

**STATE ROUTE 710 FREEWAY EXTENSION  
(ROUTE 10 TO ROUTE 210) RECORD OF DECISION**

**RECORD OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE ROUTE 710  
FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT - VOLUME I**

*April 8, 1998*

*Prepared for:*

*Federal Highway Administration  
California Division  
980 Ninth Street, Suite 400  
Sacramento, CA 95814*

*Prepared by:*

*California Department of Transportation  
Office of Environmental Planning  
120 South Spring Street  
Los Angeles, California 90012*

*With assistance from:*

*LSA Associates, Inc.  
Caltrans Contract No. 42W793  
LSA Project #CDT630*

## RECORD OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE ROUTE 710 FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

This portion of the Route 710 Record of Comments includes comments received by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) on the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for the Route 710 gap closure project between Route 10 and Route 210. The FEIS was approved by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) on March 2, 1992. A Notice of Availability requesting comments on the FEIS was published in the *Federal Register* on December 15, 1992. Comments were due by January 15, 1993. Prior to issuing a Record of Decision on the Route 710 project, FHWA will consider and make part of the project record any comments received before the close of the comment period. Subsequent to closure of the public comment period on the Final EIS, numerous activities were undertaken to address concerns regarding the Route 710 project. These activities included the Mitigation Advisory Committee, formed subsequent to the Final EIS, to address additional mitigation requirements; assessment of low build plans; and the designation of the Short Line Villa Historic District by the Keeper as eligible for the *National Register*. The April, 1998, Environmental Reevaluation documents the activities conducted subsequent to the Final EIR/EIS comment period and dispensation of comments, and recommendations generated subsequent to preparation of the Final EIR/EIS, including: 1) recommendations made by the Mitigation Advisory Committee (and incorporated into the project), 2) analyses of the most recent low build plan (Multi-Mode/Low Build) and the Short Line Villa Tract Historic District alignment shift, and 3) assessment of compliance with recent Environmental Justice legislation, resulting in any new significant impacts not covered in the FEIS, or any new information or circumstances relevant to environmental concerns and bearing on the proposed action or its impacts that would result in significant environmental impacts not evaluated in the FEIS.

The comments have been summarized in a matrix that lists the commentor, the comment date, the issue noted in the comment, and (where applicable) a response to the comment. Each comment is numbered sequentially, with a prefix of "EIS-" identifying it as a comment on the FEIS followed by a binomial code. The first number in the code classifies the comment into one of the following eight categories: Federal Agencies (1), State Agencies (2) (no comments have been received as of this time for this category), Regional or Local Agencies (3), Private Organizations and Groups (4), Utility Companies/Public Services (5) (no comments have been received as of this time for this category), Corporations/Businesses (6) (no comments have been received as of this time for this category), and Other Interested Persons (7). Within each category, the letters are organized alphabetically. The second set of numbers identifies the sequence in which the comment can be found in Appendix A. The fourth column in the matrix identifies the subject of the comment through the use of a coding system. The subject coding allows for future sorting or listing of comments by subject, if necessary. A listing of all subject codes is provided for reference on the page preceding the summary of comments.

The comments are organized as follows:

<b>Comment Nos.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>
EIS-1-1	Council on Environmental Quality
EIS-1-2 to EIS-1-4	U.S. Congressman Walter Tucker III
EIS-1-5	U.S. Congressman Carlos Moorhead
EIS-1-6	U.S. Department of the Interior

EIS-2-1 to EIS-2-2      Assemblyman Bill Hoge  
EIS-2-3                  Assemblywoman Diane Martinez

EIS-3-1 to EIS-3-11      City of Alhambra  
EIS-3-12 to EIS-3-13      Board of Education (City of Los Angeles)  
EIS-3-14 to EIS-3-21      City of South Pasadena  
EIS-3-22                  South Pasadena Public Library  
EIS-3-23                  South Pasadena Unified School District  
EIS-3-24 to EIS-3-26      Atkinson, Anderson, Loya, Ruud & Romo (retained by South  
Pasadena Unified School District)

EIS-3-27 to EIS-3-34      City of South Pasadena  
EIS-3-35                  South Pasadena Unified School District  
EIS-3-36 to EIS-3-42      City of South Pasadena  
EIS-3-43 to EIS-3-44      South Pasadena Unified School District  
EIS-3-45 to EIS-3-47      City of South Pasadena  
EIS-3-48                  Board of Education, City of Los Angeles  
EIS-3-49 to EIS-3-59      City of South Pasadena  
EIS-3-60                  City of Cudahy  
EIS-3-61                  City of Bell Gardens  
EIS-3-62 to EIS-3-63      City of Monterey Park  
EIS-3-64 to EIS-3-65      City of Rosemead  
EIS-3-66 to EIS-3-67      City of South Pasadena  
EIS-3-68                  City of Commerce  
EIS-3-69                  Alhambra School District  
EIS-3-70 to EIS-3-73      City of South Pasadena  
EIS-3-74 to EIS-3-75      City of Arcadia  
EIS-3-76 to EIS-3-79      City of South Pasadena  
EIS-3-80 to EIS-3-85      City of South Pasadena Cultural Heritage Commission  
EIS-3-86                  Alhambra School District  
EIS-3-87 TO EIS-3-88      City of South Pasadena  
EIS-3-89 to EIS-3-96      Shute, Mihaly, & Weinberger (retained by City of South  
Pasadena)

EIS-3-97                  City of Monrovia  
EIS-3-98                  City of Commerce  
EIS-3-99                  City of South Pasadena  
EIS-3-100                  City of Azusa  
EIS-3-101                  City of Bell Gardens

EIS-4-1                  Automobile Club of Southern California  
EIS-4-2 to EIS-4-8          California Preservation Foundation  
EIS-4-9                  Citizens for a Better Environment

**Comment Nos.                  Commentor**

---

EIS-4-10 to EIS-4-12      Elysian Heights Residents Association  
EIS-4-13                  Los Angeles Conservancy  
EIS-4-14 to EIS-4-16      National Trust for Historic Preservation  
EIS-4-17 to EIS-4-27      Pasadena Heritage  
EIS-4-28 to EIS-4-43      South Pasadena Cultural Heritage Commission  
EIS-4-44 to EIS-4-46      South Pasadena Preservation Foundation  
EIS-4-47 to EIS-4-48      West Pasadena Residents Association

EIS-4-49 to EIS-4-62	Los Angeles Unified School District
EIS-4-63 TO EIS-4-64	Fine Art Conservation Laboratories
EIS-4-65	Preservation Action Council
EIS-4-66 to EIS-4-68	National Trust for Historic Preservation
EIS-4-69	United Food and Comm. Workers International Union
EIS-4-70 to EIS-4-72	Sierra Club -- Angeles Chapter
EIS-4-73	National Trust for Historic Preservation
EIS-4-74 to EIS-4-75	Sierra Club -- Angeles Chapter
EIS-4-76	Old Pasadena Business and Professional Association
EIS-4-77 to EIS-4-78	Sierra Club -- Angeles Chapter
EIS-4-79	Citizens United to Save South Pasadena
EIS-4-80 to EIS-4-92	Neighborhood Action Committee
EIS-4-93	State Building and Construction Trades Council
EIS-4-94	Southern California District Council of Laborers
EIS-7-1 to EIS-7-179	Comment Letters from Various Individuals

## List of Subject Codes

<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Subject</b>
AL	Alternatives
AQ	Air Quality
C/N	CEQA/NEPA Issues
CON	Construction Impacts
CH	Cultural/Historic
CIR	Circulation/Traffic
CUM	Cumulative Impacts
FI	Fiscal Impacts
FU	Funding
GEO	Geotechnical
HW	Hazardous Waste/Materials
HB	Housing/Business Relocation
LU	Land Use
MM	Mitigation Monitoring
NOI	Noise
NEI	Not EIR/EIS Issue
NR	No Response Necessary
OB	Objectives
OP	Opinion
PD	Project Description
PH	Public Health
PHA	Phasing
PP	Public Participation
PS	Public Services & Utilities
PN	Purpose and Need
RD	Request for Data
SE	Socioeconomic
TR	Transit
VIS	Visual Resources
WR	Water Resources
4F	Section 4(f)

**Route 710 Final Environmental Impact Statement**

**Response to Comments Matrix**

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-1-1	Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ)	1/19/93	CH	The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) has referred to CEQ the proposed extension of Route 710 to be completed.	Copy of the full referral package from the ACHP is attached to letter.
EIS-1-2	U.S. Congressman Walter Tucker III	1/21/94	PD	Section 103 of HR 4385 requires that before any federal funds be made available for any federal aid highway activity (i.e., Route 710), a value engineering review be undertaken as a prerequisite to obtaining a Record of Decision (ROD), and therefore request the California Transportation Commission (CTC) to promptly convene a panel of experts to perform a value engineering review. Would include an assessment of the various alternatives.	After 20 years of environmental studies and the preparation of four DEISs, analyzing some 24 alternatives, and with the work of a Mitigation and Enhancement Advisory Committee, value engineering has been completed.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-1-3	U.S. Congressman Walter Tucker III	1/21/94	AL AQ FI	Request notification prior to ROD of (1) Evaluation, if any (by either by CTC, Caltrans, or other) of the major proposals submitted for Route 710 project in light of the proposed truck ban and the effect of the ban on the comparative performance of the competing proposals; (2) Consideration by either Caltrans or CTC of the 3/10/94 Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) guidance concerning nitrogen oxide (NOX) emissions in Los Angeles ozone nonattainment area in the context of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) evaluation process for build vs low build alternatives; and	Please refer to the "State Route 710 - A Model Evaluation of the City of South Pasadena's Multi-Modal Low Build Proposal" (April, 1996) for a discussion of these issues.
			FU	(3) Any action taken by Caltrans or CTC to comply with 11/29/93 FHWA guidance issued by FHWA in 23 CFR 450.318 re: Major Metropolitan Transportation Investments and the required analysis of additional alternatives if ROD for Route 710 project has not been approved at time of effective date of new regulations.	On January 10, 1995, the Major Investment Review Committee met and determined that the Route 710 Gap Closure project was to be "grandfathered," as provided by federal regulations, having been classified as a Category 2 project. This finding was memorialized in a February 21, 1995, letter to Caltrans from the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG).
EIS-1-4	U.S. Congressman Walter Tucker III	1/21/94	OP	Final decision on Route 710 should be comprehensive and objective, and comply with all relevant statutory and regulatory requirements.	The FHWA has every intention of complying with all relevant and statutory regulatory requirements. The final decision is based on an objective and comprehensive analysis of all pertinent facts.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-1-5	U.S. Congressman Carlos Moorhead	12/1/92	OP	Concerned that the NEPA process not be "fast tracked" at expense of project integrity.	Comment considered during the decision making process. Please refer to the Environmental Reevaluation (April, 1998) for a discussion of the consultation and coordination conducted since circulation of the Final EIS.
EIS-1-6	U.S. Department of the Interior	12/6/95	4F	Based on review of two previous Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) on Route 710 Freeway extension, concluded that there was no feasible and prudent alternative to the use of properties designated under Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act (Section 4[f]) for the Meridian Route and Meridian Variation alternative. However, this was before low build alternative was developed. Therefore, Department now requests to evaluate the new information.	Caltrans prepared the "State Route 710 - A Model Evaluation of the City of South Pasadena's Multi-Mode/Low Build Proposal" in April, 1996. The evaluation concluded that the Multi-Mode/Low Build proposal would result in more congested nearby freeways and local arterials, leading to a situation that would be worse than doing nothing at all.
EIS-2-1	State Assemblyman Bill Hoge	1/5/93	OP	Request that any action by FHWA regarding the proposed Route 710 Freeway extension be deferred to allow the freeway advisory committee sufficient time to complete its study.	The Advisory Committee completed its "Route 710 Meridian Variation Enhancement and Mitigation Advisory Committee, Final Report" in June, 1993. At the time of the release of the final report, no action on the Route 710 project had been made by the FHWA, Caltrans, or the CTC.
EIS-2-2	State Assemblyman Bill Hoge	1/12/93	OP	Request that FHWA withhold making a decision on Route 710 Freeway project and allow the new administration to properly review project.	See Response to Comment No. EIS-2-1.
EIS-2-3	State Assemblywoman Diane Martinez	1/12/93	OP	Supports completion of Route 710 Freeway construction.	Comment considered during the decision making process.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-3-1	City of Alhambra	1/12/93	NR	Note that the Route 710 project is included in the 30 Year Transportation Plan approved unanimously in 1992 by the Los Angeles County Transportation Commission (LACTC).	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-3-2	City of Alhambra	1/12/93	NR	The Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS) mentions projected traffic reductions through the City of South Pasadena once project is implemented.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-3-3	City of Alhambra	1/12/93	NR	Project will provide a critical link in the regional high occupancy vehicle (HOV) system. Project will eliminate bottlenecks and provide right-of-way (ROW) for mass transit systems.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-3-4	City of Alhambra	1/12/93	OP	Further alternatives studies would be a waste of time after 30 years of study and 24 different alternate routes.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-3-5	City of Alhambra	1/12/93	NR	Pg. II-88 of EIR/EIS noted that 4 cities have adopted resolutions in support of project; since then 11 more cities have enacted similar resolutions.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-3-6	City of Alhambra	1/12/93	FI	Update property valuation data. Assumptions should be reviewed with the LA County Tax Collector's Office.	The property valuation data were current when the EIS was written.
EIS-3-7	City of Alhambra	1/12/93	PS	Pg. IV-58 states that the War Memorial building is privately owned. It is actually owned by the City of South Pasadena.	Correction made.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-3-8	City of Alhambra	1/12/93	OP	Community cohesion will be improved with the project as neighborhoods will not be split by congested streets.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-3-9	City of Alhambra	1/12/93	NR	The planned light rail line from Los Angeles (LA) to Pasadena will serve an entirely different segment of the population than does the 710 corridor.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-3-10	City of Alhambra	1/12/93	NR	Pg. IV-99 calls for the creation of a Mitigation Advisory Committee. This Committee has been formed and has identified numerous enhanced mitigation measures.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-3-11	City of Alhambra	1/27/93	OP	Questioning the National Trust's commitment to mitigation process due to their delays until procedural issues are resolved to their satisfaction.	Comment considered during the decision making process. [Note: Same as letter AC-3-1 in the Advisory Committee Report component of the Response to Comments]
EIS-3-12	Board of Education, City of Los Angeles	1/5/93	AL	An elementary school is located adjacent to the proposed above grade freeway, while the proposed route will be depressed adjacent to South Pasadena High School. Why hasn't a depressed freeway been considered in the El Sereno area?	FHWA and Caltrans have committed to construction of a cut and cover tunnel adjacent to Sierra Vista Elementary School. In addition, FHWA and Caltrans have committed to depressing the alignment through El Sereno, if feasible.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-3-13	Board of Education, City of Los Angeles	1/5/93	PS	Student enrollment and revenues will be adversely affected by project.	South Pasadena Unified School District (SPUSD), like other districts in the LA area, is experiencing a general rise in enrollment. The Assistant Superintendent indicated an expected growth rate of 1-2 percent a year. This rate could increase if many older homes are replaced with condominiums or other high density residential development. Implementing Route 710 would offset the projected growth of the SPUSD over a three-year ROW-relocation period. (Pg. IV-77 of FEIS)
EIS-3-14	City of South Pasadena	10/22/92	NEI	Requests justification from Caltrans on the rent increases in the City. No rental increases will be imposed until City has reviewed material.	Caltrans reviewed this request and adjusted the rate to \$1,005 per month as of April, 1993.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-3-15	City of South Pasadena	1/9/93	VIS	City provides additional proposed mitigation measures for impacts resulting from light and glare, retaining walls and bridges, freeway fencing and graffiti.	<p>Some of the proposed mitigation measures were included in the <i>Route 710 Meridian Variation Enhancement and Mitigation Advisory Committee Final Report</i> (June, 1993). As stated in the Advisory Committee Report, additional mitigation measures will be considered as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommendations were given full consideration by Caltrans and FHWA, along with comments received on this Final Report prior to issuing the ROD or Notice of Determination (NOD).</li> <li>• Recommendations publicly endorsed by Caltrans and FHWA are included in the ROD and in the State document entitled Facts, Findings, and Statement of Overriding Considerations.</li> <li>• Recommendations not adopted immediately into the ROD will be given further consideration and could be developed during preliminary design or construction of the project.</li> </ul>
EIS-3-16	City of South Pasadena	1/13/93	NR	Lists the 34 comment letters on various impacts of project sent to FHWA by the City.	Comment considered during the decision making process. [Same as AC-3-34 in the Advisory Committee Report component of the Response to Comments]

