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During the Draft EIR/EIS public review period, 26 emails and letters were received. Responses to all written comments are presented in the order the comment letter was received following this table. Note that Letter No. 26 was received in July 2010 during the Community Advisory Committee meeting No. 10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Letter No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hill, Farrer &amp; Burrill LLP (representing Spilo Worldwide)</td>
<td>June 29, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)</td>
<td>July 13, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Martha Cisneros</td>
<td>July 14, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Juaquin Castellanos</td>
<td>July 14, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Victoria Torres</td>
<td>July 14, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Kevin Break</td>
<td>July 14, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Art Herrera</td>
<td>July 14, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Tiffany Sum</td>
<td>July 14, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>John Fisher</td>
<td>July 14, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Cal Hono Freight</td>
<td>July 15, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>City of Los Angeles Cultural Heritage Commission</td>
<td>July 30, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>City of Los Angeles Bureau of Street Lighting (BSL)</td>
<td>July 28, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Glacier Cold Storage</td>
<td>July 29, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works</td>
<td>August 6, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>State of California Public Utilities Commission</td>
<td>August 13, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Central City East Association</td>
<td>August 14, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Stover Seed Company</td>
<td>August 14, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Hill, Farrar &amp; Burrill LLP (representing Spilo Worldwide)</td>
<td>August 14, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Hager Pacific Properties</td>
<td>August 17, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Friends of the Los Angeles River</td>
<td>August 17, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>California Archives</td>
<td>August 19, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)</td>
<td>August 24, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Department of Interior</td>
<td>September 3, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Office of Planning and Research</td>
<td>September 18, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td>October 30, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>CRA/LA</td>
<td>July 29, 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
June 29, 2009

By E-mail and U.S. Mail

Carlos Montez, Senior Environmental Planner
California Department of Transportation
100 S. Main Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012
Carlos.montez@dot.ca.gov

Jim Wu, P.E., Project Manager
City of Los Angeles
Bridge Improvement Program
221 N. Figueroa St., Suite 350
Los Angeles, CA 90012
jim.wu@lacity.org

Wallace E. Stokes III
Bureau of Engineering
Bridge Improvement Project
City of Los Angeles
221 N. Figueroa Street, Suite 350
Los Angeles, CA 90012
wally.stokes@eng.lacity.org

Re: 6th Street Viaduct Seismic Improvement Project
Our client: Spilo Worldwide, 585 and 589 S. Santa Fe Ave.

Gentlemen:

This firm represents Spilo Worldwide which operates its business at 585 S. Santa Fe Avenue, 589 S. Santa Fe Avenue, and 1435 East Sixth Street (the north side frontage road). Spilo owns the property on Santa Fe and leases the Sixth Street parcel. The City of Los Angeles has told Spilo that of the various alternatives under consideration, the City and/or State may take Spilo’s property as part of the 6th Street Viaduct Improvement Project. This letter sets forth Spilo’s concerns with respect to the impact of the proposed project on its business and Spilo requests that the City and State respond to these issues in the Final Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (FEIR/EIS).

Spilo is a distributor of beauty products and has operated just northerly of the Sixth Street Viaduct since 1982. Spilo’s facilities include its main office at 589 S. Santa Fe Avenue, the 585 S. Santa Fe parcel, where it has additional offices, its receiving area and parking lot with access to Willow Street, and its shipping and loading area at 1435 East Sixth Street, just northerly of the westerly portion of the Sixth Street Viaduct.

We understand that under some of the scenarios being contemplated, the City and/or State would close the East Sixth Street frontage road adjacent to the viaduct. That closure would
prevent access to Spilo’s facility at 1435 East Sixth Street, and prevent Spilo from shipping its products. It is critical to Spilo’s operations that its shipping operations have access to city streets so that it can distribute its goods. Without such access, the business could not exist.

The City’s representatives have presented a conceptual mitigation measure which would provide access from the 1435 East Sixth Street parcel to Willow Street. It is critical to Spilo’s operations that if the City/State intends to proceed with creating alternative access to those buildings fronting on East Sixth Street, East of Mateo, that such access be secured and completed prior to any impact on access to the northerly frontage road.

During the period the Viaduct is being constructed, Spilo is concerned that the construction noise and vibrations will interfere with its operations, and that large amounts of dirt and debris will find its way onto Spilo’s property.

Spilo recognizes the importance of this project, but requests that the City and State fully consider the impacts of the project on local businesses, and completely mitigate those impacts, so that private citizens and businesses are not damaged by this public project.

Please make this letter part of the record of the draft EIR/EIS. Feel free to contact me if you need additional information. Thank you.

Very truly yours,

KEVIN H. BROGAN
OF
HILL, FARRER & BURRILL LLP

cc: Spilo Worldwide

KHB:hjp
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Response to Comment Letter No. 1 – Hill, Farrer & Burrill LLP (representing Spilo Worldwide)

1. As indicated in the EIR/EIS (Section 3.4.3.1), the one-way service/frontage road north of the viaduct between Mateo Street and Mesquit Street would be removed and relocated for the Replacement Alternative, which would require acquisition/relocation of several businesses along this road. Since preliminary discussions between representatives of the City Real Estate Group and Spilo Worldwide, it has been determined that it will not likely be feasible to provide alternative access to the property at 1435 East Sixth Street from Willow Street. The City is committed to working and resolving the right-of-way issue with affected property owners during the right-of-way acquisition process and final design.

2. **Concerns about noise, vibration, and dust during construction.** During the construction period, the contractor would be required to ensure dust control measures are in place. Construction methods would be considered to minimize vibration.

3. **Request the City to consider impacts to local business and mitigate them.** The City will continue to work with the businesses within the project area to try and to resolve any remaining issues.
July 13, 2009

Ronald J. Kosinski
Deputy District Director
Department of Transportation, District 7
100 South Main Street, MS-16A
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Mr. Kosinski:

This is in response to your request for comments on the Notice of Public Hearing and Availability of Environmental Impact Report/Statement for 07-LA-101.20 6th Street Viaduct Seismic Improvement Project EA 251200.

Please review the current effective countywide Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) for the City of Los Angeles (Community Number 060137) and County of Los Angeles (Community Number 065043), Maps revised September 6, 2008. Please note that the City and County of Los Angeles are participants in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). The minimum, basic NFIP floodplain management building requirements are described in Vol. 44 Code of Federal Regulations (44 CFR), Sections 59 through 65.

A summary of these NFIP floodplain management building requirements are as follows:

- All buildings constructed within a riverine floodplain, (i.e., Flood Zones A, AO, AH, AE, and A1 through A30 as delineated on the FIRM), must be elevated so that the lowest floor is at or above the Base Flood Elevation level in accordance with the effective Flood Insurance Rate Map.

- If the area of construction is located within a Regulatory Floodway as delineated on the FIRM, any development must not increase base flood elevation levels. The term development means any man-made change to improved or unimproved real estate, including but not limited to buildings, other structures, mining, dredging, filling, grading, paving, excavation or drilling operations, and storage of equipment or materials. A hydrologic and hydraulic analysis must be performed prior to the start of development, and must demonstrate that the development would not cause any rise in base flood levels. No rise is permitted within regulatory floodways.
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Ronald J. Kosinski, Deputy District Director
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- All buildings constructed within a coastal high hazard area, (any of the “V” Flood Zones as delineated on the FIRM), must be elevated on pilings and columns, so that the lowest horizontal structural member, (excluding the pilings and columns), is elevated to or above the base flood elevation level. In addition, the posts and pilings foundation and the structure attached thereto, is anchored to resist flotation, collapse and lateral movement due to the effects of wind and water loads acting simultaneously on all building components.

- Upon completion of any development that changes existing Special Flood Hazard Areas, the NFIP directs all participating communities to submit the appropriate hydrologic and hydraulic data to FEMA for a FIRM revision. In accordance with 44 CFR, Section 65.3, as soon as practicable, but not later than six months after such data becomes available, a community shall notify FEMA of the changes by submitting technical data for a flood map revision. To obtain copies of FEMA’s Flood Map Revision Application Packages, please refer to the FEMA website at http://www.fema.gov/business/nfip/forms.shtml.

Please Note:

Many NFIP participating communities have adopted floodplain management building requirements which are more restrictive than the minimum federal standards described in 44 CFR. Please contact the local community’s floodplain manager for more information on local floodplain management building requirements. The City of Los Angeles floodplain manager can be reached by calling Susan Shu at (213) 485-4493. The Los Angeles County floodplain manager can be reached by calling George De La O, Senior Civil Engineer, Department of Public Works, at (626) 458-7155.

If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to call Cynthia McKenzie of the Mitigation staff at (510) 627-7190.

Sincerely,

Gregor Blackburn, CFM, Branch Chief
Floodplain Management and Insurance Branch

cc:
Susan Shu, Floodplain Administrator, City of Los Angeles
George De La O, Senior Civil Engineer, Los Angeles County Department of Public Works
Garret Tam Sing/Salomon Miranda, State of California, Department of Water Resources, Southern District
Cynthia McKenzie, Senior Floodplain Administrator, CFM, DHS/FEMA Region IX
Alessandro Amaglio, Environmental Officer, DHS/FEMA Region IX

www.fema.gov
Response to Comment Letter No. 2 – Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)

1. **The project should comply with the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) floodplain management building requirements.** A hydrologic and hydraulic analysis was prepared to analyze potential impacts to the river due to construction of a new bridge. The study concluded that construction of a new bridge will not raise the base flood levels as documented in Section 3.10.3 of the FEIR/EIS. Based on the result of the study, construction of Bridge Concept 1 would adversely affect the river hydraulics upstream of the viaduct due to the larger pier size. Construction of other bridge types (2, 3, 4, 4A, 5) would have either negligible or beneficial impacts to the river hydraulics. Alternative 3 with the principle of Bridge Concept 4 has been identified as the preferred alternative, and it would not affect the river flow.

