my main and primary Airport. This is much better than trying to fight the traffic to and from LAX.</p> <p>The extension East, will bring the region closer by permitting stores, entertainment and businesses be better able to get to. I do not often go East when I can go West much easier. I strongly request that you Extend the Fast Track pay system to the Eastbound I-10 Freeway. This project should be done and currently is needed. I hope over the years to come this system can be expanded to other freeways.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to the needs of we the Drivers of our extensive freeway systems, This is what we have: let us use it.</p>
172		06/07/22	Email	<p>Dear Metro,</p> <p>I am a frequent SGV patron who cares about my community, the people who live in it, and the air we breathe. I therefore do not support any I-10 ExpressLanes extension projects that will destroy people's homes, encourage more vehicle trips, and further pollute some of the most pollution-burdened communities in California.</p> <p>Vehicle trips, including on freeways like I-10, are the main source of local air pollution in southern California, which remains one of the most polluted regions in the United States. The outcomes of such poor air quality are devastating, especially to the most vulnerable members of inland and frontline communities. High rates of asthma and other respiratory illnesses, as well as cognitive impairments, some cancers, and even obesity have all been linked to exposure to high levels of air pollution. The cost of these health disparities -- particularly long-term, chronic illnesses associated with air pollution such as asthma -- is billions in associated healthcare and diminished productivity to LA County.</p> <p>Vehicles on roads and highways are primarily responsible for over half of all GHG emissions in California when one accounts for emissions related to the extraction, processing, and distribution of oil. Los Angeles County and California will not reach their climate goals unless future transportation investments reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) per capita.</p> <p>Adding more lanes doesn't reduce traffic, but it does increase VMT. The outcome of roadway widening and expansion is settled science. In 2017 the Governor's Office of Planning and Research advised agencies that each percent increase in lane miles results in a 1.03 percent increase in vehicle travel (Source: pg. 29 - <a href="http://opr.ca.gov/docs/20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf">http://opr.ca.gov/docs/20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf</a>). Even Caltrans has acknowledged this fact In its Rethinking How We Build So Californians Can Drive Less ( webpage Caltrans states that [w]hen highways are expanded, a series of changes occur, often resulting in more trips and longer travel times, as people are forced to drive farther to get to work and other destinations. Induced demand creates more traffic at greater cost to people and the environment, while worsening congestion. (Source: <a href="https://dot.ca.gov/programs/sustainability/sb-743">https://dot.ca.gov/programs/sustainability/sb-743</a>).</p> <p>Metro projects should not increase GHG emissions. You have a chance to prevent this. In light of the above, only Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 are viable options. Displacement, more pollution, and more GHG emissions can not be an option. Please eliminate Alternatives 3 and 4 from consideration.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>
173		06/07/22	Email	<p>Dear Metro,</p> <p>I am an SGV resident who cares about my community, the people who live in it, and the air we breathe. I therefore do not support any I-10 ExpressLanes "extension" projects that will destroy people's homes, encourage more vehicle trips, and further pollute some of the most pollution-burdened communities in California.</p> <p>Vehicle trips, including on freeways like I-10, are the main source of local air pollution in southern California, which remains one of the most polluted regions in the United States. The outcomes of such poor air quality are devastating, especially to the most vulnerable members of inland and frontline communities. High rates of asthma and other respiratory illnesses, as well as cognitive impairments, some cancers, and even obesity have all been linked to exposure to high levels of air pollution. The cost of these health disparities -- particularly long-term, chronic illnesses associated with air pollution such as asthma -- is billions in associated healthcare and diminished productivity to LA County.</p> <p>Vehicles on roads and highways are primarily responsible for over half of all GHG emissions in California when one accounts for emissions related to the extraction, processing, and distribution of oil. Los Angeles County and California will not reach their climate goals unless future transportation investments reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) per capita.</p> <p>Adding more lanes doesn't reduce traffic, but it does increase VMT. The outcome of roadway widening and expansion is settled science. In 2017 the Governor's Office of Planning and Research advised agencies that "each percent increase in lane miles results in a 1.03 percent increase in vehicle travel" (Source: pg. 29 - <a href="http://opr.ca.gov/docs/20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf">http://opr.ca.gov/docs/20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf</a>). Even Caltrans has acknowledged this fact In its "Rethinking How We Build So Californians Can Drive Less" ( webpage Caltrans states that "[w]hen highways are expanded, a series of changes occur, often resulting in more trips and longer travel times, as people are forced to drive farther to get to work and other destinations. Induced demand creates more traffic at greater cost to people and the environment, while worsening congestion." (Source: <a href="https://dot.ca.gov/programs/sustainability/sb-743">https://dot.ca.gov/programs/sustainability/sb-743</a>).</p> <p>Metro projects should not increase GHG emissions. You have a chance to prevent this. In light of the above, only Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 are viable options. Displacement, more pollution, and more GHG emissions can not be an option. Please eliminate Alternatives 3 and 4 from consideration.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>

174		06/07/22	Email	Dear Metro,  As a local resident of El Monte, I don't believe that we should further expand the highways. Even the California Department of Transportation that expansion is not the solution. Consider ONLY alternative 1 or 2 if you all care about the public health, accelerating the climate crisis, among other issues that expansion will cost.
175	10:15am	06/08/22	Online Comment Form	I am in support of extending the toll lane of the i10 freeway from the 605 eastward towards San Bernardino.
176	12:32pm	06/08/22	Online Comment Form	Go with option 2) converting the existing high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lane to a High Occupancy Toll (HOT) lane, also known as an ExpressLane. It makes no sense to create more than use already existing infrastructure.
177	4:03pm	06/08/22	Online Comment Form	I see this as another money grab to sock it to local citizens whom have already paid more than their fair share of taxes to provide HOV lanes that you are turning into toll lanes. I bought a Prius because you offered to let hybrid vehicles use those lanes with single occupants only to have you stop that. I will not be fooled again. CA has the highest gas tyaxes in the nation and what do we get for that? The money is syphened off to the general fund. and not used for transportation upgrades,.
178		06/08/22	Email	Dear Mr. Kosinski: The City of San Dimas has reviewed the Notice of Scoping/Initiation of Studies for the I-10 Express Lanes Project (Project). The City appreciates the opportunity to review and provide comments on the Project. The following comments are based on the Notice of Scoping/Initiation of Studies dated April 25, 2022 and information provided at the scoping meeting held virtually on May 4, 2022. 1.The City of San Dimas is concerned with detour routes that may occur on urban streets that may increase pavement fatigue and will lead to the accelerated deterioration of the roadway structure. When Caltrans conducted construction on the 10-fwy recently, Via Verde Avenue was used as a detour route to the 57-fwy. This detour route caused significant deterioration of Via Verde Avenue during the construction. It should be noted, Via Verde Avenue is scheduled to be reconstructed this year. 2.The 2028 Olympics will be hosting a cycling event at Bonelli Park. Will construction of the 10-fwy be completed prior to or commence after the 2028 Olympic event to alleviate congestion? 3.The Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Assessment (EIR/ESA) shall identify and fully mitigate any noise-related impacts associated with the Project. Standards for ambient noise levels identified in the City of San Dimas Municipal Code shall be complied with and where necessary, fully mitigated. 4.The EIR/ESA shall include a cumulative impact analysis for all foreseeable future projects, including transportation and non-transportation projects and assume them as background nto the project for the purposes of all environmental analysis. 5.The EIR/ESA shall identify and mitigate all construction related impacts including, but not limited to noise, air quality, emissions, fugitive dust, parking and traffic. 6.The EIR/ESA shall complete a full environmental analysis of all proposed alternatives, and preferences shall be given to alternatives that result in fewer environmental impacts. 7.Alternatives 2, 3 and 4 will include non-standard lanes and shoulder widths; however, the information provided does not indicate what is the standard lane and shoulder width. The EIR/ESA and all applicable maps and diagrams should include the standards lane and shoulder width. 8.Concerns for Alternative 3 and 4: a.The 10-fwy eastbound adjacent to the Via Verde on/off ramp and Forest Lawn is located on a very steep slope. Reducing the shoulder will remove the ability to move disabled vehicles off the travel lanes which removes a safe area for disabled vehicles and/or slow-moving semi-trucks to get off the 10-fwy in case of an emergency. b.The retaining walls on the 10-fwy east and west bound adjacent to Via Verde Avenue were recently built. Will Caltrans be removing and reconstructing new retaining walls for either Alternative 3 or 4? 9.The City of San Dimas recommends that all property owners within 500 feet of the 10-fwy be notified of all community meetings, availability of environmental documents, and public hearings to allow appropriate opportunity for community engagement and voice any concerns they may have. 10.The City of San Dimas recommends that a Project representative make a presentation about the Project to the City Council to make the Council and community aware of the proposed improvements and opportunities for public engagement. 11.Additional comments may be provided upon review of the EIR/ESA when it's made available for public review. Thank you again for the opportunity to comments on the proposed Project. We look forward to reviewing the EIR/ESA when released for public review, at which point additional comments may be provided. Please feel free to contact Luis Torrico, Planning Manager at (909) 394-6208 or via email at ltorrico@sandimasca.gov if you have any questions or need further explanation on any of the comments in this letter.
179		06/08/22	Comment Card	Please do not put more express lanes. It is better carpool because one time I got on the express lane for accident and I got a ticket. Thank you.
180		06/08/22	Comment Card	I would like them to add a lane. Alternative 2.
181	10:08am	06/09/22	Online Comment Form	This will be a very important, sorely-needed infrastructure improvement to deal with traffic in this area. I support this project 100%. Thank You.
182	11:42am	06/09/22	Online Comment Form	NO expansion of the 10 should move forward without the closure of the soundwall gap along the residential community in Bryn Mawr Rd. in Claremont. Expansion is increasing risks to the community without addressing serious environmental justice problem with the gap at the outset. There is a soundwall on the north side with residents and large commercial structures and none on the south side, is majority minority residents and one small sliver of a commercial property. THERE IS NO DIFFERENCE. The environmental and safety burdens the residents on the south side have had to bear are completely discriminatory. The pollution and noise from the freeway does not somehow reach the north side, thereby needing protection and NOT the south. There should be no need to demonstrate an increased risk from expansion, although there clearly is one, because we have already experienced the increased pollution and noise without any protection. The existing gap and discriminatory treatment of the south side residents is reason enough to close it now, under any scenario. The decision to leave it open had no justification in the first instance. Residential and a large commercial property exist on the north side of the 10 and they are protected yet some how, the residents on the south with a smaller commercial building have not protection at all. Children play in their backyards looking at the trucks idling on the freeway with mere feet between then and no sight or sound protection - none.  As a resident of the street most directly impacted, Alternative 2 is the only option being proposed that I support. However, there should be an alternative 3 which is close the gap - period - before any construction of anything else is allowed to proceed.