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-3-17	City of South Pasadena (submitted by special legal counsel)	1/14/93	AQ CH	The Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) is based on a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) completed more than five years ago, before the enactment of the 1990 Clear Air Act amendments, before the 1990 Census, and without air quality modeling or a current assessment of historic resources.	<p>Caltrans has updated the emissions calculations as updated emissions factors become available. Modeling conducted in January, 1996, confirmed that the Build Alternative will result in lower emissions levels than the No Build. The project complies with the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, since it comes from a conforming Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).</p> <p>The Historic Preservation Subcommittee of the Route 710 Mitigation Advisory Committee found that the documentation concerning identification of historic properties was inadequate and outdated. The subcommittee has recommended that identification of all affected properties must be completed immediately. Additional recommendation and proposed mitigation measures are provided in the Advisory Committee Final Report, Appendix E, pages E-2 - E-6. The ACHP advised FHWA by letter dated September 30, 1997, that the inventory of historic resources was complete.</p>
EIS-3-18	City of South Pasadena (submitted by special legal counsel)	1/14/93	AL	FHWA has not considered a Low Build Alternative that would modify existing infrastructure to improve existing traffic conditions while taking no or few historic resources.	Caltrans' evaluation of the Low Build (Multi-Mode) proposal provided by the City of South Pasadena was completed on 2/25/94. The evaluation concluded that the Build Alternative (Meridian Variation Alternative) was the best alternative to solve the transportation problem. The evaluation also concluded that the Low Build proposal would be useful as part of a mitigation plan for local development and construction.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-3-19	City of South Pasadena (submitted by special legal counsel)	1/14/93	C/N	FHWA approved the Final EIS as complete while simultaneously recognizing the need to develop further mitigation to justify its preferred project.	The federal environmental process under NEPA is not complete until a ROD is approved. A federal lead agency may incorporate additional mitigations into a project as part of the ROD.
EIS-3-20	City of South Pasadena (submitted by special legal counsel)	1/14/93	OP	Value of Advisory Committee undermined by FHWA's breach of commitment to await Committee's Final Report before closing off public comment.	FHWA provided another formal comment period on the project by accepting comments on the Advisory Committee's report before they decide to issue a ROD. FHWA has indicated that they will consider and make part of the project record any comments received before the close of the comment period. FHWA will also consider, to the extent possible, comments received after the close of that period (see FHWA letter labeled as Comment No. AC-1-4 in the Advisory Committee component of the Response to Comments).
EIS-3-21	City of South Pasadena	3/30/93	NR	The City withdrew membership from the Mitigation Advisory Committee due to FHWA and Caltrans deliberate distortion of their proposal for collaboration. Letter provides discussion of issues leading towards their decision of withdrawal.	Comment considered during the decision making process. This letter was included in the Advisory Committee Report.
EIS-3-22	South Pasadena Public Library	1/12/93	OP	Opposed to the Route 710 extension; physical destruction will lead to loss of community pride.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-3-23	South Pasadena Unified School District	1/7/93	PS	The Final EIS does not accurately address the economic impact on the District from implementation of the 710 freeway.	Page III-16 of the Advisory Committee's Final Report provides a school impact analysis and recommendations for mitigating school impacts.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-3-24	Atkinson, Anderson, Loya, Ruud & Romo (retained by South Pasadena Unified School District)	1/13/93	PS	Final EIS's analysis of the District's growth overprojects student enrollment; project will cause steep decline in enrollment and apportionment dollars from the State.	See Response to Comment EIS-3-13.
EIS-3-25	Atkinson, Anderson, Loya, Ruud & Romo (retained by South Pasadena Unified School District)	1/13/93	NOI	Final EIS fails to adequately address the significant noise impacts that will be experienced at South Pasadena High School.	See Response to Comment EIS-3-23. Additional noise mitigation for schools is recommended by the Advisory Committee (page IV-12 of the Advisory Committee Final Report).
EIS-3-26	Atkinson, Anderson, Loya, Ruud & Romo (retained by South Pasadena Unified School District)	1/13/93	AQ	Final EIS does not address the South Coast Air Quality Management District's (SCAQMD) Rule 403 requirements on fugitive dust.	Control of construction generated fugitive dust is addressed on page IV-96 of the Final EIS. In addition, the Advisory Committee provided additional recommendations for controlling fugitive dust, based on SCAQMD's 1992 California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Handbook (pages III-16 and IV-11 of the Advisory Committee's Final Report).

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-3-27	City of South Pasadena	12/8/92	SE	<p>The EIS is very inadequate re: financial impacts to the city by Route 710 extension as it only identifies the loss in property taxes from the freeway. Information is based on old and deficient property valuation. Financial impact study should examine:</p> <p>Property Taxes - current valuation losses, loss in appreciation of property tax due from permanent losses, property value depreciation within 1/4 mile of corridor, and loss in real property transfer taxes.</p> <p>Sales Taxes - direct loss of sales tax (business and home occupations in route), indirect loss of sales tax, losses of Prop A and Prop C taxes.</p>	Please refer to the Route 710 Meridian Variation Enhancement and Mitigation Advisory Committee, Final Report of June, 1993, page III-13, for an updated discussion of property tax base impacts on corridor cities.

Comment No.	Commentor	Comment Date	Subject Code	Issue	Response/Document Reference
EIS-3-28	City of South Pasadena	12/8/92	SE	<p>Losses in Other Revenues - gas, utilities, Assembly Bill 939 (AB 939) recycling, motor vehicle fees, HCDA/CDBG entitlements, city use fees, parking citations, franchise taxes, landscape and lighting maintenance district, home occupation revenues, business improvements, building permits, water/sewer funds, street lighting assessment district, state revenue losses (Caltrans -owned properties), and agency impacts/decline in valuation growth.</p> <p>The fiscal viability of the City is an issue. We will have to weigh mitigation measures with the services the City needs to keep and those that will need to be eliminated or reduced. We are concerned about impacts on City police and fire departments.</p>	<p>Public utilities and public services impacts are discussed in the Final EIS, page IV-77. During the Advisory Committee process, the primary concern that emerged was impacts to the City's maintenance yard. Please refer to Advisory Committee's Final Report, page III-14.</p>