The 6th Street Viaduct Seismic Improvement Project does not propose to construct any buildings.
City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works Bureau of Engineering and Caltrans
6th St Bridge Viaduct Seismic Improvement Project Comment Form

Public Hearing
Tuesday, July 14, 2009
6:00 pm – 8:00 pm
Boyle Heights Senior Center

Your name: MARTHA MENEROS
Affiliation: 3h RESIDENT

Business / Residence Address:
1151 SPENCE ST, L.A. 90023

Street  City  Zip Code

Telephone 323-264-3800  Email MARTHA.MENEROS2003@YAHOO.COM

☐ Yes, I would like to provide oral public comment
☐ No, I would like to provide only written comment

Please use this space for your questions and comments

I AM IN FAVOR OF REPLICA BRIDGE 1A

I OPPOSE ALL OTHER CONCEPTS

I COMMUTE TO DOWNTOWN EVERYDAY ON 6TH ST. BRIDGE.
Response to Comment Letter No. 3 – Martha Cisneros

1. **In support of the Replica.** After comparing and weighing the benefits and impacts of all of the feasible alternatives, as summarized in Summary Table ES-1 and described in detail in Chapter 3, the Project Development Team (PDT) has identified the Replacement Alternative (Alternative 3) with Alignment 3B and the principle of Bridge Concept 4 as the Preferred Alternative for the 6th Street Viaduct Seismic Improvement Project (see Section 2.4 of the FEIR/EIS). The City and Caltrans have made the final determination of the project’s impact on the environment based on the comments and concerns expressed during the public review period and the results of the engineering and environmental technical analysis. The Preferred Alternative would attain the purpose of the project.

The City will go through a process to refine the final design for the bridge replacement to ensure that both an architecturally distinctive and cost-effective design is selected for construction. Design details of the preferred cable-supported bridge type (the principle of Bridge Concept 4) could evolve into different engineering and architectural expressions of this concept, in terms of tower and cable connection form for example, in addition to aesthetic elements of colors, textures, lighting, railings, and gateway elements.

Note that during construction, 6th Street Viaduct will be closed and detours will be in place.
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City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works Bureau of Engineering and Caltrans
6th St Bridge Viaduct Seismic Improvement Project Comment Form

Public Hearing
Tuesday, July 14, 2009
6:00 pm – 8:00 pm
Boyle Heights Senior Center

Your name: Juaquin Castellanos  Affiliation: ________________________________
Business/Residence Address:

Street  City  Zip Code
528 N. COMMUNITY ST  LA  CA  90033

Telephone  Email JuaquinCastellanos@yahoo.com

☐ Yes, I would like to provide oral public comment
☐ No, I would like to provide only written comment

Please use this space for your questions and comments

I like the replica of the 6th St Bridge because it will keep the sense of this community. This community has history and these Bridge is part of it. I like also the color is on right now. Also the lighting is important because it will bring safety to it we need to bring antique lights to make it more beautiful and more peaceful place to do a nice walk.

Sincerely,
Juaquin Castellanos

Also this Bridge should be call the same name we don’t want to dedicate or rename it to anyone.

Thank You for your input!

6th Street Viaduct Seismic Improvement Project  M-10  October 2011
Response to Comment Letter No. 4 – Juaquin Castellanos

1. **In support of the Replica.** The preferred alternative is the principle of Bridge Concept 4 and Alignment 3B (see Response to Comments 4-1 above).

2. **The same name should be used for the new bridge.** Currently there is no consideration of changing the name of the 6th Street Viaduct.
City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works Bureau of Engineering and Caltrans
6th St Bridge Viaduct Seismic Improvement Project Comment Form

Public Hearing
Tuesday, July 14, 2009
6:00 pm – 8:00 pm
Boyle Heights Senior Center

Your name: Victoria Torres
Affiliation: Boyle Heights Historical Society

Business / Residence Address:
1167 1/2 Miraleol Street, Los Angeles, 90023

Telephone 323/269-2669 Email ______________________

☐ Yes, I would like to provide oral public comment
☐ No, I would like to provide only written comment

Please use this space for your questions and comments

In the last two years I like that you have taken our concern’s into consideration on keeping the 6th Street Bridge as close to you can to blend in with the other historical bridges. I like the concept of LA Bridge. It has that historical look and does keep in concept with the bridge as it look’s today with the pillars under the bridge, with the arches.

Thank You for your input!
Response to Comment Letter No. 5 – Victoria Torres

1. **In support of Concept 1A.** The preferred alternative is Bridge Concept 4A and Alignment 3B (see Response to Comments 4-1 above).
City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works Bureau of Engineering and Caltrans
6th St Bridge Viaduct Seismic Improvement Project Comment Form
Public Hearing
Tuesday, July 14, 2009
6:00 pm – 8:00 pm
Boyle Heights Senior Center

Your name: Kevin Breach
Affiliation: photographer 1st St Project
Business / Residence Address:
600 Moulton 0205
LA CA 90031
Street City Zip Code
Telephone 3232215129
Email KBreach@gmail.com

☐ Yes, I would like to provide oral public comment
☐ No, I would like to provide only written comment

Please use this space for your questions and comments:

It sounds mundane, however it would be a great idea to make the new bridge "pigeon-proof" as there is a recurring infestation right at the anchors.

Secondly, there is so much filming at the bridge, why not put outlets for 120/220V AC so that film crews could forego the stinking diesel generators?

Thank You for your input!
Response to Comment Letter No. 6 – Kevin Break

1. **Suggested “pigeon-proof” be considered in the new bridge design.** The suggested feature will be considered during the final design phase.

2. **Suggested electrical outlets be furnished on the bridge to facilitate filming activities.** The suggested feature will be considered during the final design phase.
City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works Bureau of Engineering and Caltrans
6th St Bridge Viaduct Seismic Improvement Project Comment Form
Public Hearing
Tuesday, July 14, 2009
6:00 pm – 8:00 pm
Boyle Heights Senior Center

Your name: Art Herrera  Affiliation: Boyle HTS Resident / Homeowner
Business / Residence Address:
3438 E 51st St  LA 90023
Street  City  Zip Code
Telephone (323) 268-4567  Email

Yes, I would like to provide oral public comment
No, I would like to provide only written comment

Please use this space for your questions and comments

I support the new concrete bridge 4 ft A

Thank You for your input!
1. **In support of Concept 4A.** The preferred alternative is the principle of Bridge Concept 4 and Alignment 3B (see Response to Comments 4-1 above).
City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works Bureau of Engineering and Caltrans
6th St Bridge Viaduct Seismic Improvement Project Comment Form
Public Hearing
Tuesday, July 21, 2009
5:00 pm – 7:00 pm
Inner City Arts

Your name __________________________________________________________________________
Affiliation: _________________________________________________________________________
Business/Residence Address: __________________________________________________________________________
Street __________________________________________________________________________
City __________________________________________________________________________
Zip Code __________________________________________________________________________
Telephone __________________________________________________________________________
Email __________________________________________________________________________

☐ Yes, I would like to provide oral public comment
☐ No, I would like to provide only written comment

Please use this space for your questions and comments

I’d vote for proposal 4A.
The modern and modest design that can
compare with London’s Millennium Bridge to London Bridge
and other older infrastructure.

These needs to align cultural community and events to expand the
use of the bridge: greener, more human activities involved.

1

2
Response to Comment Letter No. 8 – Tiffany Sum

1. **In support of Concept 4A.** The preferred alternative is the principle of Bridge Concept 4 and Alignment 3B (see Response to Comments 4-1 above).

2. **Support more cultural activities on bridge.** Once the bridge is replaced, it could be available for events.
City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works Bureau of Engineering and Caltrans
6th St Bridge Viaduct Seismic Improvement Project Comment Form

Public Hearing
Responsible Agencies, Review Agencies, Cooperating Agencies
Tuesday, July 14, 2009
2:00 pm – 4:00 pm
Caltrans

Your name: John Fisher
Affiliation: LADOT, Assist. GM

Business/Residence Address:

Street
City
Zip Code
Telephone
Email

✓ Yes, I would like to provide oral public comment
☐ No, I would like to provide only written comment

Please use this space for your questions and comments

I would like to incorporate some of the original design elements from the existing bridge, such as the pyramid shape on the pylons, art deco light standard and flower design—see pictures attached.
Response to Comment Letter No. 9 – John Fisher

1. **Some original design elements should be incorporated into new bridge design.** The preliminary bridge concepts incorporate the architectural vocabulary derived from the massing of the existing river bridges. During the final design phase, an aesthetic advisory committee will be formed and will provide input on architectural features to be included in the design.
First of the e-mail comments.

wally

From: Wally Stokes
Sent: Wednesday, July 15, 2009 1:19 PM
To: "Jim Zant"
Cc: glaciervp; Diane Carletello; Sergio Ibarra
Subject: RE: Comments

Thank you Mr. Zant, your comment has been passed to the project team for further analysis. A member of the team may contact you in the future to gather additional site-specific information. Please be assured that your concern will receive the team's full attention.

wally

From: "Jim Zant" [mailto:Jim@calhono.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 15, 2009 11:34 AM
To: <wally.stokes@lacity.org>
Cc: <glaciervp@aol.com>, "Diane Carletello" <Diane@calhono.com>, "Sergio Ibarra"<Sergio@calhono.com>
Subject: Comments

Mr. Stokes:

I attended the meeting last night & made a public comment about our particular concern but I also wanted to put it in writing. We sublease part of a building from Glacier Cold Storage – our portion of the building is located at 634 S. Mission Rd. We ship ocean containers to Hawaii & Guam so we unload a lot of truck & containers every day. Since our fence that marks the end of our truck / container maneuvering area abuts the bridge pillars, we would like to get an answer as to whether we will lose any of this area when this segment of the old bridge is demolished. We would like to know exactly how we will be affected & for how long. For instance, during the demolition of the bridge sections that abut this property, will the crane be stationed to the north or south of the bridge & how long will it take to complete the demolition of this span(s)?

