

**COMMUNITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT
TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM**

**STATE ROUTE 57/STATE ROUTE 60
CONFLUENCE AT GRAND AVENUE PROJECT**

**EA# 279100
RTP# LA0D450**

CITY OF INDUSTRY, CALIFORNIA

PREPARED FOR:

CITY OF INDUSTRY

**15625 EAST STAFFORD STREET, #100
CITY OF INDUSTRY, CA 91744**

CONTACT: MR. BRIAN JAMES

(626) 333-2211

July 2012

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	Introduction.....	1
1.1	Background and Basis for Technical Memorandum.....	1
2.0	Project Description.....	3
2.1	Purpose and Need.....	3
2.2	No Build Alternative (Alternative 1)	4
2.3	Build Alternatives (Alternative 2 and 3).....	5
3.0	Affected Environment.....	7
3.1	Study Area.....	8
3.2	Social	9
3.3	Housing	15
3.4	Regional and Community Economic Conditions.....	16
4.0	Environmental Consequences and Mitigation.....	22
4.1	Methodology.....	22
4.2	Growth Inducement.....	23
4.3	Social Impacts	23
4.4	Economics	29
5.0	References Used and Contacts	31
5.1	References	31
5.2	Contacts	31

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1: Local and Regional Population and Population Growth	10
Table 3.2: Age Distribution	11
Table 3.3: Race and Ethnic Composition by County and City for 2000 and 2010	13
Table 3.4: Race and Ethnic Composition by Census Tract for 2010	134
Table 3.5: General Demographics (2010 Census)	15
Table 3.6: Housing Characteristics	16
Table 3.7: Employment by Occupation by County and City (2010 Census)	18
Table 3.8: Employment by Occupation by Census Tract (2010 Census)	189
Table 3.9: Transportation (2010 Census)	21

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) is proposing freeway improvements to the State Route-57 (SR-57)/State Route-60 (SR-60) confluence at the Grand Avenue interchange in Los Angeles County. The proposed project is subject to both the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the federal National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), and Caltrans is the lead agency under both CEQA and NEPA.

SR-57 is a major north-south freeway, serving the cities and communities of the greater Los Angeles area. This freeway's north terminus is at its junction with Interstate 210 (I-210), in the City of Glendora, and its south terminus is located at the junction with Interstate 5 (I-5), and State Route 22 (SR-22), in the City of Orange. The portion of SR-57 that is located in the project area is located in the Pomona Valley.

SR-60 is a major east-west freeway that also serves the cities and communities of the Greater Los Angeles Area. SR-60 is part of the National Highway System (NHS) and the State Freeway and Expressway (F&E) System. SR-60 runs from Interstate 10 (I-10) near the Los Angeles River in the City of Los Angeles east to I-10 in Riverside County, serving the cities and communities on the eastern side of the Los Angeles metropolitan area and running along the south side of the San Gabriel Valley. The west terminus of the freeway is at the East Los Angeles Interchange complex, and the east terminus is at the junction with I-10 in the City of Beaumont.

SR-57 and SR-60 meet and interconnect in the City of Diamond Bar and the City of Industry. The two separate freeways share an alignment for approximately 1.26 miles along the northbound/eastbound direction and approximately 1.34 miles along the southbound/westbound direction, following a generally northeasterly-southwesterly orientation.

The primary purposes of the proposed project are to improve traffic operations and safety of the SR-57 and SR-60 freeways at the Grand Avenue interchange.

1.1 Background and Basis for Technical Memorandum

The Community Impact Assessment (CIA) document prepared during the year of 2010 for the proposed project was approved by Caltrans, District 7, in December 2010. Because a decennial census was in progress during that time, the CIA analyzed data from the 2000 Census, and the document was approved based on 2000 Census data.

As of the time of this writing in July 2012, the proposed project is still in the environmental approval phase, and it has been determined that the CIA document should be updated to reflect the new 2010 Census data, which was released in the summer of 2011, well after the CIA document had already been approved. Therefore, the purpose of this technical

memorandum is to provide the updated 2010 Census data applicable to the project study area.

It should be noted that only the portions of the CIA that relied upon census data to determine conclusions regarding community impacts have been included in this technical memorandum, since revisions are only necessary for these areas of study. Specifically, these subsections include the following:

3.0 Affected Environment

- Population and Growth
- Age
- Ethnicity
- Other Demographics
- Housing Characteristics
- Employment and Income
- Commuting Patterns

4.0 Environmental Consequences and Mitigation

- Growth Inducement
- Social Impacts
- Environmental Justice
- Economics

Analysis of all other areas of study has been omitted from this technical memorandum since determination of impacts for those areas did not rely upon census data, and no revisions are necessary. Specifically, these subsections include the following:

3.0 Affected Environment

- Land Use
- Development Trends
- Farmlands
- Community Facilities and Services

4.0 Environmental Consequences and Mitigation

- Land Use
- Consistency with Local and Regional Plans
- Farmlands
- Access and Circulation
- Parking
- Community Facilities and Services
- Relocation Impacts

It should also be noted that demographic changes in the project area did occur from the time of the 2000 Census to the 2010 Census. However, the changes were relatively minor and are not significant enough to result in impacts to the existing socioeconomic and demographic environment of the study area, and would not create adverse community and neighborhood impacts. Community impacts remain similar to those described in the original, approved CIA document from December 2010.