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-3-29	City of South Pasadena	12/22/92	CON	The Final EIS/EIR identifies a possible fill site for excess materials from the construction of the freeway extension. The City of South Pasadena has not identified with Caltrans any dump sites for excess earth. Caltrans will need to identify export sites outside City of South Pasadena. Please correct the Final EIS/EIR.	Please refer to page IV-92 of the Final EIS for a thorough discussion of optional disposal sites. There appears to be some confusion here over the City's "official position" on a site in South Pasadena to be used as an excess material disposal site. The site in question was proposed as an alternative disposal site as part of the Unmodified Plan B-C Alternative, as a way to save money on disposal cost. Caltrans never endorsed this alternative, but it was at one time endorsed by the City prior to the identification of the subject disposal site as an option. Disposal sites outside of the City of South Pasadena are clearly identified in the Final EIS, and there is no need for any correction.
EIS-3-30	City of South Pasadena	12/31/92	HB	The Final EIS/EIR incorrectly identifies the impacts of relocation and the suggested mitigation measures. In addition to the residential loss of approximately 775 homes, 11 commercial buildings and 3 manufacturing properties will also be taken. Caltrans currently only owns 47 of the necessary properties. The property taxes may not be representative of true market value and therefore, there are concerns over the EIS/EIR estimate of costs for property acquisition.	Please refer to Response to Comment EIS-3-27.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-3-31	City of South Pasadena	12/31/92	HB	Requests an independent relocation advocate. The Mitigation Advisory Committee identified greater renter adjustments to use as housing down payments. A senior citizen advocate is also recommended to assist with the special needs of the elderly population.	One of the Advisory Committee's relocation mitigation recommendations was: Special relocation counseling and assistance for senior citizens, particularly those relying on their property for retirement income. This recommendation has been incorporated into the project. The Advisory Committee also recommended the appointment of an experienced consultant to act as an advocate for community groups and to advise Caltrans on ways to make relocation easier and more equitable. This recommendation has also been incorporated into the project, with the exception that Caltrans believes that an experienced professional from within the agency would be best equipped to act as advocate for the community.
EIS-3-32	City of South Pasadena	12/31/92	SE	The Final EIS/EIR does not identify the loss in property values for "non-physical" takings (i.e., losses a property owner would experience being adjacent to the freeway). The Final EIS/EIR does identify that this loss will occur; however, the impact is not quantified. In previous discussions with Caltrans, the suggested mitigation was to compensate for these non-physical takings.	Please refer to Response to Comment EIS-3-27.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-3-33	City of South Pasadena	12/31/92	SE	The Final EIS/EIR is relying on 1980 U.S. Census data. The document should be updated using 1990 data. We also suggest a special census in the freeway corridor to identify the actual population characteristics and the proper number of displaced persons from proposed project.	Because 1990 U.S. census data were unavailable at the time of the preparation of the Final EIS, the data are not included therein. However, the inclusion of 1990 census data would not have changed any of the conclusions reached in the Final EIS, and it is important to note that many demographic trends that were under way during the 1980s were in fact addressed in the Final EIS. For example, the increase in percentage of Asians in South Pasadena was identified in the Final EIS based on school enrollment data. This trend has been confirmed by 1990 Census data. During the Advisory Committee process, a "Housing and Community Disruption Study - Route 710 Extension" (April, 1993) was prepared at the direction of the Committee. The study utilized 1990 U.S. Census data in its analysis.
EIS-3-34	City of South Pasadena	12/31/92	SE	Requests an opportunity to review and comment on draft fiscal impacts study.	The Advisory Committee directed technical staff to prepare a "Tax Base Analysis - Route 710 Extension" (April, 1993). The analysis formed the basis for the tax base impact conclusions in the Committee's Final Report (see Response to Comment EIS-3-27).
EIS-3-35	South Pasadena Unified School District (Eva Rae Lueck)	8/9/93	NR	Letter thanking Caltrans for meeting with school district to discuss school impacts and mitigations from proposed Route 710 extension.	No response required.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-3-36	City of South Pasadena (Amedee Richards)	12/29/94	CH	Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21084.1, all of the historic resources listed in the official historic resources inventory adopted by the City of South Pasadena City Council on 11/30/94 are presumed to be significant for purposes of CEQA. Therefore, all resources listed in the adopted inventory need to be addressed in Route 710 Final EIS/EIR. To date, Caltrans has refused to consider these resources.	The historic resources inventory adopted by the City covers virtually the entire City of South Pasadena. There are no State or federal statutes that mandate Caltrans to survey all of the historic properties far removed from the vicinity of a project. Caltrans has, however, surveyed all of the properties in the Area of Potential Effects (APE). This was accomplished with the preparation of the Third and Fourth Historic Architecture Assessment Reports (HASRs).
EIS-3-37	City of South Pasadena (Amedee Richards)	12/29/94	4F	Pursuant to Section 4(f), all locally significant historic sites, as well as those of state and federal significance, are to be protected whenever possible against harm from federally-funded transportation projects.	Please refer to page X-1 of the Final EIS for a discussion of Section 4(f) of the U. S. of the Department of Transportation Act and the Final Section 4(f) Evaluation.
EIS-3-38	City of South Pasadena (Amedee Richards)	12/29/94	C/N	Lack of assessment of the freeway's impact on the historic resources in the adopted inventory compels rescission of the CTC's route adoption of 9/14/94 and requires preparation of a supplemental EIS/EIR for further consideration of route adoption.	The CTC relied upon the Advisory Committee's Final Report, which recommended the preparation of an updated historic properties inventory in the Route 710 Corridor. Please refer to discussion in the Final Report.  Subsequent to the final report, Caltrans/FHWA prepared a Supplemental Historic Property Inventory. The ACHP advised FHWA by letter dated September 30, 1997, that the inventory of historic resources was complete. Please refer to the Environmental Reevaluation (April, 1998) for a further discussion of impacts to historic resources and the determination that a Supplemental EIR/EIS is not required.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-3-39	City of South Pasadena (Amedee Richards)	12/29/94	CH	The National Trust for Historic Preservation (NTHP) and Pasadena Heritage are using volunteer efforts to complete additional research and identification of significant historic resources within El Sereno and Pasadena in response to Caltrans' erroneous determination that no further work is necessary on these issues. Because Caltrans has declined to include these resources in the EIS/EIR, a supplemental EIS/EIR will need to address these resources as well.	Caltrans and FHWA stand by the professionally prepared historic resource studies we have prepared. Refer to the historical sections of the Environmental Reevaluation (April, 1998) and the Final Revised Section 4(f) Evaluation for more details regarding impacts to historic resources and the determination that a Supplemental EIR/EIS is not required.  The ACHP advised FHWA by letter dated September 30, 1997, that the inventory of historic resources was complete.
EIS-3-40	City of South Pasadena (Amedee Richards)	12/29/94	AQ	Based on review by City of South Pasadena and SCAQMD, the air quality analysis contained in the Final EIS/EIR was based on obsolete models.	See Response to Comments EIS-4-65
EIS-3-41	City of South Pasadena (Amedee Richards)	12/29/94	AQ	At the 9/14/94 CTC hearing, Caltrans verbally indicated that it had performed an air quality assessment using a later model. This assertion consisted solely of an oral statement and is not supported by any material in the public file made available to South Pasadena.	See Response to Comments EIS-4-65.
EIS-3-42	City of South Pasadena	5/27/92	OP	Objects to the public comment period ending on June 1, 1992. Comments should be taken after the conclusion of the work of the Mitigation Committee.	Please refer to the Environmental Reevaluation (April, 1998) for a complete description of the public review process for the Final EIR/EIS and the Mitigation Advisory Committee.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-3-43	South Pasadena Unified School District	5/29/92	OP ALT	The Final EIS underestimates the financial effect of lost average daily attendance (ADA) funding on the District. The District opposes all proposals for completion of Route 710 Freeway through South Pasadena and favors non-freeway alternatives to relieve traffic congestion.	Please refer to Response to Comment EIS-4-60 and the Environmental Reevaluation (April, 1998).
EIS-3-44	South Pasadena Unified School District	6/30/92	OP	Strongly request that any committee or council formed to consider any aspect of the Route 710 Freeway completion include appropriate representation from the South Pasadena Unified School District.	Please refer to Response to Comment EIS-4-60 and the Environmental Reevaluation (April, 1998).
EIS-3-45	City of South Pasadena	9/28/92	ALT	Final EIS/EIR incorrectly states that South Pasadena favors the Westerly Plan B Alternative. South Pasadena does not support any freeway alternative presented in the Final EIS/EIR, but favors a low build alternative not discussed in Final EIS.	Please refer to the Environmental Reevaluation (April, 1998) for a discussion of the process undertaken to analyze several Low Build proposals. In addition, please refer to Volume III for a compendium of comments and responses on the Multi Mode (Low Build) proposals.
EIS-3-46	City of South Pasadena	10/29/92	OP	Provides resolution from the City of La Verne opposing the gap closure project on Route 710 and shifting construction funds to the Route 30 gap closure.	Comment noted. After compliance with NEPA and CEQA, the Route 710 gap closure project would have to be programmed into the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and compete for transportation funds with other projects on a Statewide basis.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-3-47	City of South Pasadena	12/3/92	NOI	Requests for noise contour mapping to be done.	Caltrans does not prepare noise contour mapping. Noise impact and abatement analyses are conducted by Caltrans under the auspices of 23 Code of Federal Register (CFR) Part 772--Procedures for Abatement of Highway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise. Please refer to Final EIS page IV-26 for a discussion of noise analysis methodology.
EIS-3-48	City of Los Angeles Board of Education	12/4/92	AL	Concerned with the impact of the proposed Route 710 Freeway extension to Sierra Vista School in El Sereno, and fiscal stability of District.	Please refer to Response to Comment EIS-4-51 through EIS-4-61.
EIS-3-49	City of South Pasadena	12/10/92	HB	Identifies mitigation required for displaced residents. Also requested use of 1990 Census data in the Final EIS.	Please refer to Response to Comment EIS-4-22.
EIS-3-50	City of South Pasadena	12/23/92	AL	Although gap closure is shown on Circulation Element, the City of South Pasadena included it only under court order and continues to oppose the project and support the Low Build proposal.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-3-51	City of South Pasadena	12/28/92	SE	With the proposed project, City of South Pasadena's property taxes will be a significant loss, as well as loss of sales tax and revenues from other fees, taxes, and services.	Please refer to Response to Comment EIS-3-27.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-3-52	City of South Pasadena	12/29/92	NOI	Requests for noise contour mapping to be done.	Please refer to Response to Comment EIS-3-47.
EIS-3-53	City of South Pasadena	12/30/92	OP	Transmittal of City of South Pasadena Resolution reiterating City's opposition to the gap closure project and support for the Low Build proposal.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-3-54	City of South Pasadena	12/30/92	OP	City of South Pasadena requests that the 5/29/92 letter from UFCW Local 770 and the 12/4/92 letter from City of Los Angeles Board of Education be made a part of the record for the Route 710 Final EIS/EIR.	Comment noted. The two letters are included in the Route 710 Final EIS/EIR record with responses.
EIS-3-55	City of South Pasadena	1/4/93	GEO OP	The Final EIS/EIR for the Route 710 Freeway extension contains obsolete and dated material on the extent of earthquake faults and seismic activity affecting the proposed project. Updated information on the Raymond Hill and Elysian faults need to be incorporated into the Final EIS/EIR.	Please refer to Response to Comment EIS-4-11.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-3-56	City of South Pasadena	1/5/93	PS	The Final EIR/EIS for the proposed Route 710 Freeway extension states that all interfering utilities will be relocated, but does not address the ability of the City's systems to meet the requirements of the freeway, nor does it evaluate the effectiveness or reliability of the sewer and water systems following the relocation.	The relocation of utilities is worked out during final design and in coordination with the respective private companies or governmental agencies with jurisdiction.
EIS-3-57	City of South Pasadena	1/6/93	NOI	Requests preparation of noise contour mapping in a format easily understood by the general public.	Please refer to Response to Comment EIS-3-47.
EIS-3-58	City of South Pasadena	1/6/93	HB	The Route 710 Final EIS/EIR does not adequately address housing impacts. State-mandated housing requirements were not discussed in the Final EIS/EIR, and the document should contain, at least, a housing replacement program.	Caltrans provides relocation assistance and benefits as mandated by the Federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act. These assistance and payment programs are discussed at length on pages IV-47 through 49 of Volume I of the Final EIS, and Appendix A of Volume II of the Final EIS. In addition, several relocation related mitigation measures, beyond the assistance and benefits mandated by the Uniform Relocation Act, were recommended by the Mitigation and Enhancement Advisory Committee. These recommendations have been incorporated into the project. One of these mitigation measures is providing relocation benefits to re-renters of State owned properties, who are otherwise not eligible for benefits under the Relocation Assistance Program.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-3-59	City of South Pasadena	1/7/93		As of 1/25/90, Assembly Bill 1623 (AB 1623) no longer applies to this project. The State must have a freeway agreement with all four communities since all four will suffer direct or indirect street closures and impacts.	On September 20, 1994, Governor Pete Wilson signed Assembly Bill 2556 (AB 2556) into law. The law relieves Caltrans of having to acquire freeway agreements with local governments when local streets have to be closed to build freeways.
EIS-3-60	City of Cudahy	1/7/93	OP	Supports completion of Route 710 Freeway extension as the project will improve air quality, reduce traffic congestion on surface streets, reduce commute times, provide jobs, and save money.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-3-61	City of Bell Gardens	1/7/93	OP	Supports completion of Route 710 Freeway extension as the project will improve air quality, reduce traffic congestion on surface streets, reduce commute times, provide jobs, and save money.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-3-62	City of Monterey Park	1/7/93	OP	Supports completion of Route 710 Freeway extension as the project will improve air quality, reduce traffic congestion on surface streets, reduce commute times, provide jobs, and save money.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-3-63	City of Monterey Park	1/7/93	OP	Supports completion of Route 710 Freeway extension (Resolution).	Comment considered during the decision making process.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-3-64	City of Rosemead	1/8/93	OP	Supports completion of Route 710 Freeway extension as the project will improve air quality, reduce traffic congestion on surface streets, reduce commute times, provide jobs, and save money.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-3-65	City of Rosemead	1/8/93	OP	Supports completion of Route 710 Freeway extension (Resolution).	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-3-66	City of South Pasadena	1/8/93	OP PS	The Final EIS/EIR contains vague references to neighborhood conservation impacts on the community during the acquisition, demolition, and construction process but does not identify measures to mitigate these impacts.	Construction impacts, and procedures employed during construction to mitigate the impacts of construction activities, are discussed in the Final EIS on pages IV-90 through 94. The Mitigation and Enhancement Advisory Committee made a number of recommendations in regards to construction and mitigation commitments in its June, 1993, Final Report. These recommendations have been incorporated into the project.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-3-67	City of South Pasadena	1/9/93	NOI	Requests completion of nighttime noise measurements and the incorporation of additional noise impact mitigation measures be incorporated into Final EIS/EIR, including increased short- and long-term noise impacts, noise impacts on adjacent neighborhoods and from construction vehicles, intermittent high level noise, levels at Orange Grove Park, and noise impacts from cut and cover work.	<p>There is nothing to be gained by taking nighttime noise measurements. Noise measurements are virtually certain to be higher during the daytime when most people are up and about. Noise mitigation analyses are based upon combining predicted freeway generated noise and ambient noise levels, to calculate anticipated future noise levels. Noise barrier recommendations are based on these calculated levels. Using lower nighttime noise levels would yield results that are too low and could lead to inadequate noise abatement measures.</p> <p>Noise abatement measures are provided to mitigate for freeway generated traffic noise, not construction noise, which is short-term. Construction noise, such as equipment noise, is largely regulated by local noise ordinances. Local noise ordinances set the maximum decibel levels and hours of operation of heavy equipment.</p>
EIS-3-68	City of Commerce	1/11/93	OP	Supports completion of Route 710 Freeway extension.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-3-69	Alhambra School District	1/11/93	OP	Urges FHWA to issue the ROD authorizing completion of Route 710 Freeway extension.	Comment considered during the decision making process.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-3-70	City of South Pasadena	1/11/93	AL	Caltrans has misunderstood the low build alternative and it has not been correctly reflected or studied in the Final EIS/EIR.	<p>There has been no misunderstanding of the low build proposal on the part of Caltrans. On August 27, 1990, Caltrans officials met with the Mayor, legal counsel, and other representatives of the City of South Pasadena. Caltrans and South Pasadena representatives of the meeting discussed the low build proposal then favored by the City. Caltrans prepared plans depicting the concepts of the proposal and presented them to all participants. Caltrans asked the South Pasadena representatives if this accurately reflected what they had in mind, and the response was yes. This low build proposal, referred to by Caltrans as the Raymond/Arroyo Couplet, was analyzed and the results placed in the Final EIS, as requested by South Pasadena. Then it was alleged by the City of South Pasadena representatives that this was not what they had in mind. In September, 1993, the City developed another low build proposal referred to as the Multi-Mode/Low Build proposal.</p> <p>The Multi-Mode/Low Build proposal from the City was evaluated and determined not to meet the project's purpose and need. Please refer to the report "A Model Evaluation of the City of South Pasadena's Multi-Mode/Low Build Proposal (April, 1996)" and the Environmental Reevaluation for further discussion of the latest low build proposal.</p>

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-3-71	City of South Pasadena	1/11/93	OP	Information in the Final EIS/EIR does not reflect recent land use and transportation projects including, General Plan Amendments, street improvements, and light rail projects in and around the communities surrounding the Route 710 Freeway corridor.	<p>The Final EIS does discuss the proposed Light Rail Transit (LRT) extension from the Los Angeles Central Business District to Pasadena. Please refer to pages II-25 through 30 of the Final EIS, also Figure II-12, where the various alternatives of the LRT extension once considered are depicted. (The LACTC, now the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority [LACMTA], ultimately selected the Highland Park Alternative, which does not utilize the Route 710 corridor.) Also see Appendix G of Volume II of the Final EIS.</p> <p>Please refer to page IV-43 for a discussion of consistency with adopted community plans, policies, and goals. For an in-depth discussion of General Plans of the corridor cities, please refer to the DEIS circulated in 1975, which is incorporated into the Final EIS by reference. It should be noted that South Pasadena's General Plan was prepared in 1963 and adopted by the City Council in 1965. The City circulated a DEIS on its proposed General Plan update during October, 1997. Caltrans sent comments to the State Clearinghouse on November 6, 1997.</p>
EIS-3-72	City of South Pasadena	1/11/93	FE	Fuel consumption as shown in the Final EIS/EIR is calculated using an older model run, and the time saved is not consistent throughout the Final EIS/EIR.	Fuel consumption rates have not changed. Please refer to Response to Comment EIS-4-87.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-3-73	City of South Pasadena	1/11/93	C/N	The environmental checklist contained in the Route 710 Final EIS/EIR should be corrected to reflect the actual impacts of the freeway and that mitigation measures are required to reduce or eliminate the impacts.	The purpose of the Environmental Checklist is to ensure that all categories of impacts are considered by the preparers of the environmental document. It also serves as an outline for the impacts and mitigation chapter of the environmental document. The checklist was never intended to be a detailed discussion forum of impacts and mitigation measures taken. For a detailed discussion of impacts and mitigation measures, please refer to the text of Chapter IV of the Final EIS.
EIS-3-74	City of Arcadia	1/12/93	OP	Supports completion of Route 710 Freeway extension as the project will improve air quality, reduce traffic congestion on surface streets, reduce commute times, provide jobs, and save money.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-3-75	City of Arcadia	1/12/93	OP	Supports completion of Route 710 Freeway extension (Resolution).	Comment considered during the decision making process.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-3-76	City of South Pasadena	1/12/93	HW	The Route 710 Final EIS/EIR incorrectly states that there are no contamination problems at Abbot Labs site. However, it is known that a portion of the building was constructed during WWII and used as a munitions plant and is equipped with explosion-proof doors, windows, and other construction materials. To date, the City does not know of any preliminary soil investigations that have been conducted to analyze soil conditions.	Please refer to page IV-12 of the Final EIS for a discussion of hazardous waste. A discussion of the adoption of a contingency plan in the event a previously undiscovered waste site is unearthed during construction.
EIS-3-77	City of South Pasadena	1/12/93	CON	The Route 710 Final EIS/EIR indicates that excess earth from the grading operation will be transported to facilities in Irwindale and Azusa. No written documentation exists that these two cities will accept the earth and construction debris. Final EIS should explore alternative sites and mitigation to reduce amount of construction debris to be landfilled, and describe special handling requirement for asbestos and other hazardous materials encountered.	Please refer to Response to Comments EIS 4-39 through EIS-4-41.  Please refer to the DEIS approved in December, 1974, page 118 for a discussion of coordination with the Southern California Rock and Gravel Association, cities of Irwindale, and Azusa, and the Regional Water Quality Control Board regarding the disposal of excess materials from the Route 710 project. The Final EIS does discuss a Monterey Hills alternate disposal site, but this site is not favored by surrounding residents.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-3-78	City of South Pasadena	1/12/93	MM C/N FU	Pursuant to CEQA Section 21081.6, amended by the State in 1990, all EIRs must include a mitigation monitoring or mitigation reporting program. The Route 710 Final EIS/EIR does not contain a detailed mitigation monitoring or reporting program. In addition, there is no detailed project budget and commitment from the State that funding available for this project. Final EIR/EIS should discuss funding process.	<p>Please refer to pages IV-94 through 99 of the Final EIS for a “Summary of Mitigation Measures” discussion. Summary item No. 13 discusses the formation of an Advisory Group to provide recommendations about other possible mitigation measures. The Mitigation and Enhancement Advisory Committee was formed following the distribution of the Final EIS in April, 1992. The Advisory Committee conducted 13 workshops between September, 1992, and April, 1993, and issued a Final Report in June, 1993. The vast majority of the Advisory Committee’s Recommendations have been incorporated into the project, including those recommendations pertaining to “Construction and Mitigation Commitments.” These recommendations include the preparation of a mitigation monitoring program.</p> <p>Please refer to Response to Comment ES-3-46.</p>
EIS-3-79	City of South Pasadena	1/12/93	HB LU	To prevent negative consequences associated with remnant properties (excess) (i.e., maintenance problems, nuisances, and a draw for transients and rodents), the City suggests that designated properties within the study area be acquired leaving no remnants and eliminating isolated clusters of residences.	<p>There are no federal or State statutory mandates directing Caltrans to make general right-of-way acquisitions outside of the project’s “footprint.” This is logical because it would become a question of where would the purchases end - at 100 feet from the freeway right-of-way limits, six blocks, a mile, or even ten miles? However, there are mitigation measures employed to reduce the impacts of a transportation facility on adjacent or nearby sensitive receptors, such as noise barriers and highway landscaping.</p>

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-3-80	City of South Pasadena, Cultural Heritage Commission	1/12/93	CH	Cultural Heritage Commission for the City of South Pasadena states that any alignment for the Route 710 Freeway will have a significant, adverse and unmitigable impact on the historic fabric of the City. Analysis in the Final EIS/EIR does not adequately address all of the potential effects of construction of the freeway on historic resources.	<p>It is fully acknowledged that any alignment for the Route 710 Freeway Gap Closure would have an adverse impact on historic properties in the City of South Pasadena and in the City of Pasadena, as well. The reason for this is the wealth of <i>National Register</i> eligible properties in the area. However, much has been done to mitigate the adverse impacts to historic properties. Please refer to the Final Section 4(f) Evaluation, for a discussion of mitigation measures employed. And as a result of the “footprint reduction” recommendations made by the Advisory Committee, and incorporated into the project, the total number of historic properties directly affected have been reduced from 67 to 52. Of the 52 properties affected, all but 5 will be either reconstructed, relocated to an alternate site, or relocated in place on top of cut-and-cover tunnel.</p> <p>Other mitigation measures recommended by the Advisory Committee include the addition of cut-and-cover tunnels, and the relocation of historic structures on top of cut-and-cover tunnels or alternate sites. All but five structures will be relocated in this manner. Cut-and-cover tunnel relocation is proposed for the Prospect Circle, Pasadena Avenue, and Markham Place Historic Districts.</p> <p>Please refer to the Environmental Reevaluation (April, 1998) for further discussion of historic resources.</p>