If we will lose any of our truck maneuvering space, we will need to relocate our facility to another building with sufficient space in front of a dock to maneuver trucks. This would be quite a hardship for us as we would need to find a building with sufficient dock space AND with freezer space.
After the meeting last night, Mr. Viramontes approached me & offered to meet with us at our facility. I have emailed him this morning & asked him to meet with us during the week of August 3rd.

Regards,

Jim Zast
Cal Hono Freight
Phone: 323-318-9468
Hawaii Only: 800-500-0225 ext. 163
Fax: 323-981-6851 or 323-315-7144

Response to Comment Letter No. 10 – Cal Hono Freight

1. **Impacts on business operations from project construction.** Special provisions to protect properties located adjacent to the bridge will be included in the project specifications. Prior to demolition, the contractor will be required to submit the means and methods for demolition for City review and approval. During the demolition period, construction inspectors will ensure that the contractors adhere to the approved plan.

   As described in the EIR/EIS, demolition and construction of Alternative 2 would take approximately 2.5 years and Alternative 3 would require approximately 4 years. The actual construction schedule cannot be accurately predicted until the final design phase is completed.
Wallace E. Stokes III
Environmental Coordinator
City of Los Angeles
221 N. Figueroa Street, Suite 350
Los Angeles, CA 90012

July 30, 2009

Dear Mr. Stokes:

On behalf of the Cultural Heritage Commission and the Office of Historic Resources, thank you for the opportunity to formally comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (DEIR/EIS) for the 6th Street Viaduct Seismic Improvement Project. As you know, the 6th Street Viaduct has been determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places and is designated as Historic-Cultural Monument (HCM) #810 under the City’s Cultural Heritage Ordinance.

One of the Cultural Heritage Commission’s primary responsibilities in its capacity as a Mayor-appointed decision-making body is overseeing the preservation and safeguarding of the City of Los Angeles’ nearly 1000 Historic-Cultural Monuments (HCMs). Since the designation of the Sixth Street Bridge as an HCM, the Cultural Heritage Commission has expressed concern over the potential demolition of this iconic landmark as part of its seismic improvement project. Cultural Heritage Commissioners have worked closely with the Bureau of Engineering, particularly in studying options to address the bridge’s Alkali-Silica Reaction (ASR) condition.

Based on an agreement signed on January 29, 2008, the Department of City Planning and Bureau of Engineering formalized a review process that allowed the Cultural Heritage Commission to provide input at appropriate milestones in the CEQA and Section 106 processes. After careful review of the DEIR, the Cultural Heritage Commission submits the following substantive comments:

**Cultural Heritage Commission Comments**

1) The DEIR neglects to cite the 6th Street Bridge’s designation as Historic-Cultural Monument #905 in the Executive Summary. The Introduction and Background section of the DEIR omit any reference to the subject bridge’s Historic-Cultural Monument designation or its inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources and eligibility for placement in the National Register of Historic Places.
2) **The DEIR should evaluate which alternatives would allow for the 6th Street Bridge to retain Historic-Cultural Monument (HCM) status.** As part of its CEQA evaluation, the DEIR does not evaluate the alternatives to address the local designation of the subject bridge as a Historic-Cultural Monument. Demolition of the 6th Street Bridge under a replacement alternative would result in a loss of its HCM designation. A full replication/reconstruction alternative and/or sufficient retention of existing character-defining features may allow for the proposed project to retain its HCM designation.

3) **The DEIR does not provide a full replication/reconstruction alternative.** Of the bridge concepts for the replacement alternative presented in Chapter 2 of the DEIR, "Bridge Concept 1-Main Span Replication" offers only a partial replication of the existing bridge. The reconstruction component would be limited to the span of the new bridge that crosses the Los Angeles River. It must be noted that many historic character-defining design elements within this section in the "Main Span Replication" will in fact not be replicated:

   a) the bridge railing will be a new design with an 8-foot stainless steel wire projectile barrier.
   b) the two main center pylons will be a new "Deco" design not based on the original landmark 1932 pylons.
   c) original light fixtures will not be reproduced.
   d) the two iconic double-arched steel will not be entirely replicated, utilizing a different number of steel columns and not reproducing the steel latticework located between each paired archway.

The discussion of this alternative in the Bridge Type Selection-Advance Planning Study Phase describes this alternative as "taking cues from the original bridge [that] pays homage to the original landmark bridge design" and "capturing the essence of the old landmark bridge." As described, the replacement bridge’s span replication is not in fact a replication, but rather a new design taking some architectural and design cues from the historic 6th Street Bridge and reinterpreting them.

Lacking in the DEIR is a full replication/reconstruction alternative that would attempt to the greatest extent possible, using original architectural plans and archival material, to reconstruct the existing subject bridge. For this type of alternative, the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Reconstruction would apply in developing a proposed project that would comply with preservation guidelines. As a case study, the City of Pasadena successfully reconstructed the 1913 Colorado Street Bridge in the early 1990s to successfully correct structural and safety deficiencies.

4) **The DEIR relies upon artificial constraints on the proposed bridge’s width, which have significantly driven the analysis of project alternatives.** A wider bridge could result in significant impacts on communities on both sides. While it is well known that additional street capacity quickly fills up when it becomes available, in this case the wider footprint of the new bridge will immediately become constricted into narrower arterial streets on either side of the proposed project. Furthermore, Federal standards regarding bridge width appear to be artificially constraining alternatives and limiting preservation options. The Final EIR should explore successful approaches nationally to preserving historic bridges, including possible opportunities to work with Federal officials to maintain existing widths for historic bridges.

The Final EIR should also consider the extent to which the bridge’s overall footprint itself may be considered a character-defining feature of the existing Monument. Additionally, the Final EIR should evaluate the cost-savings of maintaining the scope of the project within the footprint of the current bridge, thereby eliminating the need to acquire private property as necessitated by a bridge widening.
5) The DEIR should include study of an additional partial preservation alternative. The replacement alternative in the DEIR preserves none (0%) of the existing historic bridge; the retrofit alternative retains 95% of the viaduct. Somewhere in between 0% and 95% may be a project alternative that retains the eligibility of the bridge as a Historic-Cultural Monument and/or as a contributor to the National Register-eligible district of bridges while addressing the ASR-related issues. The DEIR does acknowledge that the bridge contributes to a CRHR-eligible district, thereby finding that Alternative 2 would have a less than significant impact to the district. The partial preservation alternative selected should retain the bridge as a contributor to this ensemble of historic bridges.

6) The potential mitigation measures under Alternative 3-Replacement in Chapter 3.9 (Cultural Resources) are inadequate. [3-148-149] The mitigation measures listed for a possible replacement project are inappropriate:

a) The first mitigation measure states that "the City would install two Cultural Heritage Commission plaques" at each end of the new replacement bridge. Since the new replacement bridge would most likely have lost its Historic-Cultural Monument designation, it would be inappropriate to use the Cultural Heritage Commission's Plaque Program for an HCM that would no longer be extant.

b) There is no stated mitigation measure that involves physical retention of some character defining features of the existing historic bridge. Under the replacement alternative, a new replacement bridge could potentially incorporate architectural elements of the existing bridge. Another possibility is to relocate architectural elements to a new location in a public setting.

Mitigation measures that include an educational component should target schools located in Boyle Heights and the Downtown area.

7) The proposed location for the retention and reuse of the historic bridge’s original steel arches in the replacement alternatives may be inappropriate. All replacement alternatives in the DEIR propose recycling the iconic original steel arches and relocating them to the two entrances at the abutments. The Bridge Type Selection-Advance Planning Study Phases states:

In respect to the historical landmarking of the existing bridge, the original steel arches that will be removed from their central location will be re-used as gateway monuments at the abutments. This will honor the original landmark by keeping it on site. This monumental gateway entry, at both ends of the viaduct, marks a beginning and an end point for the traveler along this long span, also acting as an homage to this popular historical structure. [Page 30]

Although the effort to conserve the original steel arches on site is applauded, their new location is not ideal and presents some contextual design issues.

8) The DEIR is silent on the effects of the proposed alternatives on architectural elements of the subject bridge that are not structurally linked to the 6th Street Bridge. During the HCM designation of the 6th Street Bridge, the staff of the Office of Historic Resources (OHR) identified two architectural elements that are not structurally linked to the actual bridge but are nonetheless important character-defining features of the bridge that were constructed alongside the bridge itself:

a) On the southwest corner of Boyle Avenue and Whittier Boulevard in the Boyle Heights side of the 6th Street Bridge is a decorative pylon and semi-circular railing matching the
design and material of the 6th Street Bridge. A matching decorative feature appears to have once existed on the opposite side of the street. Located several hundred feet from the actual structure of the 6th Street Bridge, this architectural element appears to be an original 1932 feature and has served as a gateway feature to the subject bridge for the Boyle Heights community.

b) Directly beneath the 6th Street Bridge as it crosses Santa Fe Avenue on the western section of the bridge is a separate substructure consisting of a tunnel entrance leading to the Los Angeles River. The tunnel entrance as it descends below grade is surrounded by a decorative Art Deco-style railing, surrounding the opening on three sides. Low-height pylons with geometric and floral designs support pairs of octagonal light fixtures matching those on the subject bridge’s deck.