183	1:02pm	06/09/22	Online Comment Form	I live in Claremont and oftentimes need to get to DTLA or El Sereno. I use the Fasstrak system on days when the traffic is heavy and it is a life/game changer to be able to get to DTLA in under 30 mins. Please consider extending this option to the County line at Indian Hill Blvd. Thank you.
184	1:12pm	06/09/22	Online Comment Form	I commute to downtown LA for work. I am 100% in favor of extending the Express lanes as described. I use the Express lanes to and from downtown regularly. It would be beneficial to access the Express lanes in Claremont rather than have to drive in heavy traffic to and from the 605 freeway. It doesn't make sense to not do this. Thanks
185	1:22pm	06/09/22	Online Comment Form	I would like the carpool lane converted to a express lane that allows free tolls for carpools and charges for single users
186	1:29pm	06/09/22	Online Comment Form	Since most tolls are highly reduced or eliminated based on higher vehicle occupancy, I highly recommend this upgrade. Using express lanes on other parts of the 10 is incredibly efficient, Current HOV lanes (as someone who drives with 2-7 people regularly) are as congested as traditional lanes and offer few benefits.  Thank you for your consideration.
187	1:40pm	06/09/22	Online Comment Form	I support a second carpool lane on the I-10 extension project! I firmly believe all freeways should have more than one carpool lane- all it takes is one large, slow and/or inattentive driver to ruin it for everyone. If there are two lanes then we can better choose who we drive behind. I am personally indifferent to whether or not the lanes are converted to FastTrak, but please please add a second HOV lane regardless.
188	2:55pm	06/09/22	Online Comment Form	While I understand that putting a price on peak-hour road capacity is one of the few things that's been shown to effectively reduce congestion, my concern is for the inequity in paying to use lanes. When we charge for something, the expense of paying that price is borne more heavily by the poor than by the wealthy. To see the potential of congestion pricing as anything other than a little blip on a system of transportation financing that is consistently unjust to the poor and those who don't own (or can't afford) a car, it takes a particular mix of myopia and tunnel vision. And this is before we add on \$6/gallon gas. I recognize that this project is years off from fruition but it does require further thinking of current and real issues.  And while I understand that funding sources are not always interchangeable for this stretch of travel (SB/LA County line to 605), it would make far more sense to finish the funding of the Metro GoldLine that runs along this same distance.
189	3:19 pm	06/09/22	Email	Adding additional and more effective HOV lanes are an important part to addressing some of our region's transportation issues. Toll lanes, however, will only increase revenue for the state and county while not addressing traffic issues and creating further inequality among county residents. Tiered pricing based on occupancy for toll lanes does not create enough of an incentive for drivers to actually start ride sharing. For many, depending on location or hours of employment, ride sharing isn't even a feasible option, leaving drivers with the option of either paying astronomical fees on a daily basis to access the toll lanes or in bumper to bumper traffic. As housing prices have increased, many people have moved to San Bernardino County in order to be able to afford shelter. Further exasperating their financial situations will not benefit them or the community as a whole. The focus should instead be on making mass transit a viable option by adding light rail train lines that actually go where people are trying to get at all times of the day, buses that run on time and are clean and safe, allowing for overnight parking at train station parking lots for commuters who work overnight shifts, and reducing/eliminating train and bus delays.
190	3:19pm	06/09/22	Email	The purpose of this letter is to submit the City of Claremont's formal request for installation of an additional soundwall that would close the gap at the Eastbound I-10 Freeway between College and Mills Avenues. The City is requesting Metro's support to achieve the installation of this soundwall. The City of Claremont has pursued the installation of soundwalls at the I-10 Freeway for more than 20 years. Though most of the soundwalls were installed with the Caltrans HOV/ Express Lanes project, there is still a gap in the eastbound direction between College and Mills Avenues. Since this location has been considered with the Caltrans HOV improvements, our understanding was that continuous soundwalls would be constructed along the Claremont corridor, including this location. The current gap in the soundwall is creating quality of life issues affecting the residential properties directly exposed to the freeway noise and pollution without mitigation. Please refer to the photo (Attachment) for reference. The Metro soundwall installation policy states that Metro will consider constructing soundwalls as part of new highway construction projects such as highway widening, carpool lanes, express lanes, and changes to the highway alignment. As such, the I-10 HOV/Express Lanes project should have evaluated this location for soundwall gap completion. To move forward, we are requesting your support to assist staff with future steps, including the installation of the missing wall. Additionally, we are respectfully requesting a copy of the environmental studies (including noise studies) conducted at this location for review and further consideration. The City appreciates your help in getting this issue resolved. If you have questions regarding this matter, please contact City Engineer Maria B Tipping at (909) 399-5474.
191	3:38pm	06/09/22	Online Comment Form	The Metro I-10 ExpressLanes Extension Project team should abandon this objective and project altogether. There should not be any conversion of HOV lanes to toll roads/lanes or any further addition of HOV lanes, which essentially remove travel way from passenger vehicles and further substantially congest the regular lanes. In the interim, if we assume restraint and fiscal prudence do not prevail, during the process, commuters will suffer delays and detours and longer travel time because of the excavation, construction, and delineation, which will necessitate expenditure of millions of taxpayer dollars.
192	4:21pm	06/09/22	Online Comment Form	would love to see that happen. With the massive amount of development happening throughout the inland empire, this would provide access to get into Downtown LA a lot faster than waiting to have to sit in traffic until the 605Fwy. This would be great to see happen!
193	4:55pm	06/09/22	Online Comment Form	I fully support the construction of Option 3 - Conversion of the current single HOV lane to one ExpressLane and addition of a 2nd ExpressLane in each direction. This would be a game changer!
194	5:21am	06/09/22	Online Comment Form	As a taxpayer and property owner of several real estate properties I pay a very large amount of property taxes which pays for services to the public I don't agree with privatizing freeways LA pays more than 51 % on gas taxes which also pays for roads. Why should we have to pay for tolls the idea stinks and doesn't take into consideration how many taxes we pay and receive less and less for our money. All ready the govt has reduced our weekly street cleaning program, increased fees for trash pick up etc. When will it stop government spends taxpayers money recklessly it would be different if it was only their money

195	6:24pm	06/09/22	Online Comment Form	Adding anything that creates a two-tiered system based on ability to pay to use is a terrible idea. If anything, add another HOV lane, but enough with the tollroads for people who can afford to use them to zip by the masses who have to struggle along in their regular lanes.
196	6:26pm	06/09/22	Online Comment Form	I support alternative 1: no build. Studies have shown that an increase in the number of lanes for vehicles actually increases traffic congestion, unlike what this project proposal suggests.
197	6:26pm	06/09/22	Online Comment Form	Please add a sound wall along the south side of the 10 freeway to these options. The residential area, behind the storage units, is impacted by the freeway noise. These options provide an opportunity to address this need.
198	7:41pm	06/09/22	Online Comment Form	Strong preference to turn existing HOV lane into a HOT lane. Do not add any new lanes, plenty of research shows that does nothing to reduce traffic, and air pollution is bad enough along the 10. Turn into a HOT and spend finding/focus efforts on increased transit options
199	8:16pm	06/09/22	Online Comment Form	Hello a barrier wall is long over due for our community and needs to be built blocking the freeway noise and pollution from Indian Hill to San Jose. Thank you for your consideration.
200	9:02pm	06/09/22	Online Comment Form	<p>CalTrans has done a poor job of advising the scoping period and June 10 comments deadline. I just read about this for the first time on June 9 via a Claremont city post on facebook.com. CalTrans = FAIL just on this point alone.</p> <p>I vote for Alternative 1. Don't do anything. Just go away. We haven't recovered from your current project on the 1-10 east from the Los Angeles/San Bernardino border.</p> <p>Instead, finish the sound wall along the I-10 in Claremont like you were supposed to do long ago.</p>
201	9:08pm	06/09/22	Online Comment Form	My office backs up to the 10 freeway. We need a sound wall.
202	9:39pm	06/09/22	Online Comment Form	<p>As a result of your project, that began 7 years ago, I was a victim of a devastating Motor Vehicle Accident. Your project aspires to save drivers a few minutes does the opposite, as it ruined my life and caused physical and mental loss and future devastation, as a result of injuries. Continuing frivolous freeway projects will continue to cost lives and devastate survivors and also puts you and those organizing the project collectively on the hook for liability to those victims and ultimately the state. Your project is not victimless.</p> <p>Without sufficient precautions in place to capture the fall out of driver safety, you have allowed for devastation of numerous lives without sufficient justification, the aspiration to save driver's a minute or two, in their commutes. This is not sufficient reason to pursue a project that ends lives and devastates others and opens a gap for fraud that ultimately costs.</p> <p>Please cease and desist the frivolous projects. They also allow for criminal drivers to fraud insurance and their victims and not allow for safety, given you allow the opportunity under the basis of negligence and liability, by virtue of your project.</p> <p>The project that you started maybe 7 years ago resulted in a extremely confusing freeway system, it is apparent. You should focus on freeway lighting and new pavement rather than increasing lanes and more confusion.</p> <p>Again lives have been lost and injuries have devastated survivor's lives, as a result of your frivolous freeway project. The freeway is a dangerous place, adding needless construction compounds the danger and puts your project in the onus and you will be sued as a result.</p>
203	9:52pm	06/09/22	Online Comment Form	There is no sound wall or sound barrier behind my home and you can clearly SEE and HEAR the 1-10 freeway. I do not understand why a wall was not built but with all the construction currently going on, the noise level has increased to the point where we can't keep our windows open at night on hot days to cool off. I strongly advocate for a sound wall to be erected so that the 15 houses on my block to include my own home has some noise abatement. It is as if no one cares and I have been trying for over a year to get someone to respond or listen to my concerns. It appears that Alternative 2 would be the right thing to do for our neighborhood and also to meet your needs for better control of the traffic. There is no justifiable reason why we don't have a sound wall especially when we hear traffic constantly.