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-3-81	City of South Pasadena, Cultural Heritage Commission	1/12/93	CH	Gap closure project obliterates the Prospect Circle Historic District and the Pasadena Avenue Historic District and adversely affects other historic resources.	Please refer to Response to Comment EIS-3-80.
EIS-3-82	City of South Pasadena, Cultural Heritage Commission	1/12/93	CH	Identifies numerous deficiencies in the documentation prepared for the Historic Property Survey Report.	In early 1993, during the Advisory Committee process, the ACHP referred the Route 710 project to the President's Council on Environmental Quality, citing outdated historic property inventory and lack of a low build plan analysis. The Historic Properties Subcommittee, of the Advisory Committee, prepared a Third Historic Architectural Survey Report (HASR) to address the historic properties inventory issue. The third HASR resulted in a November 20, 1995, Keeper determination of eligibility.
EIS-3-83	City of South Pasadena, Cultural Heritage Commission	1/12/93	CH	Requests information regarding impacts to the Pasadena Freeway (Arroyo Seco Parkway) from construction and operation of the 710 Freeway project.	For a discussion of the impacts of the Meridian Variation Alternative on the Pasadena freeway, please refer to page X-16 of the Final EIS. Of course, with the incorporation of the Advisory Committee's "footprint" reduction recommendations, particularly the elimination of the 110/710 Freeway Interchange, the impacts described in the Final EIS have been lessened. The affected portion of the Pasadena Freeway would be reconstructed.  During the final design phase, a detailed construction stage plan for the Pasadena freeway will be prepared. The construction stage plan will address such issues as temporary lane closures, traffic detours, etc.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-3-84	City of South Pasadena, Cultural Heritage Commission	1/12/93	CH	Demolition of structures could encounter lead paint and asbestos material and excavation could encounter contaminated or unsuitable soils. Mitigation has not been identified to minimize these potential hazards.	Please refer to Response to Comment EIS-3-76.
EIS-3-85	City of South Pasadena, Cultural Heritage Commission	1/12/93	CH	As a result of the adverse impacts to historic resources, the No Build Alternative should be selected, pursuant to the requirements of Section 4(f).	Please refer to page X-1 of the Final EIS for a description of Section 4(f) of the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) Act.
EIS-3-86	Alhambra School District	3/25/93	CIR FI	Proposed Route 710 Freeway extension will result in increased traffic and exacerbate existing congestions and vehicle/pedestrian conflicts. Relocation of housing would only remove four students, and Alhambra does not anticipate any significant financial impact from the loss of these four students.	Comment noted. It is agreed that the Route 710 freeway extension would have minimal long-term impacts on school districts in Alhambra.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-3-87	City of South Pasadena	5/21/93	GEO PH	Requests that Caltrans include updated information on Raymond Hill Fault, and City requests information from Caltrans on seismic safety of the existing bridges for the Pasadena Freeway.	<p>During the Route 710 Advisory Committee process the issue of seismic safety was discussed at length. Caltrans seismic experts from the Division of Structures in Sacramento discussed the most recent seismic design features being incorporated into freeway projects to withstand maximum credible magnitude earthquakes occurring on known faults in the region. The Route 710 project would be designed so as not to collapse during a maximum event, and thereby save lives.</p> <p>Caltrans Division of Structures shall continue with its current seismic design process, which involves peer review panels and a seismic Advisory Board. Each group involves University engineers and professors who act as consultants.</p>
EIS-3-88	City of South Pasadena	9/6/94	GEO	Findings of seismic hazards paper prepared by City of South Pasadena indicate the Route 710 Final EIS/EIR used outdated information, the Raymond Hill Fault is more destructive and active than in previous years, Elysian Park Thrust system needs to be included in Final EIS/EIR, and seismic mitigation measures for Route 710 project are inadequate.	Please refer to Response to Comment EIS-3-87.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-3-89	Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger (legal counsel representing South Pasadena)	10/12/94	AQ	A conformity finding cannot be made due to inadequate documentation in the Final EIS and the gap closure project must be subjected to Major Investment Study (MIS).	<p>The Route 710 Gap Closure project is in conformity with the provisions of the Federal Clean Air Act Amendments, because it is included in SCAG's Regional Mobility Element (RME), which in turn was determined by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), Federal Transit Administration (FTA), and FHWA to be in conformity with the State Implementation Plan (SIP) and the Clean Air Act Amendments.</p> <p>On January 10, 1995, the Major Investment Review committee met and determined that the Route 710 Gap Closure project is to be "grandfathered," as provided by Federal Regulations, having been classified as a Category 2 Project. This finding was memorialized in a February 21, 1995, letter to Caltrans from SCAG.</p>

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-3-90	Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger (legal counsel representing South Pasadena)	10/12/94	AQ	Air quality analysis does not take into consideration any growth inducing impacts of the gap closure project and relies on outdated air quality modeling and vehicle fleet assumptions.	<p>The fact is that growth is going to take place whether the Route 710 gap closure is implemented or not. The SCAG region is projected to grow by 6 million people to a population of 20 million by the year 2020, according to SCAG's Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide (RCPG). The Route 710 gap closure project would accommodate growth by adding capacity and allowing for a more efficient operation of the regional freeway system. Please refer to Chapter VIII of the Final EIS for a discussion on growth inducing impacts. The RCPG is in full agreement with the conclusions reached in the Final EIS.</p> <p>Actually, because of better emissions controls, more recent air quality models show reduced pollutant emissions for transportation projects. However, updated model results have been included in the Environmental Reevaluation (April, 1998).</p>
EIS-3-91	Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger (legal counsel representing South Pasadena)	11/12/94	AQ	Analysis fails to consider significant sources of emissions resulting from construction activities, i.e., demolition, excavation and construction and toxic emissions from freeway operations.	Please refer to Response to Comment EIS-3-66. Construction activity impacts are short-term impacts and not analyzed in the context of long-term regional air quality planning.
EIS-3-92	Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger (legal counsel representing South Pasadena)	11/12/94	AL	Final EIS does not analyze a reasonable range of alternatives particularly the multi-modal alternative.	The Final EIS analyzes 24 alternatives, which Caltrans considers a "reasonable range" of alternatives. NEPA does not require that an EIS analyze a full spectrum or infinite number of alternatives. Please refer to April, 1996, Model Evaluation.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-3-93	Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger (legal counsel representing South Pasadena)	11/12/94	C/N	Final EIS is not responsive to comments in violation of 40 CFR Section 1503.4.	Responses to comments made on past Draft Environmental Impact Statements and Supplemental 4(f) Statements can be found in Volume II of the Final EIS.
EIS-3-94	Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger (legal counsel representing South Pasadena)	11/12/94	C/N	Final EIS improperly references but does not summarize technical studies in violation of 40 CFR Section 1502.21.	All draft environmental documents and technical reports prepared for the Route 710 Gap Closure project are listed beginning on page IV-1 of the Final EIS. All of the findings of these reports have been incorporated by reference. There are no requirements to summarize the findings of all of these reports in the Final EIS. These reports are available for public review as stated in the Final EIS.
EIS-3-95	Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger (legal counsel representing South Pasadena)	11/12/94	AQ	Record does not provide adequate evidence for a conformity finding since 1) total indirect and direct emissions are not accounted for, 2) analysis does not use the most recent emissions estimates and 3) analysis does not include assessment of PM-10 and CO.	Please refer to Responses to Comments EIS-3-89 and EIS-3-91.
EIS-3-96	Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger (legal counsel representing South Pasadena)	11/12/94	AL	Consideration must be given to the multi-modal plan in both the conformity finding and the MIS.	Please refer to Responses to Comments EIS-1-6 and EIS-3-89.
EIS-3-97	City of Monrovia	1/6/93	OP	Supports completion of Route 710 Freeway construction.	Comment considered during the decision making process.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-3-98	City of Commerce	1/11/93	OP	Supports completion of Route 710 Freeway construction.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-3-99	City of South Pasadena	9/30/93	OP	Supports completion of Route 710 Freeway construction.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-3-100	City of Azusa	12/2/93	OP	Supports completion of Route 710 Freeway construction.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-3-101	City of Bell Gardens	12/6/93	OP	Supports completion of Route 710 Freeway construction.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-4-1	Automobile Club of Southern California	1/6/93	NR	Urges FHWA to sign ROD in favor of completing Route 710. Believes the Final EIS and the Committee's recommendations provide adequate measures to protect sensitive areas.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-4-2	California Preservation Foundation	1/15/93	OP	No fewer than 51 National Register eligible resources will be destroyed or substantially impaired. This is reason enough to disapprove the project.	Comment considered during the decision making process; however, it should be noted that the Final Section 4(f) Evaluation includes mitigation measures to minimize impacts on historic resources.
EIS-4-3	California Preservation Foundation	1/15/93	CH	The existing documentation of cultural and historic significance substantially understates the project's impact; surveys date 16 years and methodology does not conform as required by SHPO.	See Response to Comment EIS-3-17.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-4-4	California Preservation Foundation	1/15/93	4F	Final EIS analysis' failure to consider locally significant resources directly violates Section 4(f).	See Responses to Comments EIS-3-17 and EIS-4-2.
EIS-4-5	California Preservation Foundation	1/15/93	CH 4F	Locally significant resources in El Sereno and elsewhere along the Route are potentially eligible for California Register.	See Response to Comment EIS-3-17. A detailed Section 4(f) Evaluation analysis is provided in the Final EIS and a Final Revised Section 4(f) Evaluation has been prepared. The Final Section 4(f) Evaluation concludes that the Depressed Meridian Variation Alternative Reduced with Shift includes all possible planning to minimize harm to resources protected under Section 4(f).
EIS-4-6	California Preservation Foundation	1/15/93	CH 4F	Caltrans' treatment of National Register eligible and listed resources is entirely misleading and is unsupported by National Register guidelines. The Section 4(f) analysis is seriously flawed.	Comment considered during the decision making process. Also, see Response to Comments EIS-3-17 and EIS-4-5.
EIS-4-7	California Preservation Foundation	1/15/93	AL	A range of prudent and feasible alternatives exist (Low Build proposal) to minimize or eliminate the harm occasioned by the proposed project.	See Responses to Comments EIS-3-18, EIS-4-5, and EIS-4-10.
EIS-4-8	California Preservation Foundation	1/15/93	AL	Final EIS and Section 4(f) fails to consider tunneling in areas of concentrations of historic resources or use of extensive cut and cover with replacement of historic buildings on top of covered facilities.	Given the magnitude of the tunneling costs for the distances delineated, the Advisory Committee recommended selective use of non-ventilating cut and cover tunnels in six locations. Caltrans has agreed to tunnels at five of these six locations. A detailed cost estimate for other tunneling options is provided on page III-25 of the Advisory Committee's Final Report.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-4-9	Citizens for a Better Environment (CBE)	1/15/93	AQ	Opposes Route 710 extension due to lawsuit against California Air Resources Board (CARB) and SCAQMD over inadequacies of 1991 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP). Final EIS relies on outdated and inaccurate estimates of vehicle emissions.	See Response to Comment EIS-3-17.
EIS-4-10	Elysian Heights Residents Association	1/15/93	AL	Low Build proposal and No Build Alternatives never discussed in proceedings (hearings) as Caltrans pushed its "footprint".	See Response to Comment EIS-3-18. Also, Caltrans has studied 16 "Low-Build" or partial completion alternatives in past environmental documents. They were discussed in the Final EIS and can be found starting on page II-111. Caltrans' primary reason for rejecting the "Low-Build" or partial completion proposals was that they had insufficient traffic capacity to meet local and regional demand.
EIS-4-11	Elysian Heights Residents Association	1/15/93	AQ GEO HW	Final EIS is inadequate in discussing impacts to air quality, earthquakes and hazardous spills.	Recommendations for mitigating construction impacts are provided on page IV-3 of the Advisory Committee's Final Report (Construction Requirements) and page IV-6 (Air Quality).  As a result of discussions about the seismic analysis, specifically the Raymond Hill Fault Trace, it was recommended that Caltrans and appropriate consultants conduct a detailed review of their seismic analysis of the area. No additional recommendations were offered beyond those contained in the Final EIS (Page III-15 of the Advisory Committee's Final Report).
EIS-4-12	Elysian Heights Residents Association	1/15/93	OP	Long Beach extension should never be built; use funding for rail transit.	Comment considered during the decision making process.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-4-13	Los Angeles Conservancy	1/15/93	CH	The historic surveys performed for the Final EIS' analysis are 16 years old; other resources may have become eligible for the Register.	See Response to Comment EIS-3-17.
EIS-4-14	National Trust for Historic Preservation	1/15/93	CH 4F	Project fails to comply with Section 4(f) by: 1) failure to identify and consider all historic sites protected by Section 4(f); 2) Final EIS inexplicably distinguishes between <i>key</i> properties and <i>contributive</i> properties; 3) evaluation focuses almost exclusively on physical destruction and ignores <i>constructive use</i> impacts; 4) Final EIS fails to examine Low Build alternative; and 5) project fails to include all possible planning to minimize harm to historic sites.	See Response to Comment EIS-3-17.
EIS-4-15	National Trust for Historic Preservation	1/15/93	PN	Question the legal justification for project; also wisdom of a transportation policy that call for spending nearly a billion dollars in public funds for a freeway that will not fulfill transportation needs or resolve traffic congestion.	Although levels of service will decrease on some arterials due to changes in the local circulation system and new freeway access resulting from the project, overall level of service will improve on both a local and regional level (Final EIS Chapter I). In addition, the freeway alternative will satisfy the purpose and need and alleviate traffic congestion in the corridor.
EIS-4-16	National Trust for Historic Preservation	1/15/93	C/N	The Final EIS fails to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act and procedural requirements for public hearings.	See Response to Comment EIS-3-19. Additional opportunity for public testimony was provided at the California Transportation Commission's Route Adoption hearing on September 27, 1993.
EIS-4-17	Pasadena Heritage	1/13/93	OP	Supports the Low Build proposal as it protects existing housing and historic structures.	Comment considered during the decision making process.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-4-18	Pasadena Heritage	1/13/93	CH	Historic resources research gathered during the 1970s; a supplemental survey needs to be done since more properties are eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.	See Response to Comment EIS-3-17.
EIS-4-19	Pasadena Heritage	1/13/93	4F	Section 4(f) should not be signed for the Meridian Variation when the Low Build Alternative is a reasonable, sensible and cost-effective solution.	See Responses to Comments EIS-3-18 and EIS-4-5.
EIS-4-20	Pasadena Heritage	1/13/93	AL	Caltrans has continuously refused to consider a low build option, which has been promoted within the local communities for many years.	See Responses to Comments EIS-3-18 and EIS-4-10.
EIS-4-21	Pasadena Heritage	1/13/93	FI	Information about project costs is lacking in the Final EIS, and other cost questions remained unanswered.	Project costs (including costs of mitigation) are provided on pages III-24 through III-26 of the Advisory Committee's Final Report.
EIS-4-22	Pasadena Heritage	1/13/93	SE HB	Caltrans has not considered the negative social impacts of the project; Final EIS needs to be updated using 1990 census figures; relocation issues ignored.	The Final Report contains enhancement mitigation recommendations for relocation benefits, adopted by the Committee, above and beyond standard Caltrans procedures and beyond those contained in the Final EIS (see page III-6 of Final Report). Caltrans has analyzed the 1990 census data and determined that census changes would not change the conclusions on socioeconomic impacts or the mitigation measures.
EIS-4-23	Pasadena Heritage	1/13/93	NR	Freeway support is grossly overstated; Alhambra, the strongest supporter of project, will not lose one building or suffer negative impacts.	Comment considered during the decision making process.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-4-24	Pasadena Heritage	1/13/93	TR	Light rail will soon be a real option for commuters.	The 710 Freeway and the Pasadena Blue Line are both components of the transportation system improvements needed to meet future travel demand.
EIS-4-25	Pasadena Heritage	1/13/93	AQ	Increased pollution in local communities violates the Federal Clean Air Act.	An analysis shows that the project eliminates or reduces the number and severity of CO National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) violations in the area substantially affected by the project. Therefore, the project is in conformity with the State Implementation Plan (pages IV-20 through IV-25 of the Final EIS).
EIS-4-26	Pasadena Heritage	1/13/93	CIR	Traffic counts included in the Final EIS are years old and need to be updated. Truck ban questions the regional need of freeway. Full study of elimination of Orange Grove/Pasadena Fwy. interchange.	<p>The Advisory Committee recommended that trucks be eliminated from the freeway due to steep road grades, noise, potential for accidents, and hazardous materials spills (page III-9, Advisory Committee's Final Report). Even with the proposed truck ban, the freeway still serves a critical regional need for commuters and other non-truck traffic.</p> <p>Detailed information on the impacts of the freeway on local streets, considering the elimination of the interchange with the Pasadena Freeway, was not extensively analyzed. The Committee recommended specific enhancement and mitigation measures be developed with local communities, locations of frontage roads, on-ramps and off-ramps, pedestrian bridges and tunnels, and other key facilities and design attributes properly analyzed (page III-9 of the Advisory Committee's Final Report).</p>