The DEIR does not identify these two features and therefore does not explain whether these features would be demolished or retained in the alternatives. OHR staff has identified these as historic character-defining features of the 6th Street Bridge.

9) The DEIR fails to cite the Guidelines for Historic Bridge Rehabilitation and Replacement by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO). Conducted as part of the National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) and requested by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) in 2007, the report sought to establish guidance for balanced and consistent decision making in “rehabilitation versus replacement” bridge projects. As a pertinent project dealing with these same issues, the report should be addressed as part of the DEIR.

10) Mitigation measures MM-4 and MM-15 in Section 4.9 of CEQA Evaluation appear to imply that an MOA has already been executed between SHPO, City of LA, and Caltrans. [4-31, 4-33] Proposed mitigation measures MM-4 and MM-15 state, “Implement all stipulations of the executed Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), City of Los Angeles, and Caltrans.” The public and interested parties have not had the opportunity to review the DEIR and analysis the range of alternatives. It would therefore be inappropriate to bypass this discussion and skip directly to the selection of final mitigation measures that assume adoption of the preferred alternative identified in the FOE and DEIR. The Cultural Heritage Commission has not yet reviewed this MOA language. If the MOA is not yet executed, its inclusion in the DEIR would constitute deferred mitigation, which is impermissible under CEQA.

11) SHPO’s role in concurrence with a finding of eligibility and with the HPSR is very unclear. [3-137] If the subject bridge was formally determined eligible for the National Register, then SHPO concurrence should have occurred. It is also unclear why and whether there was no response from SHPO, since the State Historic Preservation Officer has participated in meetings on this proposal.

12) Chapter 2 of the DEIR acknowledges the vote taken by the Community Advisory Committee (CAC) in selecting the “Through Arches Category” replacement bridge type, but does not clarify that this is support for a full replication alternative. [2-49] The Public Input section of the Proposed Project Alternatives mentions the CAC’s majority vote for the “Through Arches Category” replacement bridge type (1-R). The summary text does not acknowledge that this is support for the existing historic bridge design. In the illustrated section for the alternative, Figure 2-17 states “This is the existing bridge” in describing the 1R alternative. This CAC supported alternative is also titled “Alternative 1R-Replication” in Figure 2-18.

13) The DEIR’s account of the Community Advisory Committee (CAC) actions and comments do not reflect the meeting minutes and the discussion by community members. [5-3] The summary of the CAC’s activities are vague and misleading:
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a) The DEIR neglects to mention the CAC’s vote on bridge alternatives that took place on August 28, 2007 (CAC Meeting #4). As stated in Comment 9, this vote for the replication/reconstruction alternative received the overwhelming majority of votes.

b) CAC Meeting #7 states “most CAC members present at the meeting were in support of the replacement alternative with the modern bridge type.” The meeting minutes do not indicate this assertion.

c) The description of discussions that took place on February 12, 2009 (CAC Meeting #8) is misleading, stating “a few CAC members were vocal about the bridge type (cable-supported concept) recommended by PDT.” This exchange was in fact opposition to the cable-supported alternative and concern that their vote in support for the replication/reconstruction alternative was disregarded.

14) The DEIR’s Cooperating and Participating Agency Mailing List has incorrect contact information for the Office of Historic Resource, Department of City Planning. [Appendix J] The DEIR mailing lists Mr. Jay M. Oren, Historic Preservation Officer, with the Cultural Affairs Department. Mr. Oren has been retired from this position since 2006. The list also provides a mailing address at the Cultural Affairs Department for the Cultural Heritage Commission. The CHC has been under the auspices of the Department of City Planning since 2004. The mailing addresses should be corrected to ensure proper notification procedures.

As one of the most iconic and recognized bridges in Los Angeles, the 6th Street Bridge demands utmost care and dedication in developing a seismic improvement project that will ensure its continued legacy as a beloved landmark. The Cultural Heritage Commission trusts that these comments will be pertinent in addressing the concerns and issues regarding the potential loss of the 6th Street Bridge and in developing EIR alternatives that should allow for the maximum retention of the existing bridge and/or a Standards-compliant reconstruction option.

To ensure the Cultural Heritage Commission’s continued input on this project, I formally request a future presentation at a scheduled public hearing upon the release of the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR). Your continued dialogue with the Office of Historic Resources and our Commission is greatly appreciated.

Thank you for this opportunity.

Sincerely,

RICHARD BARRON, President
Cultural Heritage Commission
Response to Comment Letter No. 11 – Cultural Heritage Commission

0. **Correction is made to CHC letter first paragraph, last sentence:** The 6th Street Viaduct is designated as Historic-Cultural Monument (HCM) #905.

1. **The Draft EIR neglects to cite the 6th Street Bridge’s designation as Historic-Cultural Monument #905 in the Executive Summary.** The Draft EIR/EIS (June 2009) included statements that the viaduct was designated as a City of Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monument in January 2008 (see Section 3.9.2.5, Historic Architectural Resource Findings and Section 3.2., Section 4(f) Evaluation [Appendix B]). A statement is added to the introduction of the summary of the Final EIR/EIS indicating that the viaduct is eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR), and that it is designated as Historic-Cultural Monument (HCM) #905.

2. **The DEIR should evaluate which alternatives would allow for the 6th Street Bridge to retain HCM status.** Several retrofit schemes were studied and evaluated in the DEIR/EIS; most of them could allow for retention of City of Los Angeles HCM status, depending on a determination by the Cultural Heritage Commission (CHC) and the city council. Most of them would maintain the integrity of the historic property (the 6th Street Viaduct) to convey its significance (based on maintaining its current location [alignment], use of the same materials [concrete], workmanship of concrete finishes) and minimize effects on the feeling and association below the deck level of the viaduct (use of infill walls between selected columns). Several historic bridges, including the 6th Street Viaduct, were seismically retrofitted in the past and were subsequently designated as City of Los Angeles HCM bridges. Section 4.4.1 (Cultural Resources) of the FEIR/EIS documented that the HCM status of the 6th Street Viaduct would likely be maintained under the retrofit alternative.

One of those schemes evaluated in the EIR/EIS included the full reconstruction/replication of the viaduct by replacing the ASR-damaged concrete within the existing viaduct while maintaining structural steel arch-spans, alignment, and width (see Section 2.4.1.8, page 2-39 of the Draft EIR/EIS). It was determined that there was no practical way to replace the bad concrete with new material without replacing all of the concrete. Implementation of this scheme would essentially require replacement of the entire viaduct. This alternative was withdrawn from further evaluation in the EIR/EIS because it does not meet the purpose of the project, nor would it remove the viaduct from the EBL list due to functionally deficient geometrics that would remain (see FEIR/EIS Section 2.5).

Another retrofit alternative, the Infill Walls/Heavy Steel Casing scheme, evaluated in the Draft EIR/EIS would retrofit the viaduct’s columns by encasing them with steel, and reinforced concrete infill walls would be constructed between selected columns. A 6-inch layer of architectural mortar would conceal exposed plates, channels and bars to maintain the visual look of concrete and texture. Exterior columns would be encased using steel plates, high strength pre-stressing bars and surface architectural mortar to hide the steel plates and maintain the concrete finish. Encasing all exterior columns with concrete mortar would also maintain visual balance and consistency for the retrofitted structure. In
addition, new foundations, grade beams, retrofitting of bent caps, and closure of some expansion joints in the superstructure would be constructed in combination with the column retrofits. The structure would be retrofitted to the minimal standard of “no collapse” for the design seismic event (maximum credible earthquake). This alternative would have a lower initial construction cost and may be desirable from a historic preservation point of view. However, retrofit is not preferred because it does not repair the existing condition or stop the ASR deterioration; it has high life-cycle cost; it does not correct the geometric design deficiencies of the existing viaduct; it would require reduction of the railroad horizontal clearances; and it would only meet a “no collapse” standard and significant damage could occur in a major earthquake, resulting in the need for viaduct replacement (see FEIR/EIS Section 2.5).

In addition to the retrofit alternative described above, a Substructure Replacement Alternative was developed to resolve the ASR deterioration within the substructure and to strengthen the lateral support system (seismic). If implemented, this retrofit scheme could allow for retention of City of Los Angeles HCM status, depending on a determination by the CHC. This alternative would replace all substructure (below deck) elements, including piles, footings, grade beams, columns and bent caps, to accommodate the anticipated seismic demands. The design would include substructure replacement for the length of the entire structure. In addition, this retrofit scheme would replace the existing substandard concrete barrier; the new barrier would be similar to the aesthetics of the existing barrier. By replacing the substructure elements rather than using traditional strengthening retrofit solutions, as in the Infill Wall/Heavy Steel Casing Alternative, the viaduct’s aesthetics and historic nature could be retained by utilizing architectural features that are compatible with the existing members. This alternative was withdrawn from full environmental evaluation due to major constructability problems, much higher cost (see FEIR/EIS Section 2.5), and significant superstructure damage could occur in a major earthquake, resulting in the need for viaduct replacement.

