

6. Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

At the end of Chapter 1, *Executive Summary*, is a table that summarizes the impacts, mitigation measures, and levels of significance before and after mitigation. Mitigation measures would reduce the level of impact, but the following impacts would remain significant, unavoidable, and adverse after mitigation measures are applied.

6.1 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Impact 5.6-1

Implementation of Mitigation Measures GHG-1 and GHG-2 would ensure that GHG emissions generated from implementation of the City of Hope Specific Plan would be minimized to the extent feasible. However, additional federal and state measures would be necessary to reduce GHG emissions to meet the midterm GHG reduction target of SB 32 and the long-term GHG reduction goal of Executive Order and S-03-05, which are, respectively, 40 percent of 1990 levels by 2030 and 80 percent of 1990 levels by 2050. Although the 2017 Scoping Plan Update is being prepared by CARB with a planned adoption in December of 2017, there is currently no adopted statewide plan past 2020 that achieves the midterm GHG reduction target of SB 32 or the long-term GHG reduction goal of S-03-05. Furthermore, at this time, the state cannot meet the 2050 goal without major advancements in technology (CCST 2012). Since no additional federal or state measures are currently available that would ensure that the City of Hope Specific Plan project could achieve the post-2020 targets, Impact 5.6-1 would remain *significant and unavoidable*.

6.2 NOISE

Impact 5.10-1

With implementation of Mitigation Measure N-1, construction noise impacts due to construction activities would be reduced to the extent feasible. There are no definitive, bright-line sound level thresholds for construction noise. Given the expected noise levels and, in particular, the extended length of the construction activities (three to four years for each of the four phases), significant construction noise impacts would remain. Impact 5.10-1 would remain *significant and unavoidable*.

6.3 TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

Impact 5.14-1

With implementation of Mitigation Measure TRAF-1 and TRAF-2, traffic operations would be improved to acceptable levels of service and impacts would be less than significant, with the exception of three intersections in the future condition (see Tables 10 and 11 in Appendix J1 of this DEIR). For the reasons

6. Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

stated above, improvements to: Live Oak Avenue & Arrow Highway (#1; Irwindale), Buena Vista Street & Evergreen Street (#13; Duarte), and Buena Vista Street & Duarte Road (#15; Duarte) are not recommended for safety reasons. Impacts to these intersections would remain *significant and unavoidable*.

The freeway ramp queues would extend beyond the 85 percent length of the ramp at I-605 Northbound Off-Ramp & Live Oak Avenue (#8) and I-210 Westbound Off-Ramp & Central Avenue (#17). Signalization of these ramp intersections as required under TRAF-1 would reduce the storage length by approximately half during both peak periods, ensuring that the queue would not extend beyond the 85 percent length (see Table 14 of Appendix J1 of this DEIR). This would mitigate the ramp to less than significant. However, the improvement is within the responsibility of Caltrans and not controlled by the Cities. Therefore, the Cities cannot guarantee implementation of the improvement and impacts to freeway ramps would remain *significant and unavoidable*.

The required improvements to Avenida Barbosa & Arrow Highway (#6; Irwindale) are not currently included in any traffic fee program; therefore, project impacts to this intersection would be *significant and unavoidable*.

Two freeway segments will operate at an unacceptable level, and the project adds traffic to these facilities. Therefore, there are project-level impacts to the freeway system near the project site. To mitigate the impacts at the identified locations, freeway mainline widening would be required. However, this type of infrastructure is extremely costly and is typically infeasible for one development project to undertake. The City cannot assure the construction of improvements to freeway facilities that may be needed to improve traffic flow. Furthermore, Caltrans does not have any funding mechanism in place to allow development projects to contribute a fair-share payment to future improvements and off-set traffic impacts caused by regional transportation. The facility is not controlled by the Cities, which could not guarantee implementation of the mitigation measures. Therefore, the identified impacts to the freeway system are considered *significant and unavoidable*.

Note this project-level impact assumes that buildout of the project would occur at one time without consideration for regional improvements. In the future condition, impacts to the two freeway segments—westbound I-210 west of I-605 and 2) southbound I-605 south of I-210— would not occur.

Improvements to state highway facilities are planned, funded, and constructed by the State of California through a legislative and political process involving the state legislature; the California Transportation Commission (CTC); the California Business, Transportation, and Housing Agency; Caltrans; and the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA). Although potential impacts to the freeway mainline segments and ramps have been evaluated, implementation of the transportation improvements to Caltrans facilities listed above is the primary responsibility of Caltrans. Caltrans has recognized that private development has a role to play in funding fair share improvements to impacts on these facilities, but neither Caltrans nor the state has adopted a program that can ensure that locally contributed impact fees will be tied to improvements to freeway mainlines, and only Caltrans has jurisdiction over mainline improvements. Because Caltrans has exclusive control over state highway improvements, ensuring that developer fair share contributions to mainline improvements are actually part of a program tied to implementation of mitigation is within the

6. Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

jurisdiction of Caltrans. However, a number of programs are in place in Los Angeles County to improve and upgrade the regional transportation system. These include the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), Interregional Improvement Program (IIP), and Caltrans Traffic Operations Strategies, State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP). State and federal fuel taxes generate most of the funds used to pay for these improvements. Funds expected to be available for transportation improvements are identified through a fund estimate prepared by Caltrans and adopted by the CTC. These funds, along with other fund sources, are deposited in the state highway account to be programmed and allocated to specific project improvements in both the STIP and SHOPP by the CTC. However, if these programs are not implemented by the agencies with the responsibility to do so, the project's freeway mainline impacts would remain *significant and unavoidable*.

6. Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

This page intentionally left blank.