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-4-27	Pasadena Heritage	1/13/93	VIS	Impacts on parks and trees need more thorough assessment.	Appendix F of the Advisory Committee's Final Report provides detailed recommendations on landscaping enhancements.
EIS-4-28	South Pasadena Cultural Heritage Commission	1/12/93	CH	Historic property survey documentation is 16 years old; Final EIR/EIS fails to state the specific criteria used; since initial survey, buildings have become eligible for listing.	See Response to Comment EIS-3-17.
EIS-4-29	South Pasadena Cultural Heritage Commission	1/12/93	CH	Final EIR/EIS devalues the significance of districts by treating them as only one property without appropriate acknowledgment of the many resources that compose the whole.	If individual houses contribute to the integrity of an historical district, they will be protected as feasible.
EIS-4-30	South Pasadena Cultural Heritage Commission	1/12/93	CH	Examples of overlooked historic resources are listed in the letter.	See Response to Comment EIS-3-17.
EIS-4-31	South Pasadena Cultural Heritage Commission	1/12/93	SE	Lack of information in the Final EIR/EIS on the community of El Sereno.	The El Sereno community is discussed on page III-18 of the Final EIS. Please refer also to the Environmental Reevaluation (April, 1998) for a discussion of historic resources in El Sereno.
EIS-4-32	South Pasadena Cultural Heritage Commission	1/12/93	SE	Neighborhood integrity (physical division by project) is another subject not adequately addressed in the Final EIS.	Community impacts are addressed on page IV-45 of the Final EIS.
EIS-4-33	South Pasadena Cultural Heritage Commission	1/12/93	MM C/N	Why is the final mitigation plan and cost estimate not already developed and included for circulation in this document? How is the public able to evaluate this project and its true impact in both physical and financial terms?	See Response to Comment EIS-3-19. The public was provided the opportunity to review and comment on the Advisory Committee's Final Report.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-4-34	South Pasadena Cultural Heritage Commission	1/12/93	HB	Request documentation of all possible <i>excess lands</i> , mapped and charted by address and the various possible widths of facility, be circulated to the public for evaluation.	Maps of a general nature are provided in the Advisory Committee's Final Report. Precise mapping of excess parcels cannot be completed until the final design phase.
EIS-4-35	South Pasadena Cultural Heritage Commission	1/12/93	MM	Document should provide information and answers to the following: A) Properties involved B) Agencies required to develop mitigation plan C) Storage location of buildings D) Measure to keep vagrants out E) Anti-graffiti programs F) Maintenance programs G) Meaning of "basic restoration", on pg. X-24.	A. Specific properties impacted will be determined during final design. B. Caltrans is legally responsible for developing and implementing the mitigation plan. C./D. The Advisory Committee's Subcommittee on Historic Preservation made numerous recommendations on building storage and protection (Appendix E of the Advisory Committee's Final Report). E. Recommendations to discourage graffiti are provided in Appendix F (Urban Design Mitigation Report) of the Advisory Committee's Final Report. F. See Appendix E of the Advisory Committee's Final Report. G. Basic restoration measures would include stabilization measures such as root repairs and bolting of houses to foundations.
EIS-4-36	South Pasadena Cultural Heritage Commission	1/12/93	MM	What mitigation measures are planned for the owner's access to the residence during construction? Measures to restore property or driveways.	Measures to preserve access will vary depending upon the property location and construction activity occurring at the time. A construction Traffic Management Plan will be prepared during final design.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-4-37	South Pasadena Cultural Heritage Commission	1/12/93	VIS	<p>Tree count, verify the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A) Accuracy of count</li> <li>B) Street tree count and species</li> <li>C) Indicate multiplier of the actual number of trees to be lost</li> <li>D) More accurate count from aerial photography</li> <li>E) Reevaluation has been made since alignment change</li> <li>F) Reevaluate loss of trees, public and private to complete width and length of corridor.</li> </ul>	A detailed tree count was not performed as part of the Advisory Committee's work; however, with the reduced project footprint recommended by the Advisory Committee, loss of trees on public and private property will be reduced from what was documented in the Final EIS.
EIS-4-38	South Pasadena Cultural Heritage Commission	1/12/93	CH	Alteration of the Pasadena Freeway may require an amendment to the Arroyo Seco Parklands Preservation Act of 1975 and would also require compliance with federal 4(f) and State preservation regulations.	The Pasadena Freeway is not part of the Arroyo Seco Parklands; therefore, no amendments to the Act or compliance with Section 4(f) is required.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-4-39	South Pasadena Cultural Heritage Commission	1/12/93	HW	<p>Route 110 soil has a high lead content due the high lead content in older cars. With the intersection of the 710 and 110, questions raised are:</p> <p>A) What will happen with the toxic soil?</p> <p>B) Where will it go?</p> <p>C) Do you have permission to dump contaminated soil?</p> <p>D) Who is responsible for dumping?</p> <p>E) Is this expense accounted for already?</p> <p>F) Age of estimate.</p> <p>These questions also apply to the older homes in the area.</p>	Mitigation measures for hazardous waste are addressed on page IV-97 of the Final EIS.
EIS-4-40	South Pasadena Cultural Heritage Commission	1/12/93	HW	<p>Questions for asbestos removal from older homes:</p> <p>A) Mitigation measures planned</p> <p>B) Costs incurred</p> <p>C) Dump site for materials</p> <p>D) Dump site for demolition rubble</p>	Asbestos removal will be conducted as part of demolition in accordance with all laws regulating asbestos removal.
EIS-4-41	South Pasadena Cultural Heritage Commission	1/12/93	HW	Caltrans is responsible to estimate the needs/costs of this project for special handling of contaminates, the disposal, and costs of cleanup.	Costs for hazardous waste removal are included in the right-of-way component of the project cost estimate.
EIS-4-42	South Pasadena Cultural Heritage Commission	1/12/93	CON	If excavated soil from Pasadena and South Pasadena is used in the elevated portions, where is the borrow site located for extra earth?	Procurement of sufficient borrow material (if required) will be the responsibility of the construction contractor.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-4-43	South Pasadena Cultural Heritage Commission	1/12/93	4F	Caltrans and the FHWA have failed to comply with Section 4(f) of the US DOT Act, particularly with respect to review by State Historic Property Officer (SHPO) and the ACHP.	A Section 4(f) Evaluation is located in Chapter 10 of the Final EIS. Also, see Response to Comment EIS-3-17.
EIS-4-44	South Pasadena Preservation Foundation	1/14/93	4F AL	Final EIS is outdated. The Section 4(f) analysis and the Low Build Alternative analysis are inadequately studied and flawed. Use of 1980 census data, when 1990 data were available.	See Response to Comment EIS-3-17 regarding historic resources; EIS-3-18 regarding the Low-Build Alternative; and EIS-4-22 regarding census data.
EIS-4-45	South Pasadena Preservation Foundation	1/14/93	SE	No discussion of the overall noise, visual, congestion impact in context of the neighborhoods.	Community impacts are discussed on pages IV-45 and IV-46 of the Final EIS.
EIS-4-46	South Pasadena Preservation Foundation	1/14/93	CH HB	No sufficient plan in document on how historic buildings will be moved and protected.	Appendix E of the Advisory Committee's Final Report contains construction requirements for the relocation and rehabilitation of historic resources during construction.
EIS-4-47	West Pasadena Resident's Association	1/14/93	PN	Purpose of completing freeway disappears when trucks are banned from vital link.	See Response to Comment EIS-4-26.
EIS-4-48	West Pasadena Resident's Association	1/14/93	FI	Economic benefits to the City of Pasadena and to its residents are not made evident by the Final EIS; loss of residents in area will result in a loss in City's tax base. The logic of the Final EIS conclusions on property tax base (page IV-52) is questioned.	Tax base impacts were reevaluated by the Advisory Committee (page III-13 of the Advisory Committee's Final Report).
EIS-4-49	Los Angeles Unified School District	1/15/93	C/N	The school district is concerned at an apparent lack of notice and failure to circulate the Final EIS to affected public agencies.	The LAUSD received a copy of the Final EIS, as well as legal notices.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-4-50	Los Angeles Unified School District	1/15/93	PS	Review of Final EIS indicates there is inadequate information the location of the freeway in relation to Sierra Vista School. Request that the Community Services Plan (Fig. IV-2 in Final EIS) be revised to show school location, nearby streets, Route 710 right-of-way and freeway lanes, the interchange lanes, and the transit station and associated parking.	See the discussion on schools in the Environmental Reevaluation (April, 1998).
EIS-4-51	Los Angeles Unified School District	1/15/93	CIR	There is negligible information on the proposed interchange and transit station Huntington Drive and the Route 710 freeway, and the impact of these facilities on Sierra Vista School. Concerns include the distance and elevation of the interchange ramps to the school, and the impact of this interchange and transit station on the traffic and circulation pattern of nearby streets.	The Huntington Drive transit station may be eliminated. If it is constructed, it will be developed as a part of final design.
EIS-4-52	Los Angeles Unified School District	1/15/93	AQ	In regards to the Final EIS air quality projections, it is essential that the assessment be updated to reflect the emissions at the Sierra Vista School from all project components: interchange, transit station and parking, and the 710 freeway. The air quality impacts on students should be reappraised.	See Responses to Comments EIS-4-53 and EIS-4-54.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-4-53	Los Angeles Unified School District	1/15/93	AQ	The school district has received no notice or consultation pursuant to Assembly Bill 928, which was intended to mandate formal consultation with a school district whenever a source that might emit hazardous air contaminants is constructed within 1,000 feet of a school.	The LAUSD is clearly aware of the project and will be notified prior to construction as applicable.
EIS-4-54	Los Angeles Unified School District	1/15/93	AQ	Please confirm or expand upon the information in the Final EIS Table IV-12, which indicates that Sierra Vista School is 350 feet from the freeway edge. Need to provide the distance of the freeway edge, interchange edge, and the transit parking to the closest school buildings and the closest part of the school playground.	The proposed project has been relocated to approximately 550 feet from the Sierra Vista School. Maps have been provided to the school.
EIS-4-55	Los Angeles Unified School District	1/15/93	AQ	Until further analysis and mitigation is provided, need to add to Chapter V, <u>Unavoidable Adverse Environmental Effects</u> , that there will be significant adverse air quality impacts on a sensitive receptor population.	Comment noted. See Response to Comment EIS-4-53.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-4-56	Los Angeles Unified School District	1/15/93	NOI	<p>Given that there is to be an interchange near Sierra Vista School, and that the air and noise studies have not projected added emissions and noise from this proposed interchange, actual noise measurements should be taken in accordance with District guidelines.</p> <p>Include as a mitigation measure that project noise will not be allowed to result in noise levels above the District standards (exterior: Leq 67 dBA; interior: Leq 52 dBA) at Sierra Vista School. If mitigation in addition to soundwalls is necessary, building modifications to the school (i.e., air conditioning, insulation, etc.) should be considered.</p>	<p>State and federal standards have been followed; the freeway has been moved away from the school.</p> <p>These criteria are consistent with State and federal criteria. Also see Response to Comment EIS-4-62.</p>
EIS-4-57	Los Angeles Unified School District	1/15/93	AL	<p>Because both the Meridian Alignment and Meridian Variation Alignment may have potentially significant impacts on a District school, the District requests that an alternate alignment be selected which is not near any District school.</p>	<p>The freeway was moved away from the school.</p>
EIS-4-58	Los Angeles Unified School District	1/15/93	CIR	<p>Provide projections on the increase in traffic in the vicinity of the Huntington Drive Interchange, and a plan showing details of the interchange ramps, transit station, station parking for 300 cars, entrances and exits to station parking, and circulation patterns and level of service of all intersections within two blocks of Sierra Vista School.</p>	<p>These specifics will be provided during final design. Conceptual plans were provided.</p>

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-4-59	Los Angeles Unified School District	1/15/93	CIR	Safe pedestrian routes must be maintained. Provide plans of overcrossings and undercrossings at Newtonia Drive and at Huntington Drive.	These specifics will be provided during final design.
EIS-4-60	Los Angeles Unified School District	1/15/93	SE	<p>The LAUSD does not agree with the Final EIS that none of the school districts would be significantly impacted by the fiscal impacts of this project. The displacement of 600 to 800 students, measured in fiscal terms, should be gauged not in percentages of revenue loss from Average Daily Attendance (ADA), but in actual dollar loss. All school districts should be treated equitably when it comes to reimbursement for revenue loss based on ADA.</p> <p>The number of displaced students who will be moving to areas of the District where there is not available school capacity needs to be considered in the calculation of costs. These students will either need to be bused to schools with adequate capacity or new school facilities will need to be built to house them. Mitigation of school impacts should include reimbursement for these costs.</p>	<p>School losses in the LAUSD are estimated at 510 students. LAUSD previously indicated that this would not be a meaningful impact. However, Caltrans and FHWA will work with the LAUSD during final design to address ADA impacts.</p> <p>The issue of fiscal and other impacts to school districts was thoroughly addressed during the Advisory Committee process. Please refer to the Advisory Committee's Final Report (June, 1993) for the school impact analysis discussion. The affect of the passage of Proposition 13 on school financing is explained. Caltrans incorporated all of the Advisory Committee's recommended mitigation measures from school impacts except the recommendation to reimburse school districts for lost ADA funds due to loss of pupils. The reason for not adopting this recommendation is lack of Legislative direction. It was fully acknowledge by all participants in the advisory Committee process that the current Education Code Statutes, Article 16: Sections 41960 - 41964, governing severance aid to school districts are no longer relevant in a post Proposition 13 world. Because of this fact, Caltrans has committed to aid school districts to have the State Legislature revise this statute.</p>

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-4-61	Los Angeles Unified School District	1/15/93	CON	Complying with local noise ordinances during construction will negatively impact Sierra Vista School, which is directly adjacent to Route 710 freeway because local ordinances limit noise levels during night and early morning hours. Therefore, the noisy operations are limited to daytime hours when classes are in session.	School losses in the LAUSD are estimated at 510 students. LAUSD previously indicated that this would not be a meaningful impact. However, Caltrans and FHWA will work with the LAUSD during final design to address ADA impacts.
			NOI	No determination has been made in the Final EIS as to the potential noise impacts on Sierra Vista School nor have proposed mitigation measures been discussed if noise levels approach or exceed federal or state noise abatement criteria.	The freeway will be located approximately 550 feet from the Sierra Vista School. Construction time frames will be determined during final design, and mitigated. Noise impacts and mitigation measures are addressed in this Environmental Reevaluation (April, 1998).