204		06/09/22	Email	<p>Dear Mr. Kosinski</p> <p>The California State Polytechnic University, Pomona (Cal Poly Pomona) is pleased to submit this comment letter, in response to the Metro/Caltrans I-10 ExpressLanes Extension Project Notice of Scoping. The intent of the scoping process is to gather input on the purpose and need for the project, proposed alternatives, environmental issues, local projects that may be proposed in the study area and approaches for community participation. We offer these comments for Metro/Caltrans consideration as your agencies begin the CEQA environment scoping process, and look forward to providing additional comments as the studies progress.</p> <p>Cal Poly Pomona is a major stakeholder and major activity/employment center, located immediately adjacent the I-10 corridor. The University is one of three state-funded, public polytechnic universities in the 23-campus California State University system. Cal Poly Pomona provides high-quality, affordable education to nearly 30,000 full- and part-time students and employs nearly 2,700 faculty and staff, many of whom reside within a 15-mile radius from campus, so providing equitable and sustainable transportation options as well as improved access to campus are critical to our campus.</p> <p>While the university understands the importance of the I-10 ExpressLanes Extension Project, we are deeply concerned about the construction fatigue that the campus has had to endure throughout the construction of the HOV lane project; and now there is this potential for another major construction project along the same stretch of the I-10 Freeway. Besides environmental resource concerns such as noise, air quality, traffic, the university is concerned about the potential for additional right-of-way impacts given the project's proximity to campus. The campus was previously impacted by the construction of the HOV Lane widening project, in which specific university-owned parcels and easements were transferred to Caltrans. The university is concerned about the cumulative impacts of both projects, particularly with Build Alternative 3 which may require additional right-of-way.</p> <p>In a prior Transfer of Jurisdiction agreement reached with Caltrans, the university explored the possibility of moving the historic Kellogg Mansion entrance gates located in the upper parking Lot R as a way to mitigate damages due to proposed footing easements, which may need to be revisited again. Caltrans agreed to build a retaining in such a way as to accommodate the addition of a soundwall, which we are not certain took into account of any additional widening needed for this project. Caltrans also agreed to provide additional noise analysis and sound attenuation, given the proximity of the freeway to instructional, administrative and dormitory buildings on campus. In addition, Caltrans agreed to redesign the Kellogg Drive on/off-ramps in order to minimize the amount of thru-traffic through the campus by re-routing traffic along East Campus Drive directly to South Campus Drive, and that the effort would be incorporated into the HOV project, or if necessary, be made part of a future project. We request that these prior commitments continue to be honored.</p> <p>Moreover, we believe the I-10 ExpressLanes Extension Project presents a significant opportunity for Metro and Caltrans to improve access to campus by integrating complete streets and transit infrastructure at the Kellogg interchange area, which is a major entrance to our campus as well as Mt. San Antonio College. Our campus Master Plan Update proposes the upgrade of East Campus Drive to a two-way road. The California Highway Patrol (CHP) also has plans to relocate its Baldwin Park Office to a six-acre site, just off of East Campus Drive, and they have expressed support for such a two-way road. The campus also envisions new Gateway entry and complete streets elements along Kellogg Drive and East Campus Drive, respectively, that would improve the student/visitor experience entering ...</p>
205		06/09/22	Email	<p>Dear Mr. Kosinski,</p> <p>The purpose of this letter is to provide comments from the City of Claremont on the proposed I-10 Express Lanes Extension Project to close the gap on the I-10 between I-605 and Los Angeles/San Bernardino County Line.</p> <p>The City of Claremont is providing comments on specific areas of concern directly related to the I-10 Freeway:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Soundwall gap at the south side of the freeway creating concerns with Noise and Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Emission issues as well as creating Community Impacts and quality of life issues for residential neighborhoods to the south of the gap</li> <li>•Existing freeway drainage patterns discharging onto private property prompting Water Quality and Storm Water Runoff concerns</li> <li>•Bicycle and pedestrian safety concerns at the Indian Hill Boulevard underpass resulting from Lack of Complete Streets Features</li> <li>•Vehicular, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Safety Concerns at the Indian Hill Boulevard - I-10 Interchange, resulting from Cumulative Impacts</li> <li>•Potential need of additional right of way to accommodate proposed project affecting existing land use and existing utilities</li> </ul> <p>Soundwall Gap at the south side of the freeway:</p> <p>The City of Claremont has pursued the installation of soundwalls at the I-10 Freeway for more than 20 years. Though the majority of soundwalls were installed with past Caltrans projects, there is still a gap in the eastbound direction between College and Mills Avenues. The current gap in the soundwall infrastructure creates quality of life issues affecting the residential properties directly exposed to the freeway noise and pollution without mitigation. This situation also raises concerns with Noise and Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Emission issues as well as Community Impacts and quality of life issues for residential neighborhoods to the south of the gap,</p> <p>To address the City's and community's concerns, Claremont Mayor Stark sent a letter to Mr. Ben Jong on August 18, 2021, to request Metro' support to complete the soundwall gap at this location. In response, a letter was received indicating that this gap would be evaluated with the project that is currently being proposed: Express Lanes Extension project. The letter also indicates that Metro will work with Caltrans to address any necessary mitigation measures. Please refer to Attachment A for specific details. Moving forward, it is imperative that this gap is effectively addressed and that a soundwall be constructed to close the current gap with the proposed project to address the environmental concerns.</p> <p>Existing freeway drainage patterns discharging onto private property prompting Water Quality and Storm Water Runoff concerns</p> <p>There is an ongoing situation involving concentrated freeway drainage patterns discharging onto private property and public right of way during storm events. This issue dates back from 2014 and has yet to be resolved. City staff has attempted to work with Caltrans to get this issue resolved, to no avail. The proposed project needs to address this situation and in the process, correct the nuisance overflow issues that remain unresolved. Please refer to Attachment B for reference backup documents.</p> <p>Bicycle and pedestrian safety concerns at the Indian Hill Boulevard underpass resulting from Lack of Complete Streets Features</p> <p>The outdated Indian Hill Boulevard freeway underpass presents safety concerns for bicyclists and pedestrians resulting from the substandard accommodations and lack of complete streets features. Collisions resulting in fatalities and injuries occurring in this area are a very serious concern. Claremont is requesting that the existing conditions at the underpass be evaluated with the project to ensure that alternative modes of transportation also receive adequate and safe infrastructure with the proposed project. The dim and ineffective lighting conditions at the underpass is also a concern as it has a negative impact on public safety. The City of Claremont is requesting that this .....</p>

206		06/09/22	Email	<p>Dear Mr. Kosinski:</p> <p>The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) has reviewed the Notice of Preparation (NOP) of a Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) from the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans; Lead Agency) for the I-10 ExpressLanes Extension (Project). Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments and recommendations regarding those activities involved in the Project that may affect California fish and wildlife. Likewise, we appreciate the opportunity to provide comments regarding those aspects of the Project that CDFW, by law, may be required to carry out or approve through the exercise of its own regulatory authority under the Fish and Game Code.</p> <p>CDFW's Role</p> <p>CDFW is California's Trustee Agency for fish and wildlife resources and holds those resources in trust by statute for all the people of the State [Fish &amp; G. Code, §§ 711.7, subdivision (a) &amp; 1802; Pub. Resources Code, § 21070; California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, § 15386, subdivision (a)]. CDFW, in its trustee capacity, has jurisdiction over the conservation, protection, and management of fish, wildlife, native plants, and habitat necessary for biologically sustainable populations of those species (Id., § 1802). Similarly, for purposes of CEQA, CDFW is charged by law to provide, as available, biological expertise during public agency environmental review efforts, focusing specifically on projects and related activities that have the potential to adversely affect State fish and wildlife resources.</p> <p>CDFW is also submitting comments as a Responsible Agency under CEQA (Pub. Resources Code, § 21069; CEQA Guidelines, § 15381). CDFW expects that it may need to exercise regulatory authority as provided by the Fish and Game Code, including lake and streambed alteration regulatory authority (Fish &amp; G. Code, § 1600 et seq.). Likewise, to the extent implementation of the Project as proposed may result in "take", as defined by State law, of any species protected under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) (Fish &amp; G. Code, § 2050 et seq.), or CESA-listed rare plant pursuant to the Native Plant Protection Act (NPPA; Fish &amp; G. Code, §1900 et seq.), CDFW recommends the Project proponent obtain appropriate authorization under the Fish and Game Code.</p> <p>Project Description and Summary</p> <p>Objective: The Project proposes to convert the high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lane into one or two high-occupancy toll (HOT), or ExpressLane(s), in each direction. The four alternatives are proposed for consideration are as follows:</p> <p>Alternative 1: No Build</p>
207		06/09/22	Email	I'm named after the subway. Option 3 does express lane all the way out into Redlands. I support option 3 so I can go to my grandma quicker. Because she lives in Claremont.
208		06/09/22	Project Hotline	Hi. I'm calling regarding the 10 freeway where you guys are making a new lane. I guess I'm hoping that you guys are making a carpool lane and nothing else. Thank you.
209	10:28pm	06/10/22	Online Comment Form	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I am writing to express my opposition to Alternatives 3 and 4. Adding more lanes to the 10 is completely counterproductive and will cause significant damage to both local communities and to the region as a whole. It will negatively impact public health and sustainability, while doing nothing to alleviate traffic.</p> <p>It has been shown time and time again that expanding highways does not reduce traffic, and in fact increases traffic through induced demand, which will only add further stress to local street networks adjacent to the 10. Given that this is your job, I know you understand the concept of induced demand; you don't need an explanation. But apparently, you need a reminder that it must be accounted for! Magical thinking has been failing LA for decades, and as our reward we have the worst traffic in the nation. As the pioneers of urban highway design, don't you think LA would have solved traffic by now, if it was in fact possible to solve?</p> <p>I think it bears repeating: we do not need more vehicle lanes on the 10, and I'll give some other reasons for why, besides the fact that the project literally cannot work as it is being advertised. Adding vehicle lanes means adding vehicles. This will create more emissions, which will damage the health of the people who live in the communities around the 10. I'm sure this project will also involve displacing people from their homes and businesses. It's frankly insulting to the residents to remove them from their homes and then spew more emissions in their air.</p> <p>The money for this project will be better spent on building out the bus network in the area, and increasing the frequency and hours of service of existing lines. This will actually alleviate traffic, unlike Alternatives 3 and 4, and will actually service the community.</p> <p>To conclude, Alternatives 3 and 4 would be expensive disasters for the area, which will make residents poorer and sicker, and take us further away from a sustainable transit system. The only viable options are Alternatives 1 and 2.</p> <p>Thank you for taking the time to read my comments.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>
210	10:44am	06/10/22	Online Comment Form	The sound wall needs to be improved. The current wall does not provide any deadening of freeway noise to the homes south of I-10 in the city of Claremont. Traffic noise is loud and can be heard blocks away and into Pomona. In the past trash has been thrown over the current low wall from the freeway into neighborhood backyards. Currently cars and trucks on the freeway can be seen over the top of the wall in front of homes from the street and in backyards. Lastly during rush hour times there is the constant smell of diesel and dust from vehicles on I-10 when outside in the neighborhood. Based on these issues most of the homeowners in Claremont south of I-10 have less than a stellar opinion or image of Caltrans and plenty of distrust. We have had to put up with too much for too long with the inadequacies of the current wall that was built by Caltrans!

211	10:58am	06/10/22	Online Comment Form	When the new I-10 Express lanes are built, please make sure that all of the sound walls are extended to the most effective height for deadening freeway noise for the homes in Claremont, especially south of the freeway. This area is part of my neighborhood. Caltrans should ensure that this neighborhood and all neighborhoods are protected as much as possible from noise pollution.