In addition to the retrofit schemes mentioned above, Bridge Concept 1A – Replication from Abutment to Abutment with a wider structure was evaluated during the preparation of the FEIR/EIS, in response to Community Advisory Committee (CAC) requests. (Replication was used here to mean that the structure would have a similar architectural look, but would meet current design standards, such as width, alignment, safety barriers and structural detailing.) Bridge Concept 1A would be identical to Concept 1 (Main Span Replication) between the riverbanks. The design would be similar to the original design with complimentary dual arches and main center pylon with belvederes providing pedestrian viewing areas as in the original 1932 design. Unlike Concept 1, which employs long span box girders with fewer columns east and west of the river similar to the other replacement concepts, refinement Concept 1A would repeat the short span haunched girders with numerous support columns of the original structure from the riverbanks to the ends of the viaduct. While this alternative would maintain the integrity of the property to convey its significance, based on use of the same materials (concrete and structural steel arch spans), workmanship of concrete finishes, architectural style, and feeling associated above and below the deck level, the viaduct alignment and width would be designed to current standards. This alternative may allow for retention of City of Los Angeles HCM status, depending on a determination by the CHC regarding the alignment shift and wider deck. Due to construction constraints and relatively high cost associated with the
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construction of this bridge concept, it was not advanced for detailed impact analysis in the Final EIR/EIS.

3. The DEIR does not provide a full replication/reconstruction alternative.

3.1 As discussed in Response No. 2 above, several retrofit schemes were studied and evaluated in the Draft EIR/EIS, one of those schemes included the preserving the general appearance of the viaduct by replacing the ASR-damaged concrete within the existing viaduct while maintaining structural steel arch-spans, alignment, and width (see Section 2.4.1.8, page 2-39 of the Draft EIR/EIS). In addition, Bridge Concept 1A – Replication from Abutment to Abutment was developed, as discussed in Response No. 2 above. Bridge Concept 1A would be similar to the original architecture with complimentary dual arches and main center pylon with belvederes providing pedestrian viewing areas as in the original 1932 design. Concept 1A would replicate the short span haunched girders with numerous support columns of the original structure from the riverbanks to the ends of the viaduct, columns having the architectural style of the existing viaduct. Concept 1A would maintain the integrity of the property to convey its significance from abutment to abutment (based on use of the same materials (concrete and structural steel arch spans), workmanship of concrete finishes, architectural style) and minimize affects on the feeling and association below the deck level, the viaduct alignment and width would be designed to current safety standards. However, the deck width and resulting association between the arch ribs and overhead latticework bracing (feeling/association), and alignment (location) would be designed to current standards; thereby not fully replicating the existing viaduct historic character-defining elements.

3.2 The materials, seismic, and functional deficiencies of the 6th Street Viaduct are different from the Colorado Street Bridge, each with unique issues and solutions. The paragraphs that follow describe why 6th Street Viaduct cannot be reconstructed the same way as the Colorado Street Bridge.

Figure 1 compares 6th Street Replacement to the Colorado Street Bridge Rehabilitation Project in Pasadena. Retrofit alternatives Infill Walls/Heavy Steel Casing and Substructure Replacement are rehabilitation strategies similar to that used at the Colorado Street Bridge. While there are similar issues, there are major differences.

1) The structural strength at Colorado Street Bridge could be restored whereas the concrete at 6th Street Viaduct has the ongoing chemical reaction ASR, and is not repairable. At Colorado Street Bridge, the concrete had high levels of carbonation that caused reinforcing steel corrosion and sequential concrete cracking. However, the damage could be repaired by removing concrete around the reinforcing steel with high level of carbonation and replacing the steel with epoxy coated steel. In the case of 6th Street Viaduct, the steel is not attacked, rather the concrete itself deteriorates.

2) The geometric and alignment deficiencies cannot be remedied at 6th Street Viaduct due to the roadway width (no shoulders or median), alignment (kink), and existing arches (sight distance). The Colorado Street Bridge does not have these deficiencies.

3) The design life that would result by rehabilitation of 6th Street Viaduct using substructure replacement is less than 30 years, due to continuation of ASR
deterioration, resulting in very high life cycle cost. The 1993 construction cost of the Colorado Street Bridge rehabilitation was $27M, providing a new design life of 75 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 1 – Comparison Between 6th Street Viaduct and the Colorado Street Bridge (Substructure Replacement Retrofit Alternative)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concrete Condition</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Repairable (ASR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sight Distance Deficiencies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design Life (after rehabilitation)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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4. **The DEIR relies upon artificial constraints on the proposed bridge’s width, which have significantly driven the analysis of project alternatives.**

4.1 The City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) recommends the standard width for the 6th Street Viaduct based on the following reasons:

1. 6th Street is classified as a secondary highway in the City’s General Plan. The City standards for highways and streets that are approved by the City Engineer and the City Council and used as a basis for all developer land dedications call for 70 feet curb-to-curb width for a 4-lane highway and 10-foot sidewalks.

2. Currently the roads at either end of the viaduct are not built per secondary highway standards, but this does not justify building a new facility to a substandard cross section. Eventually when developers propose projects at both ends of the viaduct, the City will require land dedication to build the roadway per City standards. The ultimate goal is to have the entire 6th Street width comply with the City’s General Plan.

3. The recommendation to construct the viaduct per City’s standards was not based on "artificial" constraints. It was based on a number of factors, including accidents data, lack of separation between opposing traffic lanes, lack of shoulders, current deficient geometry including horizontal and vertical alignments; the lack of shoulders does not allow room to add bike lanes to be consistent with the 2010 Bicycle Plan.
4. The viaduct needs to be wider at both east and west terminal points to conform to existing conditions. At the east end of the project, the City shares this facility with the State (Caltrans). The 6th Street Viaduct extends over the US 101 freeway and joins the State overcrossing structures across the I-5 freeway. Currently the State’s structure is over 70-foot wide. A portion of the 6th Street viaduct is located within State right-of-way and provides access to US 101. In order to meet the State’s standards the width needs to be a minimum of 70 feet. At the west end of the project, 6th Street transitions from a 4-lane roadway to a 5-lane to allow for the westbound 10-foot left turn lane onto Mateo Street. A uniform curb-to-curb width is recommended to enhance safety, geometry and meet driver expectations.

4.2 The 6th Street Viaduct is designated as a secondary highway. The existing viaduct’s roadway configuration does not meet the City’s design standards for a secondary highway because there is no safety median, no outside shoulders to accommodate vehicle breakdowns, as well as bicycles, and inadequate sidewalk width. The roadway width and alignment configurations under the Replacement Alternative are designed to current safety standards to meet the requirements of local/state/federal codes and funding sources.

The guidelines for Historic Bridge Rehabilitation and Replacement by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) note that substandard roadway geometry may be acceptable for those structures (bridges/viaducts) with average day traffic (ADT) less than about 400. The ADT for the 6th Street Viaduct is approximately 13,000; therefore, under the Replacement Alternative, the viaduct roadway is designed to provide for 4 lanes of traffic, the same as the existing facility, but is wider to meet current standards.

4.3 Based on the reasons explained under 4.1 and 4.2, the FEIR/EIS did not evaluate the alternative to replace the viaduct without upgrading it to meet the current standards.

The Historic Resources Evaluation Report (HRER) prepared for this project as part of the Section 106 consultation did not identify the 6th Street Viaduct footprint as a character defining feature. For the reasons discussed under 4.1 and 4.2, the scope of the project cannot be accomplished with in the footprint of the current bridge because 70 feet curb-to-curb is needed to meet City standards and the bridge only has 46 feet curb-to-curb.

5. The DEIR should include study of an additional partial preservation alternative.

5.1 The DEIR did study several partial preservation alternatives including a number of retrofit schemes such as Substructure Replacement. A total of 10 retrofit schemes, which included structure retrofit, replacement of damaged concrete, reconstruction with replication and partial reservation, were evaluated as part of the Alternative Development Process, as documented in Appendix N of the FEIR/EIS. Based on the results of the evaluation, only the Infill Wall and Heavy Steel Casing scheme was found to be a reasonable alternative to be analyzed in the environmental document. The rest of the retrofit schemes were dismissed for not meeting the purpose and need of the project, having major constructability problems, or having unreasonably high cost. For all practicable retrofit alternatives considered, the completed project would provide a limited additional design
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life of approximately 30 years (due to continuing ASR damage), and a design seismic event (maximum credible earthquake) within the design life period would likely damage the structure so heavily that replacement would be required.

5.2 The DEIR/EIS erroneously stated that the 6th Street Viaduct contributed to a NRHP- and CRHR-eligible district. The 6th Street Viaduct was found to be individually eligible for listing in the NRHP and CRHR. It was also determined eligible as one of a thematic group (erroneously called a district in the DEIR/EIS) of 118 “Historic Highway Arch and other bridges in California” as part of the Caltrans Statewide Bridge inventory in 1987. The information was corrected accordingly in the FEIR/EIS.

6. The potential mitigation measures under Alternative 3-Replacement in Chapter 3.9 (Cultural Resources) are inadequate.

6.1 The proposed mitigation measure to install two Cultural Heritage Commission plaques at each end of the replacement bridge has been eliminated in the Final EIR/EIS and Section 4(f) Evaluation in response to this CHC comment, and it was not incorporated as a preservation stipulation in the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) nor is it included in the CEQA mitigation measures.

6.2 The City will consider potential architectural enhancements in the replacement viaduct that will be similar to the existing bridge, and under the MOA and CEQA mitigation measures the design drawings will be submitted to the SHPO for review and comment.

Under MOA Stipulation G, the City is also receptive to relocating architectural elements of the existing bridge, such as the iconic steel arches, to a new location in a public setting. This will be stipulated in the Record of Decision (ROD) approved by Caltrans as a designee of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and in the CEQA mitigation measures approved by the City Council with the Final EIR.