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-4-62	Los Angeles Unified School District	1/15/93	AQ	The air quality assessment presented in the Final EIS/EIR is extremely outdated. Current computer programs and models as well as emission factors should be utilized.	Please refer to the 1996 Air Quality Report.
			AQ	The approach for assessing vehicular impacts is outdated. Procedures outlined in the Air Quality Technical Analysis Notes, published by Caltrans should be followed and the SCAQMD Air Quality Handbook dated 9/92 should be referenced.	Please refer to the 1996 Air Quality Report.
			AQ CON	Quantification of construction-related air quality impacts is not included in Final EIS/EIR.	Please refer to the 1996 Air Quality Report.
EIS-4-63	Fine Art Conservation Laboratories	4/8/92	CH	Opposes completion of Route 710 extension because of the destruction of hundreds of historic homes and seven historic districts, which would result in the greatest loss of National Register eligible properties in California ever.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-4-64	Fine Art Conservation Laboratories	4/8/92	AL	Requests that Caltrans consider alternate modes of transportation such as removing cars from freeways to improve traffic flow.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-4-65	Preservation Action Council	4/8/92	OP	Opposes completion of Route 710 extension to (1) preserve Pasadena's historic structures and those of other cities, and (2) for other preservation and environmental reasons.	Comment considered during the decision making process.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-4-66	National Trust for Historic Preservation	1/15/92	4F	Final EIS fails to comply with Section 4(f), because 1) no historic resources in El Sereno are identified, 2) there should be not distinction between key and contribution properties, 3) ignores constructive use of historic properties and 4) does not assess the Low Build proposal as a measure to minimize harm.	Following the completion of the eight volume Third HASR in August, 1995, the FHWA referred the Route 710 project to the Keeper of the <i>National Register of Historic Places</i> for the purpose of making a determination of eligibility for the Short Line Villa Tract Historic District in El Sereno and other properties. On November 20, 1995, the Keeper determined that the District was eligible for listing on the <i>National Register</i> . Please refer to the Keeper's determination for a listing of contributive properties to the District.  Please refer to Response to Comment EIS-1-6.
EIS-4-67	National Trust for Historic Preservation	1/15/92	CIR	The Route 710 Freeway does not resolve transportation problems in the project area (i.e. the majority of the system operate at LOS F) and worsens congestion on local streets. No justification of projected doubling of traffic volumes identified in the Final EIS. Questions purpose and need for the project.	For a discussion of purpose and needs of the project, please refer to Chapter I of the Final EIS.
EIS-4-68	National Trust for Historic Preservation	1/15/92	C/N	Requests preparation of a Supplemental EIS to address changed conditions since circulation of the Final EIS and conduction of hearings.	Please refer to the Environmental Reevaluation (April, 1998) for an assessment of the potential effect of changed environmental circumstances on the conclusion of the Final EIS.
EIS-4-69	United Food and Commercial Workers International Local 770	5/29/92	OP ALT	Oppose completion of Route 710 Freeway gab closure project and urge FHWA to develop non-freeway solutions.	Comment considered during the decision making process.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-4-70	Sierra Club - Angeles Chapter	5/29/92	GEO	The Final EIS does not adequately address the Raymond Hill Fault which lies beneath a proposed Route 710 Freeway interchange structure, or the Elysian Fault which extends to a point on the Meridian Route.	Please refer to Response to Comment EIS-3-87.
EIS-4-71	Sierra Club - Angeles Chapter	5/29/92	OP	Requests that cost/benefit justifying freeway project be made available for public review.	For a cost benefits analysis, please refer to Appendix L of the Route 710 Model Evaluation, April, 1996.
EIS-4-72	Sierra Club - Angeles Chapter	5/29/92	OP	Disagrees with the Final EIS statements that construction of the project will not affect travel demand or generate new traffic demand, new congestion, and new air pollution, and that by linking two level of service (LOS) F freeways will there be a benefit to the public.	Please refer to Response to Comment EIS-3-90. Also refer to Chapter I of the Final EIS for a discussion of purpose and need for the project. (The trip demand will grow as the region grows in population, without regards to the project. However, project implementation will better accommodate growth.)
EIS-4-73	National Trust for Historic Preservation	6/1/92	C/N OB	Strongly objects to the imposition of a 6/1/92 comment deadline for the Final EIS due to lack of adequate notice.	The FHWA granted more time for comments on the Final EIS.
EIS-4-74	Sierra Club - Angeles Chapter	6/25/92	ALT	The Final EIS does not consider, as an alternative, the linking of the southerly stub of Route 710 at the Pasadena Interchange with the northerly end of the Pasadena Freeway at Glenarm.	Such an alternative was in fact addressed in the Final EIS and is referred to as the ACHP "B-D" Alternative. Please refer to page II-62 of the Final EIS.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS -4-75	Sierra Club - Angeles Chapter	6/25/92	OP	Completion of the State's Master Plan is not adequate justification for the freeway project, since Master Plan was completed without public input or environmental considerations. Opposes completion of Route 710 Freeway gap closure project.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-4-76	Old Pasadena Business and Professional Association	7/28/92	OP	Supports the completion of the Route 710 Freeway gap closure project.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-4-77	Sierra Club - Angeles Chapter	12/5/92	GEO	The earthquake resistant design of the I-110 bridge, which is not addressed, should be considered for Route 710 Freeway gap closure project.	Please refer to Response to Comment EIS-3-87.
EIS-4-78	Sierra Club - Angeles Chapter	12/21/92	OP	Summary of six previous letters originally sent to Caltrans now being sent to FHWA for information.	Please refer to response to comments EIS-4-70 through EIS-4-75 in this volume and AC-4-38-1 and AC-4-38-2 in Volume II.
EIS-4-79	Citizens United to Save South Pasadena, South Pasadena Preservation Foundation, and Neighborhood Action Committee	1/14/93	OP	Transmittal of letter submitted to the State Historical Build Safety Board requesting their review of the Final EIS.	Comment considered during the decision making process.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-4-80	Neighborhood Action Committee	1/14/93	OP SE ALT	The Route 710 Final EIS is inadequate and does not comprehensively address the range of adverse impacts associated with the project, such as impacts in El Sereno. Data used is outdated and no discussion of low build plan proposed by the Committee is provided in the Final EIS.	Please refer to Response to Comment EIS-4-66. The Mitigation and Enhancement Advisory Committee made numerous recommendations regarding additional mitigation measures for displaced residents and businesses in El Sereno, which have been incorporated into the project. Please refer to the Advisory Committee's June, 1993, Final Report.
EIS-4-81	Neighborhood Action Committee	1/14/93	LU	New and significant information plans and regulations are not addressed in the Final EIS	Please refer to Environmental Reevaluation (April, 1998) for an updated discussion of regional plans and programs. Please refer to Response to Comment EIS-3-89.
EIS-4-82	Neighborhood Action Committee	1/14/93	HB	Final EIS fails to address the effects of the loss of affordable housing in El Sereno and the effect of the freeway project on property values and community cohesion.	Please refer to Response to Comment EIS-4-80.
EIS-4-83	Neighborhood Action Committee	1/14/93	LU	Final EIS fails to address the freeway project's long-term effects on the viability of the El Sereno community and property values within the community	Please refer to Response to Comment EIS-4-80.
EIS-4-84	Neighborhood Action Committee	1/14/93	HB	Final EIS underestimates the costs of acquisition and relocation of residents in El Sereno. Also, Final EIS does not address the losses suffered by indirect effects on remaining properties nor identifies compensation for such impacts.	Please refer to Response to Comment EIS-4-80.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-4-85	Neighborhood Action Committee	1/14/93	CIR	Final EIS fails to address local street impacts associated with freeway project.	Freeway overcrossings and undercrossings are discussed on page II-24 of the Final EIS. For a discussion of street closures refer to page IV-85 of the Final EIS. While traffic circulation patterns would change, access to either side of the freeway would still be maintained.
EIS-4-86	Neighborhood Action Committee	1/14/93	AQ	Air quality analysis is inadequate and dated since it does not take into consideration changes in federal and State air quality planning programs, including 1990 Clean Air Act standards, SCAQMD Air Quality Management Plan and West San Gabriel Valley Subregional Air quality Element, the 1990 Census data or recent air quality modeling criteria.	Please refer to Response to Comment EIS-3-89.
EIS-4-87	Neighborhood Action Committee	1/14/93	EN	Final EIS fails to properly analyze fuel consumption and time savings since 1) the emissions factors used are now superseded by EMFAC7F; 2) does not include effect of extension on I-210, I-134, I-10 and I-60; 3) vehicle miles traveled (VMT) estimate for Low Build proposal are misstated and are based on data generated by the freeway project; and 4) predicted No Build volumes are not credible or possible, since these volumes would continue to follow existing routes.	Fuel consumption rates have not changed in the last few years even though emission rates have changed. EMFAC 7F and 7G have the same rates as previously used for the same vehicle mix. The effects on adjoining freeways have been included because a regional model is run on each alternative. A totally separate run was made to estimate for the low build proposal. The No Build modeling output is considered projected demand and is used to compare demand by alternatives.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-4-88	Neighborhood Action Committee	1/14/93	AL	Final EIS fails to adequately address the Low Build proposal, in particular alternative methods for accommodating projected demand such as regional transit.	Please refer to Response to Comment EIS-1-5.
EIS-4-89	Neighborhood Action Committee	1/14/93	MM	Final EIS fails to contain detailed mitigation monitoring or reporting programs nor provide detailed budget or financial commitment from Caltrans that the funding is available to implement the mitigation monitoring process.	Please refer to Response to Comment EIS-3-78.
EIS-4-90	Neighborhood Action Committee	1/14/93	MM	Final EIS statements regarding inability to incorporate all mitigation measures appear to cast doubt on the implementation of mitigation measures under consideration by the Advisory Committee. Asks whether a final mitigation plan will be included in the Record of Decision.	It is not for certain which mitigation measures you are referring to that cannot be incorporated into the project. In some situations, such as hilly terrain, noise barriers are ineffective and are, therefore, not used. These situations are clearly pointed out in the noise impacts discussion in Chapter IV of the Final EIS. Mitigation measures committed to in the Final EIS, and recommendations of the Advisory Committee that have been incorporated into the project, have been made a part of the project. Please refer to Response to Comment EIS-3-78.
EIS-4-91	Neighborhood Action Committee	1/14/93	N	Request noise contour mapping and requests reanalysis of the predicted noise conditions in El Sereno. The analysis should be based on noise levels generated by existing projects in comparable situations.	Please refer to Response to Comment EIS-3-47.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-4-92	Neighborhood Action Committee	1/14/93	GI	Final EIS provides only cursory review of growth inducement effects of the proposed freeway project and fails to address increased pressure to increase land use densities along the corridor. Discussion of Short Term versus Long Term Productivity and Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitment of Resources are similarly flawed.	Please refer to Response to Comment EIS-3-90.
EIS-4-93	State Building and Construction Trades Council	5/30/95	OP	Urges FHWA to speed the process towards a favorable ROD for Route 710 Freeway extension.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-4-94	Southern California District Council of Laborers	10/12/93	OP	Supports completion of Route 710 Freeway extension and urges FHWA to issue ROD.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-1	Unknown	5/12/93	OP	Opposes the completion of Route 710; proposes four equally important projects that money can be used for.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-2	Robert Aronoff	1/8/92	OP	Supports due completion of Route 710. Will improve the rest of southern California.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-3	Betty Barnett	No Date	OP	Supports decision to start 30-day comment period.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-4	Earl Beadle	1/7/93	OP	Questions wisdom of project: 1) project will destroy a healthy, integrated neighborhood, 2) what is realistic cost of project (buyouts, litigation, etc.), 3) 20+ years for project start, will have mass transit.	Comment considered during the decision making process.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-7-5	Earl Beadle	1/7/93	PN	Other routes exist to accommodate traffic, as well as immediate improvement projects to alleviate congestion.	See Response to Comment EIS-3-18.
EIS-7-6	Michael Burch	1/11/93	4F	Under Section 4(f), Caltrans has not considered all possible alternatives to relocate Grokowsky House, thereby the demolition alternative cannot be considered.	See Response to Comment EIS-4-5.
EIS-7-7	Michael Burch	3/12/93	CH NEI	Resident of the Grokowsky House complains that Caltrans' contractors have not abided by the policies in their <i>Maintenance of State Owned Historic Properties</i> guidelines.	The comment is not an EIS issue. Caltrans has aggressively pursued refurbishing of homes under Caltrans ownership, and has budgeted \$3.2 million for this work. Architectural design is in progress, with some construction also under way.
EIS-7-8	Michael Burch	3/12/93	CH NEI	Resident of the Grokowsky House complains that Caltrans has not adhered to <i>Public Resources Code (SB 1652)</i> , sec. 5024 and 5024.5 pertaining to the care and rehabilitation of historic properties.	See Response to Comment EIS-7-7.
EIS-7-9	Michael Burch	3/12/93	CH NEI	Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act states that deterioration due to neglect is an adverse effect. Caltrans has severely neglected and damaged the Grokowsky House.	See Response to Comment EIS-7-7.
EIS-7-10	Michael Burch	3/30/93	CH NEI	Letter to FHWA regarding Caltrans' refusal to properly maintain their historic properties and the deterioration that has occurred through this neglect.	See Response to Comment EIS-7-7.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-7-11	Dick and Betty Butler	4/29/93	PS	South Pasadena's tax base and school system would be completely destroyed.	SPUSD, like other districts in the Los Angeles area, is experiencing a general rise in enrollment. The Assistant Superintendent indicated an expected growth rate of 1 to 2 percent a year. This rate could increase if many older homes are replaced with condominiums or other high density residential development. Implementing Route 710 would offset the projected growth of the SPUSD over a three-year right-of-way relocation period (see Pg. IV-77 of Final EIS)
EIS-7-12	Dick and Betty Butler	4/29/93	OP	Federal and State funds would be more wisely used to support light rail and other mass transit projects to the port of Long Beach and Los Angeles. Extending the 710 freeway is costly (\$1 billion) and foolhardy when existing freeways are falling apart faster than they can be maintained. South Pasadena may cease to exist if this freeway is allowed to cut through it.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-13	John and JoAnn Chalton	1/8/93	OP	Supports completion of Route 710: A) Decreases pollution. B) National and local security. C) Safety on street traffic. D) Facilitates traffic flow. E) Completes an incomplete 28 year old system.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-14	Herchel and Helen Chubb	4/28/93	OP	Opposes construction of Route 710. Freeway completion can be avoided by widening certain streets and making them one-way, improving rapid transportation, etc.	Comment considered during the decision making process.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-7-15	Thomas R. Collins	1/10/93	OP	Supports decision to begin the 30-day comment period for the Final EIS. Benefits of project include: A) Reduced annual gas mileage by 3,750 miles, also reducing pollution. B) Reduced excess drive time by 83 hours, reducing congestion. C) Reduced stress.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-16	Raymond R. Dashner	5/7/93	AL	In order to not impact the City of South Pasadena, build a tunnel for the entire length of the project.	See Response to Comment EIS-4-8.
EIS-7-17	Arthur Eggert	4/28/93	OP	Supports the completion of Route 710 because the freeway completion will provide additional emergency access.	Comment considered during the decision making process. [Same letter as AC-7-13]
EIS-7-18	David Freda	1/14/93	OP	Opposes Route 710 completion. Feels that project shows environmental racism by running through Latino neighborhoods.	Most of the entire project area (for all three alignments evaluated in the Final EIS) cuts across a community that has become largely Hispanic during the last 20 years. (Pg. IV-45 of Final EIS)
EIS-7-19	David Gebhard	4/9/93	CH	The Grokowsky House is a major figure in the development of Moderne architecture in this century. Make every effort to preserve this significant structure.	The Grokowsky House will no longer be impacted. The short line shift avoids this property.
EIS-7-20	James D. Goltz	1/8/93	GEO	Two most active and dangerous faults near the site were not addressed in Final EIR/EIS.	See Response to Comment EIS-4-11.
EIS-7-21	James D. Goltz	1/8/93	GEO	The sources of 95 percent of all damage in earthquakes, ground shaking and liquefaction, were not mentioned anywhere in Final EIR/EIS.	See Response to Comment EIS-4-11. Also, seismic mitigation measures are listed on page IV-10 of the Final EIS.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-7-22	James D. Goltz	1/8/93	GEO	Mitigation measures associated with earthquakes were inadequate and represent standard building practices.	The mitigation measures listed on page IV-10 of the Final EIS are consistent with Caltrans' design standards.
EIS-7-23	James D. Goltz	1/8/93	GEO	Errors included in Final EIR/EIS include: Newport-Santa Monica Fault should be Newport-Inglewood Fault; duration of the maximum credible fault is 120+ seconds, not 40+ as stated in Final EIR/EIS; 5.9 earthquake of 10/1/87 is Whittier Narrows Fault.	Corrections are noted and hereby incorporated into the Record of Decision for the project.
EIS-7-24	Eloise Goodyear	12/1/92	OP	Opposes Route 710 extension; project will destroy an established town; truck route will negatively affect lives in the area.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-25	Madelaine Hill	4/27/93	OP	Opposes the Route 710 extension; supports other efforts to find alternative solutions.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-26	Michael Howard	4/27/93	OP	Opposes the completion of Route 710.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-27	Steven M. Jacobs, Ph.D.	1/10/93	OP	Supports due completion of Route 710.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-28	Margery Mackenzie	5/8/93	OP	Opposes the completion of Route 710; use \$1 billion for a low-build, low-cost alternative; proposed project will destroy City.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-29	Duane R. Markus	No date.	OP	Supports the decision to begin the 30-day comment period for the Final EIS on the Route 710 project. (This is one of three identical letters.)	Comment considered during the decision making process.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-7-30	Charles W. Moore, FAIA	4/9/93	CH	Preserve the Grokowsky House; supervised and constructed by Rudolf Schindler in 1928.	See Response to Comment EIS-7-19.
EIS-7-31	Lorna L. Moore	1/13/93	PN	The traffic analysis in the Final EIR/EIS shows that the project will not improve level of service and reduce emissions.	Tables I-2 and I-3 in Chapter 1 of the Final EIS show improvements in levels of service over the no-build alternative at selected intersections with implementation of the project.
EIS-7-32	Lorna L. Moore	1/13/93	AQ	The Final EIS is incorrect in concluding that the completion of the freeway will reduce emissions by diverting traffic to a high speed facility.	See Response to Comment EIS-3-17.
EIS-7-33	Lorna L. Moore	1/13/93	OP	Traffic modeling based on Los Angeles Regional Transportation System (LARTS) is an outdated model that even Caltrans officials have admitted privately is inaccurate and meaningless today.	There was discussion by the Advisory Committee on the validity of the LARTS model as applied to this project. The Committee concluded the model had been properly applied for the type of analysis and results being sought (page III-7 of the Advisory Committee's Final Report).
EIS-7-34	Lorna L. Moore	1/13/93	AL	Caltrans has not performed an adequate study of a low build alternative.	See Response to Comment EIS-3-18.
EIS-7-35	Lorna L. Moore	1/13/93	CH	The Final EIR/EIS has failed to include a historical district (Grace Terrace District) that would be substantially impacted by the completion of the freeway.	See Response to Comment EIS-3-17. The Grace Terrace District is outside the Area of Potential Effect for the Route 710 project. Residents of this district are encouraged to pursue National Register designation on their own with the City.
EIS-7-36	Lorna L. Moore	1/13/93	PN	What is regional need if trucks are banned from freeway? If there is an alternative route for trucks, then, there is an alternative route for cars.	See Response to Comment EIS-4-26.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-7-37	Thomas E. Nuckols, P.E.	1/14/93	NOI	Noise abatement for construction activities should be specifically noted.	The Final EIS states that construction noise will be confined to periods of normal human activity and by use of noise attenuation devices on machinery. See Response to Comment EIS-4-11 regarding additional recommendations for construction impacts.
EIS-7-38	Thomas E. Nuckols, P.E.	1/14/93	CON	Erosion and dust control of cut slopes during construction, what specific measures will be done to prevent impacts? What will be the impact on the City of South Pasadena's water system?	Erosion control measures are listed on page IV-11 of the Final EIS. See Response to Comment EIS-3-26 regarding control of fugitive dust. As noted on page IV-4 of the Final EIS (Environmental Significance Checklist), Caltrans concluded that the project will not have an adverse impact on local water supplies.
EIS-7-39	Thomas E. Nuckols, P.E.	1/14/93	CON	What effect will heavy trucks have on the proposed haul routes, staging areas and City streets?	Traffic and community disruption will be minimized by implementing a traffic management plan, employing techniques such as staged construction, detours, limiting work on arterial streets to off-peak hours, confining haul routes, and providing public awareness and media campaigns as needed (page III-7 of the Advisory committee's Final Report).
EIS-7-40	Thomas E. Nuckols, P.E.	1/14/93	HW	The increased concentration of hazardous materials passing through the City of South Pasadena with the Route 710 extension may impact emergency services and increase the risk of toxic explosion.	An accident is possible at any time on any highway, but the probability is low on freeways where design criteria are high. Within Caltrans District 7, spill cleanup operations on freeways are coordinated by either the CHP, local fire departments, or District 7 Maintenance (page IV-86 of the Final EIS).
EIS-7-41	Thomas E. Nuckols, P.E.	1/14/93	GEO	Specific grading, benching, retaining walls, architectural treatments and landscaping should be stated in Final EIR/EIS.	Page IV-7 of the Final EIS discusses standard engineering procedures to be employed to stabilize cut sections. Retaining walls, architectural treatments and landscaping are addressed in the Route 710 Urban Design Mitigation Plan (Appendix F of the Advisory Committee's Final Report).