212	11:36 pm	06/10/22	Email	<p>Dear Metro,</p> <p>I am an SGV resident who cares about my community, the people who live in it, and the air we breathe. I therefore do not support any I-10 ExpressLanes "extension" projects that will destroy people's homes, encourage more vehicle trips, and further pollute some of the most pollution-burdened communities in California.</p> <p>Vehicle trips, including on freeways like I-10, are the main source of local air pollution in southern California, which remains one of the most polluted regions in the United States. The outcomes of such poor air quality are devastating, especially to the most vulnerable members of inland and frontline communities. High rates of asthma and other respiratory illnesses, as well as cognitive impairments, some cancers, and even obesity have all been linked to exposure to high levels of air pollution. The cost of these health disparities -- particularly long-term, chronic illnesses associated with air pollution such as asthma -- is billions in associated healthcare and diminished productivity to LA County.</p> <p>Vehicles on roads and highways are primarily responsible for over half of all GHG emissions in California when one accounts for emissions related to the extraction, processing, and distribution of oil. Los Angeles County and California will not reach their climate goals unless future transportation investments reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) per capita.</p> <p>Adding more lanes doesn't reduce traffic, but it does increase VMT. The outcome of roadway widening and expansion is settled science. In 2017 the Governor's Office of Planning and Research advised agencies that "each percent increase in lane miles results in a 1.03 percent increase in vehicle travel" (Source: pg. 29 - <a href="https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com?url=http%3A%2F%2Fopr.ca.gov%2Fdocs%2F20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf&amp;data=05%7C01%7C10extension%40metro.net%7C9ad7b29bdd874ffe4fe008da4b749be2%7Cab57129bdbfd4caca77fc74c40364af%7C1%7C0%7C637905261610465045%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljojMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&amp;sd=ujtV6Q1pVhZyhH6Ds2CQeZ0YrOpN8%2FaMwZ0je44eIWk%3D&amp;reserved=0">https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com?url=http%3A%2F%2Fopr.ca.gov%2Fdocs%2F20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf&amp;data=05%7C01%7C10extension%40metro.net%7C9ad7b29bdd874ffe4fe008da4b749be2%7Cab57129bdbfd4caca77fc74c40364af%7C1%7C0%7C637905261610465045%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljojMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&amp;sd=ujtV6Q1pVhZyhH6Ds2CQeZ0YrOpN8%2FaMwZ0je44eIWk%3D&amp;reserved=0</a>). Even Caltrans has acknowledged this fact in its "Rethinking How We Build So Californians Can Drive Less" ( webpage Caltrans states that "[w]hen highways are expanded, a series of changes occur, often resulting in more trips and longer travel times, as people are forced to drive farther to get to work and other destinations. Induced demand creates more traffic at greater cost to people and the environment, while worsening congestion." (Source: <a href="https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com?url=https%3A%2F%2Fdot.ca.gov%2Fprograms%2Fsustainability%2Fsb-743&amp;data=05%7C01%7C10extension%40metro.net%7C9ad7b29bdd874ffe4fe008da4b749be2%7Cab57129bdbfd4caca77fc74c40364af%7C1%7C0%7C637905261610465045%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljojMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&amp;sd=sjGZSYCipfd6lfHetnEolaiEKz6qWay24UhnZ%2BFcv5M%3D&amp;reserved=0">https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com?url=https%3A%2F%2Fdot.ca.gov%2Fprograms%2Fsustainability%2Fsb-743&amp;data=05%7C01%7C10extension%40metro.net%7C9ad7b29bdd874ffe4fe008da4b749be2%7Cab57129bdbfd4caca77fc74c40364af%7C1%7C0%7C637905261610465045%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljojMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&amp;sd=sjGZSYCipfd6lfHetnEolaiEKz6qWay24UhnZ%2BFcv5M%3D&amp;reserved=0</a>)).</p> <p>Metro projects should not increase GHG emissions. You have a chance to prevent this. In light of the above, only Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 are viable options. Displacement, more pollution, and more GHG emissions can not be an option. Please eliminate Alternatives 3 and 4 from consideration.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>
213	11:53am	06/10/22	Online Comment Form	YES!! Please improve my neighborhood by improving the sound wall along the I-10 at Indian Hill Blvd in Claremont.
214	11:54 pm	06/10/22	Email	<p>Dear Metro,</p> <p>I am an SGV resident who cares about my community, the people who live in it, and the air we breathe. I therefore do support any I-10 ExpressLanes "extension" projects that destroy people's homes, reduce congestion, and won't further pollute some of the most pollution-burdened communities in California.</p> <p>Traffic congestion, including on freeways like I-10, are the main source of local air pollution in southern California, which remains one of the most polluted regions in the United States. The outcomes of such poor air quality are devastating, especially to the most vulnerable members of inland and frontline communities. High rates of asthma and other respiratory illnesses, as well as cognitive impairments, some cancers, and even obesity have all been linked to exposure to high levels of air pollution. The cost of these health disparities -- particularly long-term, chronic illnesses associated with air pollution such as asthma -- is billions in associated healthcare and diminished productivity to LA County.</p> <p>Vehicles on roads and highways aren't primarily responsible for over half of all GHG emissions in California when one accounts for emissions related to the extraction, processing, and distribution of oil. Los Angeles County and California will reach their climate goals when future transportation investments won't reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) per capita.</p> <p>Adding more lanes reduce traffic, but it doesn't increase VMT. Induced demand is a fallacy when used against freeway expansion.</p> <p>Metro projects should not increase GHG emissions. You have a chance to prevent this. In light of the above, only Alternative 3 and Alternative 4 are viable options. Displacement, less pollution, and less GHG emissions can be an option. Please eliminate Alternatives 1 and 2 from consideration.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>
215	12:04pm	06/10/22	Online Comment Form	Please provide a better sound wall on the south side of I-10 east of Indian Hill as part of your work there. Thank you.
216	12:25 pm	06/10/22	Email	Do you clown engineers at metro have any idea what induced demand is? Why would you destroy people's homes and businesses in order to create MORE traffic?? Wouldn't a better idea be to induce demand to promote public transportation ridership? Bike lanes, dedicated bus lanes (people don't take the bus because it gets stuck in traffic and takes LONGER), expansion of the rail network, these are all areas that would induce demand AWAY from the freeways. Please, I beg you to look at the transportation solutions overseas in the Netherlands or Japan where cars and pollution do not dominate daily existence and commuting.

217	12:59pm	06/10/22	Online Comment Form	I support a better sound wall for the homes in Claremont that are east of Indian Hill Blvd and south of the freeway.
218	1:24 pm	06/10/22	Email	<p>Dear Metro,</p> <p>I am a resident who cares about my community, the people who live in it, and the air we breathe. I therefore do not support any I-10 ExpressLanes "extension" projects that will destroy people's homes, encourage more vehicle trips, and further pollute some of the most pollution-burdened communities in California.</p> <p>Vehicle trips, including on freeways like I-10, are the main source of local air pollution in southern California, which remains one of the most polluted regions in the United States. The outcomes of such poor air quality are devastating, especially to the most vulnerable members of inland and frontline communities. High rates of asthma and other respiratory illnesses, as well as cognitive impairments, some cancers, and even obesity have all been linked to exposure to high levels of air pollution. The cost of these health disparities -- particularly long-term, chronic illnesses associated with air pollution such as asthma -- is billions in associated healthcare and diminished productivity to LA County.</p> <p>Vehicles on roads and highways are primarily responsible for over half of all GHG emissions in California when one accounts for emissions related to the extraction, processing, and distribution of oil. Los Angeles County and California will not reach their climate goals unless future transportation investments reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) per capita.</p> <p>Adding more lanes doesn't reduce traffic, but it does increase VMT. The outcome of roadway widening and expansion is settled science. In 2017 the Governor's Office of Planning and Research advised agencies that "each percent increase in lane miles results in a 1.03 percent increase in vehicle travel" (Source: pg. 29 - <a href="https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Fopr.ca.gov%2Fdocs%2F20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf&amp;data=05%7C01%7C10extension%40metro.net%7C982f09570c8e4d1b7b6808da4b1f2333%7Cab57129bdbfd4caca77fc74c40364af%7C1%7C0%7C637904894495791208%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEkaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&amp;sdata=jcH%2BFqHgu4Tul7xgfDMGCPDAn8EB037x3I%2BDjRnVK6Y%3D&amp;reserved=0">https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Fopr.ca.gov%2Fdocs%2F20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf&amp;data=05%7C01%7C10extension%40metro.net%7C982f09570c8e4d1b7b6808da4b1f2333%7Cab57129bdbfd4caca77fc74c40364af%7C1%7C0%7C637904894495791208%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEkaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&amp;sdata=jcH%2BFqHgu4Tul7xgfDMGCPDAn8EB037x3I%2BDjRnVK6Y%3D&amp;reserved=0</a>). Even Caltrans has acknowledged this fact In its "Rethinking How We Build So Californians Can Drive Less" ( webpage Caltrans states that "[w]hen highways are expanded, a series of changes occur, often resulting in more trips and longer travel times, as people are forced to drive farther to get to work and other destinations. Induced demand creates more traffic at greater cost to people and the environment, while worsening congestion." (Source: <a href="https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fdot.ca.gov%2Fprograms%2Fsustainability%2Fsb-743&amp;data=05%7C01%7C10extension%40metro.net%7C982f09570c8e4d1b7b6808da4b1f2333%7Cab57129bdbfd4caca77fc74c40364af%7C1%7C0%7C637904894495791208%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEkaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&amp;sdata=bODZ0Q05rZRsZOxExPxClyS71xfTku%2B1sboYSP8ibeQ%3D&amp;reserved=0">https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fdot.ca.gov%2Fprograms%2Fsustainability%2Fsb-743&amp;data=05%7C01%7C10extension%40metro.net%7C982f09570c8e4d1b7b6808da4b1f2333%7Cab57129bdbfd4caca77fc74c40364af%7C1%7C0%7C637904894495791208%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEkaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&amp;sdata=bODZ0Q05rZRsZOxExPxClyS71xfTku%2B1sboYSP8ibeQ%3D&amp;reserved=0</a>).</p> <p>Metro projects should not increase GHG emissions. You have a chance to prevent this. In light of the above, only Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 are viable options. Displacement, more pollution, and more GHG emissions can not be an option. Please eliminate Alternatives 3 and 4 from consideration.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>
219	1:51pm	06/10/22	Online Comment Form	<p>Two issues, please address:</p> <p>(1) Tall sound wall is needed east of the Indian Hill Blvd. onramp to protect neighborhood homes from the freeway. It has been inadvertently shortened past the commercial district at the on/off-ramp.</p> <p>(2) Widening of Indian Hill Blvd. bridge: The bridge is narrow and unduly restricts traffic on Indian Hill Blvd. It's a terrible safety issue, locks up traffic and pedestrians need to walk so close to cars. The commercial district down there needs a wider berth for Indian Hill to pass through. It's just untenable.</p> <p>Please address the above issues,</p>
220	2:02am	06/10/22	Online Comment Form	<p>As you drive east on the I-10 towards Claremont, there is a tall sound wall that protects the homes in Pomona which are south of the I-10. The height of the wall drops when you reach the auto park commercial area in Claremont. What is needed is a similarly tall sound wall to be built when you again reach single family homes east of Indian Hill Blvd. This occurs at the north end of Drake Ave. The wall needs to extend to San Bernardino County, where a tall wall has recently been constructed.</p> <p>Motel 6 should be contact to determine if they need a similarly tall wall just west of the single family homes.</p>