6.3 Several stipulations under the MOA are education-related. The City of Los Angeles will include schools in Boyle heights and Downtown Los Angeles on the list of recipients for educational materials produced as part of the relevant mitigation measures under this project.

7. The proposed location for the retention and reuse of the historic bridge’s original steel arches in the replacement alternatives may be inappropriate. The existing steel arches cannot be reused as structural load-carrying members for any of the replacement concepts under Alternative 3. The appropriateness of potential re-use or design expressions will be evaluated during the final design phases with input from key stakeholder groups.

One of the stipulations in the MOA states that “the City shall offer artifacts removed from the Viaduct during demolition to local museums, or other suitable facilities to be determined by the City. The accepting institutions shall arrange their own transportation to deliver the artifacts to designated locations.” The City will work with any interested local museums or other entities with suitable facilities to identify an appropriate reuse/preservation strategy and location for the steel arches, if that is requested, in consultation with local preservationists.
8. The DEIR is silent on the effects of the proposed alternatives on architectural elements of the subject bridge that are not structurally linked to the 6th Street Bridge.

8.1 The decorative pylon on the southwest corner of Boyle Avenue and Whittier Boulevard will not be demolished or removed. It is located outside of the project limits.

8.2 The EIR/EIS identifies the tunnel features as part of the historic 6th Street Viaduct property. As Section 3.9.2.5 states, “The boundaries of the historic property include the entire bridge: its abutments, bents and piers, all approaches, the deck, all handrails, streetlight standards and luminaires, the river access tunnel, the steel and concrete arches, the spandrels, and the areas below the decks that contain bridge-related structures.” The FEIR/EIS describes the components of the river access tunnel (Section 3.6.1.2) and the potential impacts to it under Retrofit Alternative and Replacement Alternative (Section 3.6.2.1). Under the Replacement Alternative, the river access ramp, tunnel, and portals could require reconstruction to accommodate the construction of new columns and foundation. The tunnel may be impacted under any of the replacement alternatives depending on how the new west main span abutment/bent is configured. If the selected bridge type requires the tunnel and access ramp to be reconstructed, it could be designed to match the architectural style and theme of the new viaduct, including both the entry access point and the portal at the river bank. The components of the tunnel that would be subject to demolition, if required, would be treated under the same mitigation measures stipulated in the MOA.

9. The DEIR neglects to cite the Guidelines for Historic Bridge Rehabilitation and Replacement by AASHTO. The PDT did consider and apply the principles of the AASHTO guidelines, as documented in Section 2.3.2 of the FEIR/EIS for clarity. The guidelines provide a methodology to determine the potential for rehabilitation or replacement of a historic bridge, as outlined in Figure 2.

The 6th Street Viaduct falls into Group VI (Superstructure/ Substructure Condition, Geometry, and Load-Carrying Capacity Are Inadequate, see Figure 3) — “Bridges in this group are severely deteriorated and severely deficient. When a bridge is deficient in all categories and those deficiencies cannot be corrected in a feasible and prudent manner, it is very unlikely to have rehabilitation potential.”

Based upon the AASHTO guidelines, it is very unlikely that the 6th Street Viaduct has rehabilitation potential. The primary reasons are:

1. The load carrying capacity of the structure for seismic loading is doubtful considering existing concrete is damaged and continues to be attacked by ASR. Seismic retrofit schemes for concrete structures use drill and bonding techniques into existing concrete to add structural elements to resist seismic demands. However, the existing concrete at 6th Street Viaduct is not dependable.

2. The live and dead load carrying capacity of the structural system will continue to decrease as the concrete ASR continues with time.
3. The horizontal, vertical alignments along with the arch ribs create a safety issue related to sight distance near the ‘kink’ in the alignment. On such long viaducts, speed control devices and patrolling are not likely to prevent future accidents.
4. Barrier rails are under strength for vehicle impact loads and the shape will not deflect vehicles in a controlled fashion.

5. Roadway width is substandard with no median or shoulders.

6. The concrete within the substructure and superstructure is in very poor condition.

7. Major maintenance work will be required in the future as the ASR will continue.

8. The retrofit cost is more than 50 percent of the replacement cost.

9. The life cycle cost of the retrofit is approximately double the replacement life cycle cost.

10. The seismic criterion for the retrofit is “no collapse.” It is likely that after a design seismic event, the retrofitted structure could be so severely damaged, that it would need replacement at that time.

10. Mitigation measures MM-4 to MM-15 in Section 4.9 of CEQA Evaluation (MM3-11 to MM3-18 in FEIR/EIS) appear to imply that an MOA has already been executed between SHPO, City of LA, and Caltrans. The MOA had not been executed by SHPO, the City of Los Angeles, and Caltrans at the time of circulation of the Draft EIR/EIS. As stated in the Draft EIR/EIS mitigation measures pertaining to Cultural Resources (Section 3.9), Caltrans “would consult” with the SHPO regarding a MOA for this proposed project. The Draft EIR/EIS went on to say “the MOA would address the preferred alternative, which has not been determined at this time” (see Section 3.9.4). The “potential mitigation measures” presented in the Draft EIR/EIS (in Chapters 3 and 4, and in the Draft Section 4(f) Evaluation) were offered as “anticipated” measures to be incorporated in an MOA addressing the preferred alternative, which had not been determined at that time. As stated in the Draft Section 4(f) Evaluation (Draft EIR/EIS, Appendix B, Section 4.9.1), “A Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) will be prepared by Caltrans and submitted to FHWA and the SHPO for comment. … Once FHWA and SHPO agree on the terms and conditions of the MOA, it will be executed and Caltrans will concur. The conclusions of this analysis will be presented in the Final Section 4(f) Evaluation that will be circulated with the Final EIR/EIS.”

The MOA was subsequently approved by all parties in May 2010, and its stipulations are included in the Final EIR/EIS and will be incorporated in the ROD as well as in the CEQA mitigation measures. It should be noted that even if the MOA has been signed, it does not preclude the City of Los Angeles (as the CEQA lead agency) from adopting additional measures to mitigate impacts. The MOA is an agreement document between Caltrans (on behalf of FHWA), the ACHP and SHPO for Section 106 compliance and therefore may be resolved prior to completion of the CEQA process. Section 106 is a federal law and is not tied to the CEQA process. 36 CFR 800.2 allows for integrating Section 106 review into other processes (such as NEPA); although Section 106 documentation may be used to support CEQA studies, it does not replace CEQA. Therefore findings may be different for the two separate laws as well as mitigation measures to resolve adverse effects or mitigate significant impacts. Mitigation MM-17 which is one of the stipulations in the MOA (“Offer artifacts removed from the viaduct during demolition to local museums, or other suitable facilities to be determined by the City. The accepting institutions shall arrange their own transportation to deliver the artifacts to designated locations”) provides an
opportunity for the City to work with CHC staff and any other interested parties to
determine the appropriate way to reuse any requested artifact(s) from the viaduct.

11. **SHPO's role in concurrence with a finding of eligibility and with the HPSR is very unclear.** Per stipulation VIII.C.5.a of the January 1, 2004 *Programmatic Agreement among the Federal Highway Administration, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, the California State Historic Preservation Officer, and the California Department of Transportation Regarding compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act*, Caltrans must submit the Historic Property Survey Report (HPSR) to the SHPO for concurrence with the eligibility findings. The SHPO has 30 days to respond to the findings of the HPSR. When the 30-day period elapsed after submittal of the 6th Street Viaduct HPSR to SHPO, Caltrans assumed concurrence and proceeded with the project.

12. **Chapter 2 of the DEIR acknowledges the vote taken by the Community Advisory Committee (CAC) in selecting the “Through Arches Category” replacement bridge type, but does not clarify that this is support for a full replication alternative.** The text in the Final EIR/EIS has been clarified to say that the highest number of CAC votes was for the existing bridge type (Through Arches Category), a bridge type with a design that is similar to the existing viaduct from abutment to abutment (see Final EIR/EIS, Appendix N, Section 3.2.3, Public Input).

13. **The DEIR’s account of the Community Advisory Committee (CAC) actions and comments do not reflect the meeting minutes and the discussion by community members.**

13.1 Section 2.4.2.2, Public Input Subsection of the DEIR, referred to the number of votes received for each bridge type. This information is clarified relative to the CAC vote on the abutment to abutment replication in the FEIR/EIS, as described in response to comment 12.

13.2 The text was revised in the FEIR/EIS to reflect the minutes.

14. **The DEIR’s Cooperating and Participating Agency Mailing List has incorrect contact information for the Office of Historic Resource, Department of City Planning.**

The information was corrected in the FEIR/EIS.
July 28, 2009

Ronald J. Kosinski, Deputy District Director  
Division of Environmental Planning  
Department of Transportation, District 7  
100 S. Main Street MS-16A  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

SUBJECT: 6th STREET VIADUCT SEISMIC IMPROVEMENT PROJECT – STREET LIGHTING COMMENTS TO DRAFT EIR/EIS OF JUNE 2009

The City of Los Angeles, Bureau of Street Lighting (BSL) has had contact with the author of this Draft EIR/EIS regarding the street lighting design concept for the subject project. However, BSL does have the following comments to the Draft EIR/EIS.

1. You did not address nighttime glare and light pollution from both permanent and temporary lighting systems. Except for fixtures that are fabricated to replicate the historical bridge lighting in the 1930s, all new and temporary lighting fixtures should be cutoff and directed away from private property.