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-7-42	Vernon E. Paltz	1/6/93	OP	Several individuals and businesses of Los Angeles County are asking FHWA to issue a ROD in favor of completing Route 710. (This is one of 11 identical letters of support.)	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-43	Joy N. Peralez	1/7/93	OP	Opposes Route 710 extension; project will cut funding to fine school district; degrade already bad air quality; and threaten City's tax base.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-44	Mary Ann Parada	1/13/93	AQ	Ed Edelman Children's Court in Monterey Park should be included as a sensitive site for air quality due to its location to the freeways.	The air quality analysis indicated that even though the Build Alternative will increase emissions adjacent to the project, the emissions will be below the State and federal ambient air quality standards at all receptors studied (page IV-14 of the Final EIS). Since the Children's Court is farther away from the project than the receptors modeled, the same conclusion would apply.
EIS-7-45	Mary Ann Parada	1/13/93	AQ	Correct Tables IV-11 and IV-12 to show <i>Huntington Memorial Hospital</i> instead of <i>Huntington Memorial Park</i> .	Correction noted.
EIS-7-46	Annie R. Patterson	1/8/93	OP	Supports the extension of Route 710; will improve air quality, remove commuter vehicles from residential streets, decrease commute times and create jobs. This is one of four identical letters.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-47	Jeanina Quezada	1/13/93	OP	Constructing new freeways does not promote the use of mass transit; implement more forms of mass transit.	Comment considered during the decision making process.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-7-48	Jeanina Quezada	1/13/93	SE	Final EIR/EIS does not adequately address the freeway impacts on the stable Hispanic communities in El Sereno and the loss of affordable housing.	Impacts to the El Sereno community are discussed on page IV-45 of the Final EIS and the Environmental Reevaluation (April, 1998).
EIS-7-49	Jess M. Reynolds, P.E.	1/14/93	AL	Supports the <i>Compromise Route</i> , and provides benefits of proposed <i>Compromise Route</i> .	See Response to Comment EIS-4-10 regarding the various alternatives considered by Caltrans.
EIS-7-50	Robert J. Reid	1/13/93	CUM	Final EIR/EIS fails to address the cumulative impacts of construction and traffic on the immediate and surrounding communities.	The Final EIS has addressed cumulative impacts to the extent required by CEQA and NEPA. The Environmental significance Checklist (page IV-6 of the Final EIS) acknowledges that the project will result in cumulative impacts.
EIS-7-51	Robert J. Reid	1/13/93	FI	The estimated cost of the project is seriously unsubstantiated.	Project cost estimates have been updated (page III-24 of the Advisory Committee's Final Report and the Environmental Reevaluation [April, 1998]).
EIS-7-52	Robert J. Reid	1/13/93	AL	Final EIR/EIS poorly addresses the no project alternative, and dismisses alternative transportation methods as serious options to the project.	The Final EIS has addressed the No Build Alternative and other alternatives to the extent required by NEPA and CEQA.
EIS-7-53	Robert J. Reid	1/13/93	CH	Final EIR/EIS poorly addresses the impact, both direct and indirect, on the historic fabric of the surrounding community.	See Response to Comment EIS-3-17.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-7-54	Gretchen Robinette	1/14/93	PH	There is a possibility of Valley Fever occurring from the vast earth removal; spores are located in the earth.	The Advisory Committee requested the technical staff to investigate this public health impact for the proposed project corridor. The technical staff reviewed the materials provided and indicated that the Final EIS mitigation measures had addressed this public health concern. The Committee made no further recommendations regarding public health beyond those contained in the Final EIS. (Same letter as AC-7-52 in the Advisory Committee Report component of the Record of Decision.)
EIS-7-55	Kimberly Saavedra	4/22/93	OP	Opposes Route 710 extension; use \$1 billion funds to support rail projects.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-56	R. Walter Simmons	1/12/93	AQ	Final EIR/EIS does not contain information on the impact of the freeway on levels of toxic air contaminants such as benzene.	The air quality analysis was prepared in accordance with both State and federal requirements. No federal or State air quality standards have been established for benzene.
EIS-7-57	Robert H. Sims	1/14/93	CH	Failure of Caltrans to inform members of the Cultural Heritage Commission or South Pasadena Preservation Foundation in the analysis of impacts on historic resources.	See Response to Comment EIS-3-17.
EIS-7-58	Robert H. Sims	1/14/93	CH	Supporting technical studies were not available to local reviewers in a timely manner, and appeared to have been prepared after decision has been made. A letter of concurrence from SHPO is needed.	See Responses to Comments EIS-3-17 and EIS-3-20.
EIS-7-59	Robert H. Sims	1/14/93	SE	Socio-economic impact analysis is still inadequate. (See letter for list of inadequacies.)	The Advisory Committee conducted additional analysis of relocation impacts (page III-3 of the Advisory Committee's Final Report) and tax base impacts (page III-3 of the Final Report).