221	2:05pm	06/10/22	Online Comment Form	I support Alternative #3, we need to extend the Expresslanes to the 605 in both directions and repurpose the existing HOV lane into another Expresslane. Congestion is horrible in this corridor. Please also do more Expresslanes throughout the LA Metro area. Thank you for your consideration
222	2:26pm	06/10/22	Online Comment Form	<p>We strongly agree that Alternative 2 should be implemented near the area between Indian Hills and Monte Vista exit off 10 freeway. As we understand, this option would convert existing HOV lane into HOT lane and add additional HOT lane. We live in the neighborhood of homes behind the storage rental facility, and have lived for too long with the excessive noise heard from the 10 freeway. It is imperative that a sound wall is built, and we understand that Alternative 2 would guarantee this or some other noise abatement consideration.</p> <p>The sound wall would be of great benefit to our neighborhood and our children. It would positively impact the quality of our lives and also the value of our real estate. We would greatly appreciate a sound wall or other noise abatement consideration, and for this reason strongly agree with Alternative 2.</p>
223	2:27pm	06/10/22	Online Comment Form	<p>Foothill Transit is in support of the project, speed improvements along the 10 Freeway. The agency encourages the implementation of the ExpressLanes 3+ pilot to help ease the congestion caused by single driver vehicles utilizing the lanes.</p> <p>Foothill Transit launched its student pass program, the Class Pass, at Cal Poly Pomona this past academic year and its use has steadily increase as the year progressed. The agency is working closely with the university on a feasibility project to build a mobility hub/ transit center on campus to encourage the use of public transit. The agency supports the enhancement of the Kellogg Drive on/off ramp, the rerouting of the Silver Streak is currently being planned to serve the campus and the service will be using the on/off ramp as it exits the freeway.</p> <p>Foothill Transit looks forward to working with CalTrans, LA Metro, and Cal Poly Pomona as the project moves forward.</p>

224	2:28pm	06/10/22	Online Comment Form	<p>We strongly agree that Alternative 2 should be implemented near the area between Indian Hills and Monte Vista exit off 10 freeway. As we understand, this option would convert existing HOV lane into HOT lane and add additional HOT lane. We live in the neighborhood of homes behind the storage rental facility, and have lived for too long with the excessive noise heard from the 10 freeway. It is imperative that a sound wall is built, and we understand that Alternative 2 would guarantee this or some other noise abatement consideration.</p> <p>The sound wall would be of great benefit to our neighborhood and our children. It would positively impact the quality of our lives and also the value of our real estate. We would greatly appreciate a sound wall or other noise abatement consideration, and for this reason strongly agree with Alternative 2.</p>
225	2:38pm	06/10/22	Online Comment Form	<p>A taller sound wall should be built on the south side of the 10 freeway from Indian Hill Blvd to the county line with San Bernardino county. Also, Indian Hill Blvd. needs to be widened under the freeway as it is currently a major bottleneck and causes major traffic congestion.</p>
226	2:55 pm	06/10/22	Email	<p>Dear Metro,</p> <p>I do not support any I-10 ExpressLanes "extension" projects that will destroy people's homes, encourage more vehicle trips, and further pollute some of the most pollution-burdened communities in California.</p> <p>Vehicle trips, including on freeways like I-10, are the main source of local air pollution in southern California, which remains one of the most polluted regions in the United States. The outcomes of such poor air quality are devastating, especially to the most vulnerable members of inland and frontline communities. High rates of asthma and other respiratory illnesses, as well as cognitive impairments, some cancers, and even obesity have all been linked to exposure to high levels of air pollution. The cost of these health disparities -- particularly long-term, chronic illnesses associated with air pollution such as asthma -- is billions in associated healthcare and diminished productivity to LA County.</p> <p>Vehicles on roads and highways are primarily responsible for over half of all GHG emissions in California when one accounts for emissions related to the extraction, processing, and distribution of oil. Los Angeles County and California will not reach their climate goals unless future transportation investments reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) per capita.</p> <p>Adding more lanes doesn't reduce traffic, but it does increase VMT. The outcome of roadway widening and expansion is settled science. In 2017 the Governor's Office of Planning and Research advised agencies that "each percent increase in lane miles results in a 1.03 percent increase in vehicle travel" (Source: pg. 29 - <a href="http://opr.ca.gov/docs/20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf">http://opr.ca.gov/docs/20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf</a>). Even Caltrans has acknowledged this fact In its "Rethinking How We Build So Californians Can Drive Less" ( webpage Caltrans states that "[w]hen highways are expanded, a series of changes occur, often resulting in more trips and longer travel times, as people are forced to drive farther to get to work and other destinations. Induced demand creates more traffic at greater cost to people and the environment, while worsening congestion." (Source: <a href="https://dot.ca.gov/programs/sustainability/sb-743">https://dot.ca.gov/programs/sustainability/sb-743</a>).</p> <p>Metro should be at the forefront of improving southern California communities, Knocking down houses and businesses while creating more pollution is not doing that. Building freeways should be a thing of the of the past.</p> <p>Metro projects should not increase GHG emissions. You have a chance to prevent this. In light of the above, only Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 are viable options. Displacement, more pollution, and more GHG emissions can not be an option. Please eliminate Alternatives 3 and 4 from consideration.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>
227	3:03pm	06/10/22	Online Comment Form	n/a
228	3:04pm	06/10/22	Online Comment Form	<p>It's past time that we stop builidng and expanding freeways.. 80 years of freeway building has decimated commuties, destroying houses and businesses, often in our most vulnerable neighborhoods. We've had years of research showing us that we can't pave our way out of traffic. It's time to find a better solution. Please don't choose any option that paves over anymore more Southern California.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
229	3:08pm	06/10/22	Online Comment Form	<p>Metro should analyze the induced VMT and resultant induced GHG, local criteria pollution and collisions caused by alternatives that would add additional lane miles (general purpose, managed HOT lanes or HOV lanes. Metro shall identify all mitigation measures to mitigate the induced VMT and resultant impacts. Metro should use the Induced VMT Calculator that Caltrans has advised is the appropriate tool for measuring full long term impacts of induced travel caused by highway capacity expansion.</p>

230	3:17 pm	06/10/22	Email	<p>Dear Metro,</p> <p>I am a Councilmember in the San Gabriel Valley who cares about the SGV community, the people who live in it, and the air we breathe. I therefore do not support any I-10 ExpressLanes "extension" projects that will destroy people's homes, encourage more vehicle trips, and further pollute some of the most pollution-burdened communities in California.</p> <p>Vehicle trips, including on freeways like I-10, are the main source of local air pollution in southern California, which remains one of the most polluted regions in the United States. The outcomes of such poor air quality are devastating, especially to the most vulnerable members of inland and frontline communities. High rates of asthma and other respiratory illnesses, as well as cognitive impairments, some cancers, and even obesity have all been linked to exposure to high levels of air pollution. The cost of these health disparities -- particularly long-term, chronic illnesses associated with air pollution such as asthma -- is billions in associated healthcare and diminished productivity to LA County.</p> <p>Vehicles on roads and highways are primarily responsible for over half of all GHG emissions in California when one accounts for emissions related to the extraction, processing, and distribution of oil. Los Angeles County and California will not reach their climate goals unless future transportation investments reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) per capita.</p> <p>Adding more lanes doesn't reduce traffic, but it does increase VMT. The outcome of roadway widening and expansion is settled science. In 2017 the Governor's Office of Planning and Research advised agencies that "each percent increase in lane miles results in a 1.03 percent increase in vehicle travel" (Source: pg. 29 - <a href="https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Fopr.ca.gov%2Fdocs%2F20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf&amp;data=05%7C01%7Ci10extension%40metro.net%7Cf8e8ccba4e0843bdfc108da4b2eff9%7Cab57129bdbfd4caca77fc74c40364af%7C1%7C0%7C637904962606632360%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljojMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQljoV2luMzliLCJBTiI6k1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&amp;sdata=DBfjn3nGGPrWn6PjkvPvm9q5Js3RLCQ8jiUPVzmLN4o%3D&amp;reserved=0">https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Fopr.ca.gov%2Fdocs%2F20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf&amp;data=05%7C01%7Ci10extension%40metro.net%7Cf8e8ccba4e0843bdfc108da4b2eff9%7Cab57129bdbfd4caca77fc74c40364af%7C1%7C0%7C637904962606632360%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljojMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQljoV2luMzliLCJBTiI6k1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&amp;sdata=DBfjn3nGGPrWn6PjkvPvm9q5Js3RLCQ8jiUPVzmLN4o%3D&amp;reserved=0</a>). Even Caltrans has acknowledged this fact. In its "Rethinking How We Build So Californians Can Drive Less" ( webpage Caltrans states that "[w]hen highways are expanded, a series of changes occur, often resulting in more trips and longer travel times, as people are forced to drive farther to get to work and other destinations. Induced demand creates more traffic at greater cost to people and the environment, while worsening congestion." (Source: <a href="https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fdot.ca.gov%2Fprograms%2Fsustainability%2Fsb-743&amp;data=05%7C01%7Ci10extension%40metro.net%7Cf8e8ccba4e0843bdfc108da4b2eff9%7Cab57129bdbfd4caca77fc74c40364af%7C1%7C0%7C637904962606632360%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljojMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQljoV2luMzliLCJBTiI6k1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&amp;sdata=AFxVWY6t3%2FTQB8RC6WJlpPvTp%2FZPaC7shtrghIX8ZU%3D&amp;reserved=0">https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fdot.ca.gov%2Fprograms%2Fsustainability%2Fsb-743&amp;data=05%7C01%7Ci10extension%40metro.net%7Cf8e8ccba4e0843bdfc108da4b2eff9%7Cab57129bdbfd4caca77fc74c40364af%7C1%7C0%7C637904962606632360%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljojMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQljoV2luMzliLCJBTiI6k1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&amp;sdata=AFxVWY6t3%2FTQB8RC6WJlpPvTp%2FZPaC7shtrghIX8ZU%3D&amp;reserved=0</a>).</p> <p>Metro projects should not increase GHG emissions. You have a chance to prevent this. In light of the above, only Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 are viable options. Displacement, more pollution, and more GHG emissions can not be an option. Please eliminate Alternatives 3 and 4 from consideration.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>
231	3:29am	06/10/22	Online Comment Form	On the entrance to the east 10 fwy off of indian hill, the tall wall that protects the homes from noise abruptly ends. The homes at the end of the wall are treated with the obnoxious full-throttle sound of the cars that are accelerating at high rpm's as they near the end of the on-ramp, and try to merge into traffic (and the occasional honking from drivers avoiding those who cant merge properly).. Maybe something can be done to continue the height off the wall on that southside stretch, similar to how it is on the northside of the 10 freeway.