2. On Page 16, 1st Paragraph, Last Sentence, it states, “As part of the barrier replacement, the existing luminaires would be replaced with light standards replicating 1930s design.” BSL would like to make that sentence clearer by saying, “As part of the barrier replacement, all existing cobra-head luminaires and arms would be replaced with new fabricated ornamental lanterns and standards replicating the original 1930s design.” In addition, BSL would like to insert this new sentence: “BSL is not required to meet current City adopted lighting standards because the Sixth Street Viaduct is protected by the State Historical Building Codes. BSL will, however, provide the best feasible illumination levels and uniformity ratios for both roadway and sidewalks.”

3. On Page 25, Design Standards Section (for a total bridge replacement alternative), 1st Sentence states, “…designed to meet the City’s street design standards.” BSL would like to modify it: “…designed to meet the City’s current street and street lighting design standards.”

If you have any questions or require any additional information, please contact Silva Batikian at (213) 847-1524 and silva.batikian@latcity.org.

Sincerely,

Ed Ebrahimian  
Director
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AN EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY – AFFIRMATIVE ACTION EMPLOYER
1. **Nighttime glare and light impacts.** Alternative 3, replacement, could likely include accent lighting. The architecture of the electroliers and fixtures will be determined during the final design phase. Final design of accent lighting will need to address nighttime glare and light effects. Discussion of potential nighttime glare impacts from accent lighting has been added in the Final EIR/EIS (see Sections 3.8.3.1 and 3.8.3.2).

2. **Add language to clarify the lighting requirement.** The paragraph under Section 2.5, Substructure Replacement, of the FEIR/EIS was revised with the wording requested by BSL.

3. **Add language to clarify standard requirement.** This wording change was made in Section 2.3.3.4 of the FEIR/EIS, under Design Standards.
Thank you Mr. McCutcheon. Your comment has been received and will be given consideration in the preparation of the final version of the EIR/EIS.

wally

From: <glaciervp@aol.com> [mailto:glaciervp@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 29, 2009 6:08 PM
To: <wally.stokes@lacity.org>
Subject: 6th Street Viaduct

Mr. Stokes,

My name is Richard McCutcheon and I am the general manager of Glacier Cold Storage located at 2233 Jesse Street. The property line at the back of the property I operate borders the bridge property. We also currently utilize the property directly under the bridge as a subtenant of a lease from the city.

My concerns after attending the meeting on Tuesday, July 21, are that our property will be infringed upon during the demolition phase or during the renovation phase (should that option be chosen). This will hamper the operation of my tenant and force him to move to a different facility. This would cause my business great financial harm.

I was told there are technologies available that would allow demolition without such an infringement. I am asking for such technologies to be seriously considered when this project moves forward.

I have made provisions already for a contingency plan to divert our "under the bridge" requirements to another piece of property we have.

I hope this comment goes on record and that it is taken into consideration.

Sincerely,
Richard McCutcheon
Glacier Cold Storage
2233 Jesse Street
Los Angeles, CA 90023
(323) 526-3623
Cell (818) 825-9914
Sent via BlackBerry by AT&T
Response to Comment Letter No. 13 – Glacier Cold Storage

1. **Impacts on business operations from project construction.** Special provisions to protect properties located adjacent to the bridge will be included in the project specifications. Prior to demolition, the contractor will be required to submit the means and methods for demolition for City review and approval. During the demolition period, construction inspectors will ensure that the contractors adhere to the approved plan.

2. **Concern about impacts from demolition.** Special provisions to protect properties located adjacent to the bridge will be included in the project specifications. Prior to demolition, the contractor will be required to submit the means and methods for demolition for City review and approval. During the demolition period, construction inspectors will require the contractors to adhere to the approved plan.

3. **Owner has arranged its own contingency plan to minimize impacts from the project.** Comment noted.
August 6, 2009

Mr. Ronald J. Kosinski, Deputy District Director
Division of Environmental Planning
Department of Transportation, District 7
100 South Main Street MS-16A
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Mr. Kosinski:

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING AND AVAILABILITY OF
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
6TH STREET VIADUCT SEISMIC IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

We reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Report for subject projects. The proposed 3,500-foot-long 6th Street improvement project is needed to safeguard the critical Los Angeles River crossing from failure in a major earthquake by either retrofitting the existing structure or replacing it entirely.

The following comments are for your consideration and relate to the environmental document only:

Hazards—Flood/Water Quality

1. The proposed project may impact some of the proposed improvements outlined in the Los Angeles River Master Plan (LARMP). The LARMP is available at http://dpw.lacounty.gov/wmd/watershed/LA/LARMP for reference. Impacts to the proposed improvements in this area should be minimized.

2. The pollutants of concern listed on page 3-162 are for the Los Angeles River, Reach 1. The proposed project is located in the Los Angeles River, Reach 3. Therefore, this document should list pollutants of concern and appropriate mitigation for the Los Angeles River, Reach 3.
Mr. Ronald Kosinski
August 6, 2009
Page 2

If you have any questions regarding flood/water quality comments above, please contact Mr. Diego Rivera at (626) 458-3978.

If you have any other questions or require additional information, please contact Mr. Toan Duong at (626) 458-4945.

Very truly yours,

GAIL FARBER
Director of Public Works

DENNIS HUNTER, PL S PE
Assistant Deputy Director
Land Development Division

MA:ca
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1. **Impact to Los Angeles River Master Plan (LARMP).** The EIR/EIS analyzed potential impacts to the Los Angeles River (See Sections 3.10 and 3.11). With the exception of Bridge Concept 1, implementation of any alternative alignment and bridge concept would not affect river hydraulics and designated beneficial uses of any range of the Los Angeles River. Since bridge Concept 1 is not the preferred alternative, no impact to the LARMP is anticipated. In addition, the various bridge replacement concepts have been developed keeping in mind compatibility with the Los Angeles River Revitalization Master Plan (LARRMP) which was developed to be consistent with the LARMP. Issues, such as river access, structural impediments, and aesthetics, were part of the screening criteria of the proposed options.

2. **Incorrect information about pollutants of concern.** The text in Section 3.11.2 of the FEIR/EIS regarding the pollutants of concern has been revised.
August 13, 2009

Wally Stokes
City of Los Angeles-Dept. of Public Works
221 N. Figueroa, Suite 350
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Mr. Stokes:

Re: SCH# 2007041015: 6th Street Viaduct Seismic Improvement Project

The California Public Utilities Commission's (Commission) Rail Crossings Engineering Section (RCES) is in receipt of the Notice of Completion & Environmental Document Transmittal-Draft EIR from the State Clearinghouse for the City's proposed 6th Street improvement project that includes possibly retrofitting the existing structure or replacing the existing grade separation over the BNSF, Union Pacific Railroad Company, Metrolink and Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority tracks.

The California Public Utilities Code requires Commission approval for the construction or alteration of crossings and grants the Commission exclusive power on the design, alteration, and closure of crossings. A request for authorization must be submitted to RCES. The design criteria of the proposed project must comply with Commission General Orders (GOs), such as, GO 26-D: “Clearances on railroads and street railroads as to side and overhead structures, parallel tracks and crossings.”

City should arrange a meeting with RCES staff to discuss relevant safety issues and requirements of for authority to modify the existing 6th Street overpass (CPUC crossing number 101 RI-483.65-A, U.S. DOT number 811256T).

Thank you for your consideration of these comments and we look forward to working with the City on this project. If you have any questions in this matter, please contact Sergio Licon, Utilities Engineer at 213-576-7085, sal@cpuc.ca.gov, or me at rmx@cpuc.ca.gov, 213-576-7078.

Sincerely,

Roza Munoz, PE
Utilities Engineer
Rail Crossings Engineering Section
Consumer Protection & Safety Division
Response to Comment Letter No. 15 – State of California Public Utilities Commission

1. **Project construction requires Commission approval.** A request for authorization will be submitted to the Rail Crossing Engineering Section (RCES) during the final design phase. The design criteria of the project will be in compliance with the General Orders (GOs), including GO 26-D. The required approval from the California Public Utilities Commission has been added to Section 3.6.2 of the FEIR/EIS.

2. **A meeting with RCES is suggested.** A mitigation measure requiring the City to meet with RCES staff during the final design phase to discuss safety issues and rail crossing replacement permit requirements was added to Section 3.6.3 of the FEIR/EIS.
Central City East Association

August 14, 2009

Department of Transportation – District 7
State of California
100 S. Main Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012-3606

RE: 6th Street Viaduct Seismic Improvement Project
Draft EIR/EIS

For the last 23 years, the Central City East Association has served as the principal voice and advocate of eastern Downtown Los Angeles. We are a 501(c)(6) not-for-profit organization that administers the Arts District, Toy District and Downtown Industrial Business Improvement Districts (BIDs). Through these three BIDs, we represent 1,100 property owners, 1,600 businesses, and 15,000 employees. Our BID districts span 110 blocks of Downtown L.A.

The Arts District BID spans the area roughly bounded by the 101 freeway, Alameda, 7th Place and the Los Angeles River. The Arts District community is evolving from a traditional manufacturing base with a vibrant artistic community to an increasingly 24-hour live/work neighborhood with new and varied amenities that include fine dining and after-hours establishments. The heavy industrial and more modern uses are thriving successfully side-by-side, placing increasing demands on mobility within and into the district.

Our members have been closely following the 6th Street Viaduct Seismic Improvement Project. We have attended meetings, hosted briefings, and communicated regularly with representatives of both City and State agencies. We understand the importance and significance of this project, but we must take this moment to underscore the potential for serious impacts to the economic vibrancy of the Arts District.