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-7-60	Robert H. Sims	1/14/93	PD CON	Description of proposed freeway is inconsistent from page to page in Final EIR/EIS. Discussion of construction impacts is inadequate.	A "reduced footprint" project description has been recommended by the Advisory Committee (page IV-2 of the Advisory Committee's Final Report). See Response to Comment EIS-4-11 regarding construction impacts.
EIS-7-61	Robert H. Sims	1/14/93	C/N	Caltrans has violated Section 1502.2 of NEPA guidelines requiring: A) Agencies shall not commit resources prejudicing selection of alternatives before making a final decision. B) EIS shall serve as the means of assessing the environmental impact of proposed agency actions, rather than justifying decisions already made.	Acquisition of properties for right-of-way preservation did not preclude consideration of other alternatives during the EIS process.
EIS-7-62	Robert H. Sims	1/14/93	CIR	The traffic which the non-highway alternative would have to accommodate should not include the long-distance and truck traffic projected to use the freeway alternatives.	Not all of the traffic on the Route 710 extension is long-distance traffic (i.e., traffic with destinations in Alhambra, South Pasadena, and Pasadena would use the freeway in the Build Alternative, but would use local roadways in the No Build Alternative.)
EIS-7-63	Kelly C. Wallace	4/12/93	4F	Opposed to Route 710 extension; project violates Section 4(f).	See Response to Comment EIS-3-17.
EIS-7-64	Ian L. White-Thomson	11/11/92	OP	Opposes Route 710 extension; originally, route was not planned to pass through So. Pasadena; low build alternatives should be sought; powerful support from trucking industry.	Comment considered during the decision making process.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-7-65	Teri Williamson	No Date	OP	Supports decision to begin 30-day comment period; great progress made by Advisory Committee; project will greatly reduce impacts to those who live and operate businesses in the corridor.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-66	Michael Renaud-Wright	3/23/92	OP	Supports completion of Route 710 extension.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-67	Peggy and Steve Sisson	3/26/92	OP	Support completion of Route 710 extension.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-68	Paula and Phillip Detchmendy	3/28/92	OP	Requesting copy of EIR for the Route 710 extension.	Document was sent to the commentor.
EIS-7-69	Thomas Keiser	4/6/92	OP	Supports completion of Route 710 extension. If project is not approved for connection to I-210, Route 710 should at least be extended to terminate at Huntington Drive to alleviate traffic congestion at Route 710/I-10 interchange and on surface streets through Alhambra.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-70	James J. Agazzi	4/13/92	OP	Opposes completion of Route 710 extension because of potential damage/impact to the environment and historic properties that lie in the intended pathway of the project. Supports using existing surface streets to achieve completion of I-710.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-71	Robert H. McGowan	5/26/92	OP	Supports completion of Route 710 extension as it will relieve traffic congestion through neighborhoods and along local city streets.	Comment considered during the decision making process.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-7-72	Kathryn D. Fonteno	8/17/93	OP	Supports completion of Route 710 freeway link.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-73	Alexis Bilitch	9/9/93	OP	Strongly opposes completion of Route 710 freeway because of the destruction to the community of South Pasadena that it would cause.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS 7-74	Dean R. Price	10/10/93	OP	Strongly supports completion of Route 710 extension to reduce lost travel time, fuel expenses, and smog levels.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-75	Mary Ellen Emery	10/10/93	OP	Supports completion of Route 710 extension, even only to Huntington Drive to alleviate traffic out of Alhambra.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-76	Shirley J. Wright	10/12/93	ALT	Opposes completion of Route 710 extension and favors multi-mode/low build alternative which is a logical, fiscally prudent, fair, sensible, and nondestructive solution to closing the 710 freeway gap, and would preserve South Pasadena's historical community.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-77	Karen Wei	10/12/93	ALT	Strongly opposes completion of Route 710 freeway because of the destruction to South Pasadena that it would cause, the traffic congestion that a freeway would bring, and air and noise pollution that would result from its construction. Urges Caltrans to strongly consider the low build alternative.	Comment considered during the decision making process.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-7-78	Eric Maher	No date (before 6/94)	OP	Opposes completion of Route 710 freeway and favors efforts to find a non-freeway solution to traffic congestion. Freeway is too drastic and would alter the character of South Pasadena.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-79	Joe S. Rivera	No date (before 6/94)	OP	Supports the completion of Route 710 extension because it will reduce traffic load on I-5 between I-710 and Route 134 freeways, and will lessen traffic load in downtown L.A. and provide an overall better traffic pattern.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-80	Suzanne M. Brandt	No date (before 6/94)	OP	Opposes the completion of Route 710 extension because of the destruction to South Pasadena. Favors efforts to find a non-freeway solution.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-81	Ken and Ann Bergford	9/5/94	OP	Urges Governor Wilson to not approve AB 2556 which would help to further complete Route 710 gap closure because of the destruction to the communities that the freeway would pass through.	Because of the impacts on the surrounding communities associated with this proposal, the FHWA directed Caltrans to form a Route 710 Mitigation and Enhancement Advisory Committee to find ways to further mitigate these impacts. After a series of meetings, the committee issued a final report in June, 1993.
EIS-7-82	Larry deGras	9/16/94	OP	Opposes this project of uprooting people and destroying neighborhoods for more than five years or at all. The CTC is wrong. And, how can we expect use of public transportation when more freeways are promoted?	Comment considered during the decision making process. Both public transportation and freeways are needed to solve the congestion problem in Los Angeles.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-7-83	Atonia Rodarte	No date	OP	Support FHWA decision to begin the 30-day comment period for Final EIS and urge approval of ROD to complete Route 710 Freeway.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-84	Jamshid Iranfar	No date	OP	Support FHWA decision to begin the 30-day comment period for Final EIS and urge approval of ROD to complete Route 710 Freeway.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-85	Lorna L. Moore, Neighbors Opposed to the 710 Freeway	No date	OP	Requests rescinding the 30-day public comment period or at least extending the period so that there is adequate time to review and provide comments, based on results of mitigation process.	Please refer to the Environmental Reevaluation (1998) for a discussion of the public participation process.
EIS-7-86	[Signature illegible]	No date	OP SE	Oppose approval to complete Route 710 Freeway because the plans discriminate against the poorest and most ethnically diverse communities.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-87	John Vasincular (?) [signature illegible]	No date	OP	The Garfield House, where President Garfield's widow resided, would also be adversely affected by Route 710 project.	Constructing the Meridian Variation Alternative would not require the taking of the Garfield House. The freeway would be one block to the west of the property, would be depressed (below ground level), and would be provided with a cut-and-cover tunnel 1,190 feet long.
EIS-7-88	Russell Gee	No date	OP	Supports completion of the Route 710 Freeway and suggests that the freeway, if nothing else, be extended up to Huntington Drive.	Comment considered during the decision making process.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-7-89	J. Randolph Richards	6/9/92	OP	Supports completion of the Route 710 Freeway.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-90	Robert McClellan	6/11/92	OP	Supports completion of the Route 710 Freeway.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-91	Kenneth H. Patton	6/11/92	OP	Supports completion of the Route 710 Freeway.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-92	L. Raymond Freer	6/15/92	OP CIR	Supports completion of the Route 710 Freeway which would enhance the surrounding communities due to better access, less traffic on surface streets, and more complete integration with the Los Angeles Metropolitan area.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-93	Gene Buchanan	6/26/92	OP CIR	Supports completion of the Route 710 Freeway which would reduce accidents on surface streets.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-94	Robert Pat Blevens	9/4/92	CON OP	The Final EIS does not address the possibility that the proposed project will require the lowering or widening of the Pasadena Freeway in order to join the two freeways.	The proposed project will not have an interchange with the Pasadena Freeway. Please refer to the Environmental Reevaluation (April, 1998) for further discussion.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-7-95	Tom Houg	9/19/92	OP	Opposes completion of proposed Route 710 extension because freeways tend to marginalize areas that surround them and they adversely affect building design and land use patterns.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-96	Martin and Jesse DeLaTorre	9/20/92	OP AQ	Opposes completion of Route 710 extension because of the added air pollution that freeway can bring.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-97	Margery Mackenzie	9/22/92	C/N ALT	Asks if project formulation concepts mandated by NEPA have been fully and honestly implemented, which indicates that low-build would be most feasible solution.	Please refer to the Environmental Reevaluation (April, 1998) for a discussion of the evaluation of the low build alternatives.
EIS-7-98	Glen Alexander Phelps, AIA	9/28/92	OP ALT	Opposes completion of the Route 710 extension and supports wiser alternatives to freeway construction.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-99	Mr. and Mrs. Glen C. Travis	10/21/92	OP	Urges completion of Route 710 Freeway gap closure project and stop delays in mitigation committee.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-100	Lawrence and Margaret Schlomer	10/24/92	OP	Supports completion of Route 710 Freeway extension.	Comment considered during the decision making process.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-7-101	John Hiller	10/25/92	OP	Supports completion of Route 710 Freeway extension and suggests placing freeway underground. Strong concerns about the delays in the mitigation committee process.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-102	Thomas, Marie, and Steven Placido	10/29/92	OP	Urges completion of Route 710 Freeway gap closure project and stop delays in mitigation committee.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-103	Mary E. Bryer	11/8/92	OP FI	Opposes completion of Route 710 extension because its minimal transportation benefits do not justify its billion dollar cost.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-104	Daniel E. Stohler	11/19/92	OP	Urges completion of Route 710 Freeway gap closure project and stop delays in mitigation committee.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-105	William I. and Margaret K. Kelly	11/12/92	OP	Opposes completion of Route 710 Freeway.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-106	Dr. Jacquelin Lindstrom	11/21/92	OP	Supports completion of the Route 710 Freeway and suggests that the freeway, if nothing else, be extended up to Huntington Drive to reduce traffic congestion in Alhambra.	Comment considered during the decision making process.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-7-107	Mark and Sherry Irvine	12/28/92	RD	In a previous FHWA Response to Comments, FHWA indicated that it would not consider issuing the ROD until after the recommendation of the mitigation committee are developed. Is this still FHWA's position?	Caltrans has adopted recommendations made by the Mitigation Advisory Committee's Final Report (June, 1993).
EIS-7-108	Janet A. Scott	12/28/92	OP	Opposes completion of Route 710 Freeway extension because it will not solve traffic problems, will further degrade air quality and quality of life, is not cost-effective, and is a misuse of public funds.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-109	Tom Houg	12/31/92	OP	Opposes completion of Route 710 Freeway extension; requests FHWA to make an objective and honest decision.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-110	Mr. and Mrs. Glen C. Travis	1/5/93	OP	Supports FHWA decision to begin the 30-day comment period for Final EIS and urge approval of ROD to complete Route 710 Freeway.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-111	Judy C. McLellan	1/6/93	OP	Supports completion of Route 710 Freeway extension to reduce traffic on surface streets.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-112	Antonio (Tony) Sanchez	1/6/93	OP	Supports completion of Route 710 Freeway extension.	Comment considered during the decision making process.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-7-113	Thomas H. Jenkins	1/6/93	OP	Supports completion of Route 710 Freeway extension.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-114	William and Janet Ludwick	1/6/93	OP	Supports completion of Route 710 Freeway extension.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-115	Kenneth and Margaret Maddux	1/6/93	OP	Supports completion of Route 710 Freeway extension.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-116	Dorothy M. Roller	1/6/93	OP	Supports completion of Route 710 Freeway extension.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-117	Mr. and Mrs. Walfred Runston	1/6/93	OP	Supports completion of Route 710 Freeway extension.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-118	Joseph and Ernestine Bonfiglio	1/6/93	OP	Supports completion of Route 710 Freeway extension.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-119	Mrs. Lawrence Franco	1/6/93	OP	Supports completion of Route 710 Freeway extension.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-120	David M. Fritz	1/6/93	OP	Supports completion of Route 710 Freeway extension.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-121	Rollin I. Herron	1/6/93	OP	Supports 30-day comment period for Final EIS and favors approval of ROD for Route 710 Freeway extension.	Comment considered during the decision making process.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-7-122	Roger Ho	1/6/93	OP	Supports completion of Route 710 Freeway extension and favors approval of ROD.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-123	Irvin and Alice Walder	1/6/93	OP	Supports completion of Route 710 Freeway extension and favors approval of ROD.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-124	Mark and Juana Oakly	1/6/93	OP	Supports completion of Route 710 Freeway extension and favors approval of ROD	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-125	Mary Ortega	1/6/93	OP	Supports completion of Route 710 Freeway extension and favors approval of ROD.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-126	Thomas, Marie, and Steven Placido	1/6/93	OP	Supports completion of Route 710 Freeway extension and favors approval of ROD.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-127	Louis J. Richards	1/6/93	OP	Supports completion of Route 710 Freeway extension and favors approval of ROD.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-128	Robert T. Vasquez	1/7/93	OP	Supports 30-day comment period for Final EIS and favors approval of ROD for Route 710 Freeway extension.	Comment considered during the decision making process.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-7-129	John Hiller	1/7/93	OP	Favors option of placing Route 710 Freeway extension underground and using short tunnels in South Pasadena.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-130	Stephen M. Reed	1/8/93	OP	Supports completion of Route 710 Freeway extension.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-131	Lanny D. Larsen	1/8/93	OP	Supports completion of Route 710 Freeway extension.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-132	Ernestine Bonfiglio	1/8/93	OP	Supports completion of Route 710 Freeway extension to reduce traffic on Fremont.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-133	Ralph Angel	1/11/93	ALT AQ	Final EIS is incomplete in part because neither Caltrans nor FHWA has considered alternate, environmentally sound and creative transportation solutions to regional traffic, and the proposed project does not comply with the 1990 Clean Air Act Amendments or the 1990 SCAQMD Plan.	Please refer to the Environmental Reevaluation (April, 1998) for a discussion of alternatives considered and air quality issues.
EIS-7-134	Robert H. McGowan	1/11/93	OP	Supports completion of Route 710 Freeway extension because of not only regional transportation and economic benefits, but also for public safety.	Comment considered during the decision making process.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-7-135	Louise Woo and Mason M. Core	1/11/93	OP	Opposes federal funding for the extension of Route 710 Freeway and supports alternative modes of transportation.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-136	Robert W. Winter	4/12/93	CH	Urges FHWA to guard the historically significant Grokowsky House and to see that it is restored to its original condition.	The Grokowsky house will not be displaced by the gap closure project and measures are identified to reduce potential impacts.
EIS-7-137	Mark Sholz	7/93	OP	Supports completion of Route 710 Freeway extension.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-138	Cynthia G. Marrs	7/93	OP	Supports completion of Route 710 Freeway extension.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-139	D. Donath	7/93	OP	Supports completion of Route 710 Freeway extension.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-140	Dorothy V. McKee	7/93	OP	Supports completion of Route 710 Freeway extension.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-141	Edward H. Trower	7/93	OP	Supports completion of Route 710 Freeway extension.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-142	Art Pedersen	7/93	OP	Supports completion of Route 710 Freeway extension.	Comment considered during the decision making process.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-7-143	Carmen A. Porto	7/93	OP	Supports completion of Route 710 Freeway extension.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-144	Brian Ho	7/93	OP	Supports completion of Route 710 Freeway extension.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-145	Ellen Balsley	7/93	OP	Supports completion of Route 710 Freeway extension.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-146	Thomas S. Brachko	7/93	OP	Supports completion of Route 710 Freeway extension.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-147	Christopher Magamez	7/24/93	OP	Supports completion of Route 710 Freeway extension to reduce traffic congestion.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-148	William S. Holbrook III	7/25/93	OP	Strongly encourages FHWA to support completion of Route 710 extension.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-149	James A. Dal Pozzo	7/26/93	OP	Strongly encourages FHWA to support completion of Route 710 extension.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-150	Paul V. Wong	7/27/93	OP	Strongly encourages FHWA to support completion of Route 710 extension.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-151	David G. Lipps	7/27/93	OP CIR	Supports completion of Route 710 Freeway extension to reduce traffic congestion.	Comment considered during the decision making process.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-7-152	Maurice R. Chasse	7/29/93	OP CIR	Supports completion of Route 710 Freeway extension to reduce traffic congestion.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-153	Eric K. Steen	8/9/93	OP	Opposes completion of Route 710 Freeway extension and favors a more efficient way to direct traffic without destroying communities.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-154	Dan Silver, MD	11/20/94	OP C/N ALT	Opposes completion of Route 710 Freeway extension and favors analysis of alternatives. Caltrans has not completed cost-benefit and life-cycle analyses of proposed project as required by law.	Please refer to Environmental Reevaluation (April, 1998) for a discussion of the cost/benefit evaluation of identified alternatives.
EIS-7-154a	George Wacnile	No date	OP	Opposes completion of the Route 710 Freeway extension and supports multi-mode/low build alternative.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-155	Melissa L. McClain	No date	OP	Supports FHWA's decision to begin 30-day public comment period and urges FHWA to issue ROD for completion of Route 730 Freeway extension.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-156	Patricia S. Kunz	5/11/92	OP	Supports completion of Route 710 Freeway extension.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-157	Lester Jones	5/13/92	OP	Supports completion of Route 710 Freeway extension.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-158	Harvey C. Christen	5/15/92	OP	Supports completion of Route 710 Freeway extension.	Comment considered during the decision making process.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-7-159	Joy N. Peralez	5/16/92	OP	Supports completion of Route 710 Freeway extension.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-160	John E. Grech	5/20/92	OP	Supports completion of Route 710 Freeway extension.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-161	J. Randolph Richards	6/9/92	OP	Supports completion of Route 710 Freeway extension.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-162	Kenneth H. Patton	6/11/92	OP	Supports completion of Route 710 Freeway extension.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-163	Brian W. Courier	6/12/92	OP	Supports completion of Route 710 Freeway extension.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-164	Mary J. Proteau	9/18/92	OP	Supports completion of Route 710 Freeway extension.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-165	Stuart and Carol Mirell	9/22/92	OP	Supports completion of Route 710 Freeway extension.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-166	M. McArthur	No date (11/92)	OP	Supports completion of Route 710 Freeway extension.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-167	Tony Mizgalski	11/5/92	OP	Supports completion of Route 710 Freeway extension.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-168	John and Sheryl Yortsos	11/6/92	OP	Opposes completion of Route 710 Freeway extension and favors non-freeway solutions.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-169	M.R. Chase	11/8/92	OP	Opposes completion of Route 710 Freeway extension.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-170	Julie Howard	11/9/92	OP	Opposes completion of Route 710 Freeway extension.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-171	Joel Daskal	11/11/92	OP	Opposes completion of Route 710 Freeway extension.	Comment considered during the decision making process.

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comment Date</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response/Document Reference</b>
EIS-7-172	Frank and Marie Garibay	11/12/92	OP	Opposes completion of Route 710 Freeway extension.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-173	Nancy Swartz Connelly	11/12/92	OP	Opposes completion of Route 710 Freeway extension along Meridian Variation route and favors Low Build Plan.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-174	Dean Gordon	12/17/92	OP	Opposes completion of Route 710 Freeway extension and favors non-freeway solutions.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-175	Gene Buchanan	1/11/93	OP	Opposes completion of Route 710 Freeway extension.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-176	Esther Munoz	7/93	OP	Opposes completion of Route 710 Freeway extension.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-177	Duane Paul	7/93	OP	Opposes completion of Route 710 Freeway extension.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-178	B.A. Valdez	7/93	OP	Opposes completion of Route 710 Freeway extension.	Comment considered during the decision making process.
EIS-7-179	M. Walls	9/93	OP	Opposes completion of Route 710 Freeway extension.	Comment considered during the decision making process.

**ATTACHMENT  
COMMENTS ON THE ROUTE 710 FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL  
IMPACT STATEMENT**