232	3:29pm	06/10/22	Online Comment Form	This is a no brainer. A soundwall that is essentially identical to the soundwalls in residential areas elsewhere along the freeway needs to be constructed in this area.
233	3:41pm	06/10/22	Online Comment Form	I only just found out about this project thanks to a neighbor. Our residential neighborhood is subject all the noise and pollution created by the 10 freeway. Whichever project is finally determined to go ahead, I implore you to complete the sound wall along the 10 freeway behind our neighborhood on Bryn Mawr Rd in Claremont. The extension will certainly increase the freeway volume and accordingly the noise and pollution impacting our neighborhood. We have a constant layer of dust and grime on the surfaces in our home, on the outdoor surfaces and our vehicles, it cannot be healthy. Please consider the surrounding neighbors. If I had earlier notification of this project and our ability to provide input, I would have had time to review the project and present a more educated position. Unfortunately, we were not informed timely.
234	3:43pm	06/10/22	Online Comment Form	<p>Hi there, I am a resident of south Claremont and am writing regarding the 10 Freeway. As you drive east on the I-10 towards Claremont, there is a tall sound wall that protects the homes in Pomona which are south of the I-10. The height of the wall drops when you reach the auto park commercial area in Claremont. What is needed is a similarly tall sound wall to be built when you again reach single family homes east of Indian Hill Blvd. This occurs at the north end of Drake Ave. The wall needs to extend eastward to San Bernardino County, where a tall wall has already been constructed.</p> <p>With construction happening in both surrounding cities, Claremont needs attention along the 10 Freeway.</p> <p>Thank you!</p>
235	3:50pm	06/10/22	Online Comment Form	<p>I like to comment on the 10 Fwy sound wall between College ave and Mills Ave Claremont ca.</p> <p>The noise at this location is sometimes unbearable. Motorcycles and semi trucks are really bothersome and embarrassing at times. We really can not enjoy our back yard due to this and it is also a clear view as if the trucks are right on the other side of the wall. My neighbor was trying to sell their house last year and couldnt. The main complaint was the freeway noise. I really hope this can be resolved by putting up a sound wall. I know northern Claremont got a wall on the 210 fwy. I know this hurts our home values and our health. Please consider the wall. Build that wall!!!.All kidding aside we are really tired of it and would love to have some solitude in our own backyard.</p>
236	5:01pm	06/10/22	Online Comment Form	I'm apposed to any sound wall from college ave going east to San Bernardino county line. I have lived here for almost 40 years. One of the reasons I bought and stayed here is because the view of the mountains
237	5:44 pm	06/10/22	Email	<p>Hello Metro,</p> <p>I am against widening alternatives 3 and 4! Did you not learn your lessons from the 405 widening? It does not work. There are no significant travel time savings from widening freeways; it will only induce more vehicle trips. Widening freeways increase air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions, accelerating the climate crisis. Widening freeways historically have destroyed people of color's homes and businesses, robbing them of generational wealth associated with homeownership and negatively affecting their health. NO widening of the 10 Freeway</p>

238	5:54 pm	06/10/22	Email	<p>Dear Metro,</p> <p>I am an SGV resident who cares about my community, the people who live in it, and the air we breathe. I therefore do not support any I-10 ExpressLanes "extension" projects that will destroy people's homes, encourage more vehicle trips, and further pollute some of the most pollution-burdened communities in California.</p> <p>Vehicle trips, including on freeways like I-10, are the main source of local air pollution in southern California, which remains one of the most polluted regions in the United States. The outcomes of such poor air quality are devastating, especially to the most vulnerable members of inland and frontline communities. High rates of asthma and other respiratory illnesses, as well as cognitive impairments, some cancers, and even obesity have all been linked to exposure to high levels of air pollution. The cost of these health disparities -- particularly long-term, chronic illnesses associated with air pollution such as asthma -- is billions in associated healthcare and diminished productivity to LA County.</p> <p>Vehicles on roads and highways are primarily responsible for over half of all GHG emissions in California when one accounts for emissions related to the extraction, processing, and distribution of oil. Los Angeles County and California will not reach their climate goals unless future transportation investments reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) per capita.</p> <p>Adding more lanes doesn't reduce traffic, but it does increase VMT. The outcome of roadway widening and expansion is settled science. In 2017 the Governor's Office of Planning and Research advised agencies that "each percent increase in lane miles results in a 1.03 percent increase in vehicle travel" (Source: pg. 29 - <a href="http://opr.ca.gov/docs/20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf">http://opr.ca.gov/docs/20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf</a>). Even Caltrans has acknowledged this fact In its "Rethinking How We Build So Californians Can Drive Less" ( webpage Caltrans states that "[w]hen highways are expanded, a series of changes occur, often resulting in more trips and longer travel times, as people are forced to drive farther to get to work and other destinations. Induced demand creates more traffic at greater cost to people and the environment, while worsening congestion." (Source: <a href="https://dot.ca.gov/programs/sustainability/sb-743">https://dot.ca.gov/programs/sustainability/sb-743</a>).</p> <p>Metro projects should not increase GHG emissions. You have a chance to prevent this. In light of the above, only Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 are viable options. Displacement, more pollution, and more GHG emissions can not be an option. Please eliminate Alternatives 3 and 4 from consideration.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>
239	5:54pm	06/10/22	Online Comment Form	<p>I want a better sound wall for the homes in Claremont that are east of Indian Hill Blvd and south of the freeway.</p>
240	6:15 pm	06/10/22	Email	<p>Dear Metro,</p> <p>I am an Los Angeles resident who cares about my community, the people who live in it, and the air we breathe. I therefore do not support any I-10 ExpressLanes "extension" projects that will destroy people's homes, encourage more vehicle trips, and further pollute some of the most pollution-burdened communities in California.</p> <p>Vehicle trips, including on freeways like I-10, are the main source of local air pollution in southern California, which remains one of the most polluted regions in the United States. The outcomes of such poor air quality are devastating, especially to the most vulnerable members of inland and frontline communities. High rates of asthma and other respiratory illnesses, as well as cognitive impairments, some cancers, and even obesity have all been linked to exposure to high levels of air pollution. The cost of these health disparities -- particularly long-term, chronic illnesses associated with air pollution such as asthma -- is billions in associated healthcare and diminished productivity to LA County.</p> <p>Vehicles on roads and highways are primarily responsible for over half of all GHG emissions in California when one accounts for emissions related to the extraction, processing, and distribution of oil. Los Angeles County and California will not reach their climate goals unless future transportation investments reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) per capita.</p> <p>Adding more lanes doesn't reduce traffic, but it does increase VMT. The outcome of roadway widening and expansion is settled science. In 2017 the Governor's Office of Planning and Research advised agencies that "each percent increase in lane miles results in a 1.03 percent increase in vehicle travel" (Source: pg. 29 - <a href="https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Fopr.ca.gov%2Fdocs%2F20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf&amp;data=05%7C01%7Ci10extension%40metro.net%7Ce9f9b0a91ea5451dad0a08da4b47cddd%7Cab57129bdbfd4caca77fc74c40364af%7C1%7C0%7C637905069175088371%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljoIjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&amp;sd=LGy8%2BbEZHVz4BND2EkPSV8QtFYJetJh1ZOJ2IOiSH8%3D&amp;reserved=0">https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Fopr.ca.gov%2Fdocs%2F20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf&amp;data=05%7C01%7Ci10extension%40metro.net%7Ce9f9b0a91ea5451dad0a08da4b47cddd%7Cab57129bdbfd4caca77fc74c40364af%7C1%7C0%7C637905069175088371%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljoIjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&amp;sd=LGy8%2BbEZHVz4BND2EkPSV8QtFYJetJh1ZOJ2IOiSH8%3D&amp;reserved=0</a>). Even Caltrans has acknowledged this fact In its "Rethinking How We Build So Californians Can Drive Less" ( webpage Caltrans states that "[w]hen highways are expanded, a series of changes occur, often resulting in more trips and longer travel times, as people are forced to drive farther to get to work and other destinations. Induced demand creates more traffic at greater cost to people and the environment, while worsening congestion." (Source: <a href="https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fdot.ca.gov%2Fprograms%2Fsustainability%2Fsb-743&amp;data=05%7C01%7Ci10extension%40metro.net%7Ce9f9b0a91ea5451dad0a08da4b47cddd%7Cab57129bdbfd4caca77fc74c40364af%7C1%7C0%7C637905069175088371%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljoIjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&amp;sd=lpkcvd%2BjYS%2FQ017NqUb8xcWitNNfSYbvkbgEG3u%2FI0%3D&amp;reserved=0">https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fdot.ca.gov%2Fprograms%2Fsustainability%2Fsb-743&amp;data=05%7C01%7Ci10extension%40metro.net%7Ce9f9b0a91ea5451dad0a08da4b47cddd%7Cab57129bdbfd4caca77fc74c40364af%7C1%7C0%7C637905069175088371%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljoIjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&amp;sd=lpkcvd%2BjYS%2FQ017NqUb8xcWitNNfSYbvkbgEG3u%2FI0%3D&amp;reserved=0</a>).</p> <p>Metro projects should not increase GHG emissions. You have a chance to prevent this. In light of the above, only Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 are viable options. Displacement, more pollution, and more GHG emissions can not be an option. Please eliminate Alternatives 3 and 4 from consideration.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>

241	7:05 pm	06/10/22	Email	<p>Dear Metro,</p> <p>I am an SGV resident who cares about my community, the people who live in it, and the air we breathe. I therefore do not support any I-10 ExpressLanes "extension" projects that will destroy people's homes, encourage more vehicle trips, and further pollute some of the most pollution-burdened communities in California.</p> <p>Vehicle trips, including on freeways like I-10, are the main source of local air pollution in southern California, which remains one of the most polluted regions in the United States. The outcomes of such poor air quality are devastating, especially to the most vulnerable members of inland and frontline communities. High rates of asthma and other respiratory illnesses, as well as cognitive impairments, some cancers, and even obesity have all been linked to exposure to high levels of air pollution. The cost of these health disparities -- particularly long-term, chronic illnesses associated with air pollution such as asthma -- is billions in associated healthcare and diminished productivity to LA County.</p> <p>Vehicles on roads and highways are responsible for over half of all GHG emissions in California when one accounts for emissions related to the extraction, processing, and distribution of oil.</p> <p>Los Angeles County will not reach its climate goals unless future transportation investments reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) per capita. Adding more lanes doesn't reduce traffic, but it does increase VMT. The outcome of roadway widening and expansion is settled science. In 2017 the Governor's Office of Planning and Research advised agencies that "each percent increase in lane miles results in a 1.03 percent increase in vehicle travel" (Source: pg. 29 - <a href="http://opr.ca.gov/docs/20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf">http://opr.ca.gov/docs/20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf</a>).</p> <p>Even Caltrans has acknowledged this fact In its "Rethinking How We Build So Californians Can Drive Less" ( webpage Caltrans states that "[w]hen highways are expanded, a series of changes occur, often resulting in more trips and longer travel times, as people are forced to drive farther to get to work and other destinations. Induced demand creates more traffic at greater cost to people and the environment, while worsening congestion." (Source: <a href="https://dot.ca.gov/programs/sustainability/sb-743">https://dot.ca.gov/programs/sustainability/sb-743</a>).</p> <p>Metro projects should not increase GHG emissions. You have a chance to prevent this. In light of the above, only Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 are viable options. Displacement, more pollution, and more GHG emissions can not be an option. Please eliminate Alternatives 3 and 4 from consideration.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>