During the period the Viaduct will be under construction, our members will not only be inconvenienced due to the required detours. Their businesses will suffer economic hardships. The Arts District is home to large national distribution warehouses and food processing centers. Both rely on the local streets for goods.
movement and connections to freeways and highways en route to the ports, the airports, and for ground routes. Some businesses here today will survive the Viaduct project; others may not. These business stakeholders require considerable lead time to prepare for a change in how they do business. Some of these businesses cannot relocate; for others, relocation would require months of pre-planning, if not longer, due to the logistical requirements of their distribution commitments.

These types of businesses are not sure what to anticipate. They understand that the final design decisions have yet to be made. Nevertheless, they are facing an uncertainty that could cost them their future. Therefore, we urge you to give the highest priority to a business information campaign and the hiring of a business impact specialist whose only responsibility would be to resolve the challenges this project will impose on businesses in the project zone.

Potential impacts to business will go beyond those posed by street closures and detours, of course. Dirt and debris, the environmental hazards in the materials, soil, groundwater and air, will all contribute to an unhealthy working and living environment for Arts District stakeholders. Fortunately, Arts District business and live-work stakeholders are a highly connected population, presenting you with an opportunity to use a message distribution network that communicates with stakeholders directly using the latest technology. It will be incumbent on you to maintain on-going dialogue with our stakeholders informing them of the environmental impacts on a day-to-day basis.

Finally, considering the replacement of the historic 6th Street bridge and the loss of the historical elements on the west side of the river (the tunnel entrance leading to the Los Angeles River has a concrete decorative Art Deco railing that corresponds with the historical classic styling of the bridge), we are anticipating that this project will include elements that will contribute to the cultural, health and wellness of the community that will host the detrimental impacts of the project for years. For example, Arts District property owners, residents and business have long desired green space. The Viaduct project provides an opportunity within the newly created underside for this green space with elements such as a park/pocket park, dog park, dog run etc. that can be utilized by residents and employees of the local businesses.

Thank you for this opportunity to submit our comments and respectfully request that you take them into consideration in your on-going decisions regarding this project.

Sincerely,

ESTELA LOPEZ
Executive Director

cc: Hon. Gil Cedillo, State Senator
    Hon. John Perez, Assemblyman
    Hon. Jose Huizar, City Councilman
Appendix M  Written Comments and Responses on DEIR/EIS

Response to Comment Letter No. 16 – Central City East Association

1. **Viaduct construction could lead to the permanent closure of some area businesses.** Considerable lead time is required to prepare and implement coping measures, including relocation. The City will work with the businesses within the project area to help mitigate the impacts. The relocation assistance program would be part of this process.

2. **Arts District business and live-work stakeholders are a highly connected population, presenting an opportunity to use message distribution networks that communicate with stakeholders directly.** As described in several sections of the EIR/EIS, a Traffic Management Plan (TMP) would be developed to assist local businesses in continuing operation during the construction period. The TMP would identify and provide alternate traffic detour routes, pedestrian routes, and commercial access routes to be used during the construction period. In addition, the City-mandated Work Area Traffic Control Plan (WATCP) would be strictly implemented by the contractor during project construction. The Arts District message distribution network will facilitate interaction and communication with the affected business community during development of the TMP.

3. **The Viaduct project provides an opportunity within the newly created underside for this green space with elements such as a park/pocket park, dog park, dog run, etc. that can be utilized by residents and employees of the local businesses.** While open space in the form of right-of-way (ROW) parcels underneath and adjacent to the viaduct footprint would occur as a result of property acquisition for the preferred alternative, no use of this property has been determined at this time. Interested parties have expressed varying ideas for the disposition of this land, which will be the subject of future planning and community input.
August 14, 2009

TO:
Mr. Wally Stokes
Environmental Coordinator
City of Los Angeles Bureau of Engineering
Wally.stokes@ lacity.org

Mr. Carlos Montez
Caltrans District 7
Environmental Planning Department
Carlos.montez@ dot.ca.gov

Mr. Sam Wong
Senior Real Estate Officer
City of Los Angeles, Dept of Public Works
1149 S. Broadway, Ste 610
Los Angeles, CA 90015
Sam.wong@ lacity.org

FROM:
STOVER SEED COMPANY
Stephen Knutson, CEO
John McShane, President
1415 E. 6th Street
Los Angeles, CA 90021
Stephen_k@ stoverseed.com
John_mc@ stoverseed.com

Response to Draft EIR/EIS, 6th Street Viaduct Improvement Project.
Parcels 51, 52, 53, 54 corner of 6th Street and Mateo Street and parcel 4 on Willow Street.

Gentlemen:

Stover Seed Company is an 87 year old family business that has been operating at the corner of 6th and Mateo streets since the mid 1950's. We are a seed blending, packaging and distribution company that services the consumer and commercial markets. Among our customers are the City of Los Angeles, LAUSD and Caltrans. We currently have 19 full-time employees and 19 part-time employees. 15 full-time employees work out of our offices and warehouse on 6th street.
We have reviewed the draft EIR/EIS and participated in several project information meetings concerning this project. Any of the alternatives proposed in the report will have a material impact on the operation of our business.

The various options listed in the report all require that the bridge be widened which would eliminate the 6th street frontage road. The frontage road provides the only access to our parking lot. While there is access to our office and warehouse from the loading dock on Willow Street (parcel 4) the access is not safe for customers nor is there parking available.

The elimination of the 6th Street frontage road will:
1. Eliminate access to our 12 vehicle parking lot.
2. Force employees and customers to find parking on nearby streets that are already at capacity during normal work hours.
3. Render the parking lot space useless and inaccessible.
4. Eliminate customer access to the front door of our offices and create only one exit for office employees in the event of an emergency.
5. Force customers to enter our business through the rear, via Willow Street and enter the offices through the warehouse creating safety and security issues.
6. Eliminate small parcel delivery and flatbed truckload deliveries at our front warehouse doors.
7. Eliminate egress of our fork lift to unload trucks on Willow Street where we store some bulky materials.

Section 5.5 of the draft states that a survey of business operations was done that “identified issues and concerns.” While our firm was visited early in the process and a few, brief questions were asked, there was no mention of the bridge project nor was there any attempt to identify “issues of concern” that such a bridge project would create. Only within the last month have city officials visited our firm to identify and discuss the issues listed above.

We realize that that bridge project needs to go forward and ask that the agencies involved in this project consider the impact on a long standing, small business that is a stable employer and contributes to the city tax base. Steever Seed Company wishes to remain a downtown business. We are available and willing to work with the city to resolve the issues that we face.

Sincerely,

Stephen Knutson, CEO
John McShane, President
Response to Comment Letter No. 17 – Stover Seed Company

See responses next page.

1. **Concern over impacts to business operations.** See response to comment 2. As indicated in the EIR/EIS (Section 3.4.3.1), the one-way service/frontage road north of the viaduct between Mateo Street and Mesquit Street would be removed and relocated for the Replacement Alternative, which would require acquisition/relocation of businesses along this road. This impact cannot be avoided with the Replacement Alternative, and mitigation measures are identified in the EIR/EIS.

2. **Business survey did not ask for issues and concerns.** The purpose of the business survey was to understand the operations of each of the businesses and to use this information to document the potential relocation and access impacts in the EIR/EIS. The survey was completed during the early stages of design. At the time the survey was completed, the preferred alignment was not identified, and the right-of-way (ROW) impact was not established. The potential impacts to ROW were considered during preparation of the draft environmental document. The overview of potential impacts was presented at the public hearings for the Draft EIR/EIS. The City has been meeting owners at their request to discuss these impacts. The intent of the survey was not to discuss these issues.

3. **Understand the project is needed, but still want to remain in Downtown.** We appreciate your understanding of the situation and will work with all affected business owners. For more information, please see Chapter 3.4, “Community Impacts – Relocation and Business Disruptions,” and Appendix D, “Summary of Relocation Benefits.”
August 14, 2009

By E-mail and U.S. Mail

Carlos Montez  
Senior Environmental Planner  
California Department of Transportation  
100 S. Main Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90012  
Carlos.montez@dot.ca.gov

Jim Wu, P.E., Project Manager  
City of Los Angeles  
Bridge Improvement Program  
221 N. Figueroa St., Suite 350  
Los Angeles, CA 90012  
Jim.wu@lacity.org

Wallace E. Stokes III  
Bureau of Engineering  
Bridge Improvement Project  
City of Los Angeles  
221 N. Figueroa Street, Suite 350  
Los Angeles, CA 90012  
wally.stokes@eng.lacity.org

Re: 6th Street Viaduct Seismic Improvement Project  
Our client: Spilo Worldwide, 585 and 589 S. Santa Fe Ave.

Gentlemen:

This firm represents Spilo Worldwide which operates its business at 585 S. Santa Fe Avenue, 589 S. Santa Fe Avenue, and 1435 East Sixth Street (the north side frontage road). This is a follow-up letter to my letter of June 29, 2009. As noted previously, Spilo owns the property on Santa Fe and leases the Sixth Street parcel. The City of Los Angeles has told Spilo that of the various alternatives under consideration, the City and/or State may take Spilo’s property as part of the 6th Street Viaduct Improvement Project. This letter sets forth Spilo’s additional concerns with respect to the impact of the proposed project on its business and Spilo requests that the City and State respond to these issues in the Final Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (FEIR/EIS).

First, we believe it is important for the FEIR/EIS to consider the cumulative effect of other projects in the vicinity. The most significant project, besides the subject project, is the voter-approved high speed rail line. We believe this cumulative impact should be studied.

Second, while various city and state personnel have verbally advised Spilo that it may not need to move, we note that the draft EIR/EIS is replete with references to the anticipated demolition of Spilo’s buildings. For example, Page 2-28 refers to “Demolition of adjacent