242	7:06am	06/10/22	Online Comment Form	<p>I believe a sound wall is needed on the I-10 Eastbound in Claremont. The sound wall ends in Pomona as you enter Claremont. Also West bound when you enter Claremont from Montclair the sound wall ends. Please consider building sound wall requests from Claremont businesses and residents.</p>
243	7:10am	06/10/22	Online Comment Form	<p>Please consider building a taller sound wall on the I-10 eastbound in Claremont east of Indian Hill Blvd exit, similar to the tall sound wall that ends in Pomona just before the Claremont Auto Center. When considering the length/distance of adding a taller sound wall, it is the remainder of Los Angeles County line. It's imperative that residential areas have minimal intrusion of noise created by onslaught of traffic on such a busy interstate. Please build a taller sound wall.</p>
244	7:20am	06/10/22	Online Comment Form	<p>I believe there needs to be a taller sound wall to protect homes south of the 10 freeway in Claremont. In addition tk the sound protection, it will also prevent hazardous exhaust fumes from so easily contaminating the air surrounding these homes. Thank you</p>
245	7:20am	06/10/22	Online Comment Form	<p>A tall wall on the 10 FWY needs to run east after Drake Ave in Pomona.</p>
246	7:52pm	06/10/22	Online Comment Form	<p>As you drive east on the I-10 towards Claremont, there is a tall sound wall that protects the homes in Pomona which are south of the I-10. The height of the wall drops when you reach the auto park commercial area in Claremont. What is needed is a similarly tall sound wall to be built when you again reach single family homes east of Indian Hill Blvd. This occurs at the north end of Drake Ave. The wall needs to extend eastward to San Bernardino County, where a tall wall has already been constructed.</p> <p>Motel 6 should be contacted to determine if they need a similarly tall wall just west of the single-family homes</p>
247	8:54 pm	06/10/22	Email	<p>Dear Metro Team,</p> <p>I understand that you're exploring widening 10. My grandparents were born and raised in East LA. My grandmother's family was displaced when the I-10 was built, and her husband, my grandfather, was an ironworker who helped build the I-10. I grew up in Baldwin Park and have lived in El Monte and South Pasadena. I am still a resident in San Gabriel Valley. My large extended family is dotted along the I-10 for miles. I have been served by it for most of my life and have a vested interest in its future. Still, I do NOT support any I-10 ExpressLanes "extension" projects.</p> <p>Wider lanes only encourages more cars, more driving, more pollution, and less health for families, communities, and the environment. I work in academia and this is well known. This doesn't even mention displacement. Our population is increasing. If the answer is to keep widening the freeways, when will we stop? What will they look like in 100 years for your grandchildren and their descendants? What will the air be like?</p> <p>I'm glad to say that my family and friends are increasingly looking to carpool and mass transit due to traffic on the freeways. Keeping the freeway as it is or changing to an HOT Expressway should be the only options.</p> <p>HOT can benefit the community and also provide the revenue to pay for itself. See this academic study: <a href="https://digitalcommons.usf.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1204&amp;context=jpt">https://digitalcommons.usf.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1204&amp;context=jpt</a></p> <p>Metro projects should not increase GHG emissions. You have a chance to prevent this. In light of the above, only Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 are viable options. Displacement, more pollution, and more GHG emissions can not be an option. Please eliminate Alternatives 3 and 4 from consideration.</p>

248	9:03pm	06/10/22	Online Comment Form	<p>As you drive east on the I-10 towards Claremont, there is a tall sound wall that protects the homes in Pomona which are south of the I-10. The height of the wall drops when you reach the auto park commercial area in Claremont. What is needed is a similarly tall sound wall to be built when you again reach single family homes east of Indian Hill Blvd. This occurs at the north end of Drake Ave. The wall needs to extend eastward to San Bernardino County, where a tall wall has already been constructed.</p> <p>Motel 6 should be contacted to determine if they need a similarly tall wall just west of the single-family homes.</p>
249	9:19pm	06/10/22	Online Comment Form	<p>As you drive east on the I-10 towards Claremont, there is a tall sound wall that protects the homes in Pomona which are south of the I-10. The height of the wall drops when you reach the auto park commercial area in Claremont. What is needed is a similarly tall sound wall to be built when you again reach single family homes east of Indian Hill Blvd. This occurs at the north end of Drake Ave. The wall needs to extend eastward to San Bernardino County, where a tall wall has already been constructed.</p> <p>Motel 6 should be contacted to determine if they need a similarly tall wall just west of the single-family homes.</p>
250	9:32am	06/10/22	Online Comment Form	<p>We'd like a better sound wall for the homes in Claremont that are east of Indian Hill Blvd and south of the freeway. The freeway is extremely noisy. As you drive east on the I-10 towards Claremont, there is a tall sound wall that protects the homes in Pomona which are south of the I-10. The height of the wall drops when you reach the auto park commercial area in Claremont. What is needed is a similarly tall sound wall to be built when you again reach single family homes east of Indian Hill Blvd. This occurs at the north end of Drake Ave. The wall needs to extend eastward to San Bernardino County, where a tall wall has already been constructed. Motel 6 should be contacted to determine if they need a similarly tall wall just west of the single-family homes.</p>
251	9:54am	06/10/22	Online Comment Form	<p>Please build a sound wall south of 10 fwy east of Indian Hill Blvd</p>
252		06/10/22	Email	<p>Dear Mr. Kosinski,</p> <p>Notice of Scoping/Initiation of Studies for the Interstate 10 (I-10) ExpressLanes Project</p> <p>The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (Metropolitan) has reviewed the Notice of Scoping/Initiation of Studies for the Interstate 10 (I-10) ExpressLanes Project. The purpose of the Project is to provide efficient operation of the High Occupancy Toll (HOT)/ExpressLanes and High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) or carpool network, improve safety, enhance mobility, and increase regional connectivity along I-10. The Project is needed to reduce degradation of HOV/HOT lanes operation in accordance with Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) regulations. This will be accomplished by addressing the gap between Metro's existing I-10 ExpressLanes and San Bernardino County Transportation Authority's (SBCTA) I-10 ExpressLanes facility.</p> <p>Metropolitan owns and operates facilities within and adjacent to the proposed Project Limits. As shown on the attached map, Metropolitan's Middle Feeder North, Orange County Feeder, Yorba Linda Feeder, and Upper Feeder Pipelines, which are located adjacent to the I-10 freeway within the Metropolitan fee-owned property along and/or within the Project boundary. Metropolitan is concerned with potential impacts to these facilities and rights-of-way that may result from implementation of the proposed Project.</p> <p>Metropolitan must be allowed to maintain its rights-of-way and access to its facilities and properties at all times, in order to repair and maintain the current condition of those facilities. In order to avoid potential conflicts with Metropolitan's rights-of-way, we require that any design plans for any activity in the area of Metropolitan's pipelines or facilities be submitted for our review and written approval. Metropolitan will not permit procedures that could subject the pipes to excessive vehicle, impact or vibratory loads. Any future design plans associated with this Project should be submitted to the attention of Metropolitan's Substructures Team.</p> <p>700 North Alameda Street, Los Angeles, California 90012 □ Mailing Address: Box 54153, Los Angeles □ California 90054-0153 □ Telephone (213) 217-6000</p> <p>the Project should be contingent on Metropolitan's approval of design plans for portions of the proposed Project that could impact its facilities.</p> <p>Detailed prints of drawings of Metropolitan's pipelines and rights-of-way may be obtained by contacting Metropolitan's Substructures Team at <a href="mailto:EngineeringSubstructures@mwdh2o.com">EngineeringSubstructures@mwdh2o.com</a>. To assist Caltrans and Metro in preparing plans that are compatible with Metropolitan's facilities and rights-of-way, enclosed is a copy of the "Guidelines for Developments in the Area of Facilities, Fee Properties, and/or Easement of The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California." Please note that Metropolitan's facilities and rights-of-way must be fully shown and identified as Metropolitan's on all designs or plans submitted.</p> <p>Additionally, appropriate property rights must be obtained from Metropolitan for any project activities within Metropolitan's property, such as the granting of a road easement or license. The granting of property rights may be subject to Metropolitan's Board of Director's approval. No work must be done including potholing or any studies within Metropolitan's property prior to the execution of an appropriate agreement. Please contact Metropolitan's Real Property Group regarding the process for obtaining access or property rights at <a href="mailto:RealEstateServices@mwdh2o.com">RealEstateServices@mwdh2o.com</a>. Metropolitan recommends that...</p>
253	10:27pm	06/11/22	Online Comment Form	<p>We need a better sound wall for the homes in Claremont that are east of Indian Hill Blvd and south of the freeway.. As you drive east on the I-10 towards Claremont, there is a tall sound wall that protects the homes in Pomona which are south of the I-10. The height of the wall drops when you reach the auto park commercial area in Claremont. What is needed is a similarly tall sound wall to be built when you again reach single family homes east of Indian Hill Blvd. This occurs at the north end of Drake Ave. The wall needs to extend eastward to San Bernardino County, where a tall wall has already been constructed.</p> <p>Motel 6 should be contacted to determine if they need a similarly tall wall just west of the single-family homes.</p>

254	8:50 am	06/11/22	Email	<p>Dear Metro,</p> <p>I am an SGV resident who cares about my community, the people who live in it, and the air we breathe. I therefore do not support any I-10 ExpressLanes "extension" projects that will destroy people's homes, encourage more vehicle trips, and further pollute some of the most pollution-burdened communities in California.</p> <p>Vehicle trips, including on freeways like I-10, are the main source of local air pollution in southern California, which remains one of the most polluted regions in the United States. The outcomes of such poor air quality are devastating, especially to the most vulnerable members of inland and frontline communities. High rates of asthma and other respiratory illnesses, as well as cognitive impairments, some cancers, and even obesity have all been linked to exposure to high levels of air pollution. The cost of these health disparities -- particularly long-term, chronic illnesses associated with air pollution such as asthma -- is billions in associated healthcare and diminished productivity to LA County.</p> <p>Vehicles on roads and highways are primarily responsible for over half of all GHG emissions in California when one accounts for emissions related to the extraction, processing, and distribution of oil. Los Angeles County and California will not reach their climate goals unless future transportation investments reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) per capita.</p> <p>Adding more lanes doesn't reduce traffic, but it does increase VMT. The outcome of roadway widening and expansion is settled science. In 2017 the Governor's Office of Planning and Research advised agencies that "each percent increase in lane miles results in a 1.03 percent increase in vehicle travel" (Source: pg. 29 - <a href="https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Fopr.ca.gov%2Fdocs%2F20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf&amp;data=05%7C01%7Ci10extension%40metro.net%7C57df748f6be942cece7a08da4bd40958%7Cab57129bdbfd4caca77fc74c40364af%7C1%7C0%7C637905671442802090%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljojMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQJjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6I1haWwLjCjXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&amp;sd=0">https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Fopr.ca.gov%2Fdocs%2F20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf&amp;data=05%7C01%7Ci10extension%40metro.net%7C57df748f6be942cece7a08da4bd40958%7Cab57129bdbfd4caca77fc74c40364af%7C1%7C0%7C637905671442802090%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljojMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQJjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6I1haWwLjCjXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&amp;sd=0</a>). Even Caltrans has acknowledged this fact in its "Rethinking How We Build So Californians Can Drive Less" ( webpage Caltrans states that "[w]hen highways are expanded, a series of changes occur, often resulting in more trips and longer travel times, as people are forced to drive farther to get to work and other destinations. Induced demand creates more traffic at greater cost to people and the environment, while worsening congestion." (Source: <a href="https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fdot.ca.gov%2Fprograms%2Fsustainability%2Fsb-743&amp;data=05%7C01%7Ci10extension%40metro.net%7C57df748f6be942cece7a08da4bd40958%7Cab57129bdbfd4caca77fc74c40364af%7C1%7C0%7C637905671442802090%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljojMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQJjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6I1haWwLjCjXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&amp;sd=qe2P2WSnnVWLO6G4nSXc%2B3ow02Caurnz1HdLSznNFYY%3D&amp;reserved=0">https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fdot.ca.gov%2Fprograms%2Fsustainability%2Fsb-743&amp;data=05%7C01%7Ci10extension%40metro.net%7C57df748f6be942cece7a08da4bd40958%7Cab57129bdbfd4caca77fc74c40364af%7C1%7C0%7C637905671442802090%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljojMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQJjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6I1haWwLjCjXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&amp;sd=qe2P2WSnnVWLO6G4nSXc%2B3ow02Caurnz1HdLSznNFYY%3D&amp;reserved=0</a>).</p> <p>Metro projects should not increase GHG emissions. You have a chance to prevent this. In light of the above, only Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 are viable options. Displacement, more pollution, and more GHG emissions can not be an option. Please eliminate Alternatives 3 and 4 from consideration.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>
255	9:09 am	06/11/22	Email	<p>Dear Metro,</p> <p>I am a Los Angeles city resident who cares about my community, the people who live in it, and the air we breathe. I therefore do not support any I-10 ExpressLanes "extension" projects that will destroy people's homes, encourage more vehicle trips, and further pollute some of the most pollution-burdened communities in California.</p> <p>Vehicle trips, including on freeways like I-10, are the main source of local air pollution in southern California, which remains one of the most polluted regions in the United States. The outcomes of such poor air quality are devastating, especially to the most vulnerable members of inland and frontline communities. High rates of asthma and other respiratory illnesses, as well as cognitive impairments, some cancers, and even obesity have all been linked to exposure to high levels of air pollution. The cost of these health disparities -- particularly long-term, chronic illnesses associated with air pollution such as asthma -- is billions in associated healthcare and diminished productivity to LA County.</p> <p>Vehicles on roads and highways are primarily responsible for over half of all GHG emissions in California when one accounts for emissions related to the extraction, processing, and distribution of oil. Los Angeles County and California will not reach their climate goals unless future transportation investments reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) per capita.</p> <p>Adding more lanes doesn't reduce traffic, but it does increase VMT. The outcome of roadway widening and expansion is settled science. In 2017 the Governor's Office of Planning and Research advised agencies that "each percent increase in lane miles results in a 1.03 percent increase in vehicle travel" (Source: pg. 29 - <a href="https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Fopr.ca.gov%2Fdocs%2F20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf&amp;data=05%7C01%7Ci10extension%40metro.net%7C30af376ede054bc346dc08da4bc4bee5%7Cab57129bdbfd4caca77fc74c40364af%7C1%7C0%7C637905605764948197%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljojMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQJjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6I1haWwLjCjXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&amp;sd=LtpjuCq%2FxnTUAfGEu2YyhtWLTJ0wbN8KLyQ36JdkuQ%3D&amp;reserved=0">https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Fopr.ca.gov%2Fdocs%2F20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf&amp;data=05%7C01%7Ci10extension%40metro.net%7C30af376ede054bc346dc08da4bc4bee5%7Cab57129bdbfd4caca77fc74c40364af%7C1%7C0%7C637905605764948197%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljojMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQJjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6I1haWwLjCjXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&amp;sd=LtpjuCq%2FxnTUAfGEu2YyhtWLTJ0wbN8KLyQ36JdkuQ%3D&amp;reserved=0</a>). Even Caltrans has acknowledged this fact in its "Rethinking How We Build So Californians Can Drive Less" ( webpage Caltrans states that "[w]hen highways are expanded, a series of changes occur, often resulting in more trips and longer travel times, as people are forced to drive farther to get to work and other destinations. Induced demand creates more traffic at greater cost to people and the environment, while worsening congestion." (Source: <a href="https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fdot.ca.gov%2Fprograms%2Fsustainability%2Fsb-743&amp;data=05%7C01%7Ci10extension%40metro.net%7C30af376ede054bc346dc08da4bc4bee5%7Cab57129bdbfd4caca77fc74c40364af%7C1%7C0%7C637905605764948197%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljojMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQJjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6I1haWwLjCjXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&amp;sd=IF%2Fz0Wc6Fyp8cLNQACI03ozuYrGJrOVPGcykznHfByM%3D&amp;reserved=0">https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fdot.ca.gov%2Fprograms%2Fsustainability%2Fsb-743&amp;data=05%7C01%7Ci10extension%40metro.net%7C30af376ede054bc346dc08da4bc4bee5%7Cab57129bdbfd4caca77fc74c40364af%7C1%7C0%7C637905605764948197%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljojMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQJjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6I1haWwLjCjXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&amp;sd=IF%2Fz0Wc6Fyp8cLNQACI03ozuYrGJrOVPGcykznHfByM%3D&amp;reserved=0</a>).</p> <p>Metro projects should not increase GHG emissions. You have a chance to prevent this. In light of the above, only Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 are viable options. Displacement, more pollution, and more GHG emissions can not be an option. Please eliminate Alternatives 3 and 4 from consideration.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>

256	2:20pm	06/12/22	Online Comment Form	<p>Dear Metro,</p> <p>I am an SGV resident who cares about my community, the people who live in it, and the air we breathe. I therefore do not support any I-10 ExpressLanes "extension" projects that will destroy people's homes, encourage more vehicle trips, and further pollute some of the most pollution-burdened communities in California.</p> <p>Vehicle trips, including on freeways like I-10, are the main source of local air pollution in southern California, which remains one of the most polluted regions in the United States. The outcomes of such poor air quality are devastating, especially to the most vulnerable members of inland and frontline communities. High rates of asthma and other respiratory illnesses, as well as cognitive impairments, some cancers, and even obesity have all been linked to exposure to high levels of air pollution. The cost of these health disparities -- particularly long-term, chronic illnesses associated with air pollution such as asthma -- is billions in associated healthcare and diminished productivity to LA County.</p> <p>Vehicles on roads and highways are responsible for over half of all GHG emissions in California when one accounts for emissions related to the extraction, processing, and distribution of oil.</p> <p>Los Angeles County will not reach its climate goals unless future transportation investments reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) per capita. Adding more lanes doesn't reduce traffic, but it does increase VMT. The outcome of roadway widening and expansion is settled science. In 2017 the Governor's Office of Planning and Research advised agencies that "each percent increase in lane miles results in a 1.03 percent increase in vehicle travel" (Source: pg. 29 - <a href="http://opr.ca.gov/docs/20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf">http://opr.ca.gov/docs/20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf</a>).</p> <p>Even Caltrans has acknowledged this fact In its "Rethinking How We Build So Californians Can Drive Less" ( webpage Caltrans states that "[w]hen highways are expanded, a series of changes occur, often resulting in more trips and longer travel times, as people are forced to drive farther to get to work and other destinations. Induced demand creates more traffic at greater cost to people and the environment, while worsening congestion." (Source: <a href="https://dot.ca.gov/programs/sustainability/sb-743">https://dot.ca.gov/programs/sustainability/sb-743</a>).</p> <p>Metro projects should not increase GHG emissions. You have a chance to prevent this. In light of the above, only Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 are viable options. Displacement, more pollution, and more GHG emissions can not be an option. Please eliminate Alternatives 3 and 4 from consideration.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>
257	3:48pm	06/13/22	Online Comment Form	Please do not build lanes that charge money. The cost of everything is so high. I think that HOV lanes should be added but make them no cost (no toll).
258	10:17PM	06/14/22	Online Comment Form	Expanding Express lanes on the 10fwy corridor will alleviate traffic significantly. A large segment of the population has invested in PHEV to have access to HOV in peak times. Once HOV stickers expire, access to HOV also expires. Thank you for considering this. Perhaps should be considered on the 605 corridors as well.
259	2:14PM	06/14/22	Online Comment Form	The sound wall East of Indian Hill along the I-10 and on the South side of the freeway is necessary....
260	1:25pm	06/15/22	Online Comment Form	Metro seems to continue to try the same thing over and over again seeking different resultsâ€”pay to play lanes are regressive taxes on the poorest Angelinos who need to get to work and provide for their families. More lanes or car-centric infrastructure will not solve our problems and only make car ownership and commuting even more expensive than it already is. The ONLY thing that will reduce traffic is increased alternatives for commuters, including reformatting this project into a bus-only lane with sufficient capacity, articulated buses. When buses get stuck in traffic, only the poor and desperate use them. When they are a viable travel time alternative, the public WILL choose them as an option when they see the personal cost savings. This is the only long term viable solution to solve congestion.