2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1 Purpose and Need

No changes in the purpose and need have occurred since the CIA document was approved in December 2010. The proposed project would consist of the reconfiguration of the approximately 2.5-mile confluence of SR-57 and SR-60, which would include the addition of auxiliary lanes and associated on-ramp/off-ramp reconfigurations. SR-57 and SR-60 are major inter-regional freeways linking cities in the San Gabriel Valley and the Inland Empire with Los Angeles and Orange Counties.

The purpose of the project is to improve operational deficiencies of the freeways at the Grand Avenue interchange. In addition, the proposed project would increase traffic safety by improving the merge and diverge operations of the SR-57 and SR-60 freeways in the vicinity of the Grand Avenue interchange.

The purpose of the project is:

- To improve traffic operation on Grand Avenue from Golden Springs Drive to the interchange at SR-60;
- To increase capacity at the Grand Avenue interchange;
- To improve traffic operation on the freeway mainline;
- To reduce traffic weaving and increase weaving distance; and
- To improve safety.

The proposed project is necessary due to the operational deficiencies on SR-60 between the merge and diverge points with SR-57. The deficiencies are primarily due to the short weaving length provided between the Grand Avenue interchange and merges and diverges of the two freeways. The Grand Avenue interchange is located approximately 1,800 feet east of the merge between northbound SR-57 and eastbound SR-60. The eastbound SR-60 traffic headed for the Grand Avenue exit ramp must make a three-lane weave in this distance across lanes that are heavily used by SR-57 traffic in the confluence area. The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) year 2035 forecasted traffic for the

eastbound off-ramp at Grand Avenue is expected to increase the length of the queue that would exceed the length of the single exit lane to Grand Avenue.

A similar short weaving condition exists at the eastbound on-ramp from Grand Avenue to SR-60/57. The on-ramp traffic from Grand Avenue must make a three-lane weave across traffic lanes that serve SR-57 to continue eastbound on SR-60, thus creating a bottleneck to the SR-57 traffic heading north. In the westbound direction of SR-60, a lane drop occurs on the SR-57 connector just before the merge with the westbound SR-60 mainline. The westbound SR-60 traffic exiting on Grand Avenue must make a two-lane weave across the traffic on this connector in order to exit at Grand Avenue. The added weaving traffic further reduces the capacity of the two-lane connector for SR-57.

The confluence segment of SR-60 maintains four through lanes in each direction. The northbound SR-57 is reduced from three lanes to two lanes as it merges with the eastbound SR-60 at the west end of the confluence, thus providing a total of six lanes on eastbound SR-60 at the Grand Avenue interchange. Similarly, southbound SR-57 is reduced from three lanes to two lanes as it merges with westbound SR-60; thus, mainline westbound SR-60 carries a total of six lanes through the Grand Avenue interchange as well. At the peak AM and PM hours, the lane drops on SR-57 cause bottleneck conditions on SR-60 and SR-57, which result in long delays beyond the confluence segment on both freeways. The mainline freeway experiences travel delays with LOS F conditions over many hours of the day. PM peak hour mainline queues frequently back up south of Pathfinder Road on SR-57 and east of Fairway Drive on SR-60 for three to four hours per day due to deficiencies at the confluence of SR-57 and SR-60.

The existing geometric and operational deficiencies present potential safety concerns. Existing deficient weaving distances between the ramps and SR-57 connectors, plus the lack of storage capacity on the ramps, contribute to less than optimum safety conditions.

2.2 No Build Alternative (Alternative 1)

The No Build Alternative (Alternative 1) undertakes no roadway improvements along the SR-57/SR-60 confluence, but rather maintains the existing roadway geometry. No improvements to the local streets would occur under this alternative. This alternative serves as the baseline against which to evaluate the effects of the Build Alternatives. The No Build Alternative would produce no immediate environmental impacts other than routine roadway maintenance within the project area; consequently, no mitigation would be required. However, compared to the proposed Build Alternatives, the No Build Alternative does not provide enhanced circulation or public safety benefits within the area and does not meet the defined project purpose and need.

This alternative would maintain existing deficient capacity and congestion conditions, and existing safety hazards, related to the short weave condition.

2.3 Build Alternatives (Alternative 2 and 3)

No changes in the alternatives descriptions have occurred since the CIA document was approved in December 2010. Refer to the December 2010 CIA for graphics of the proposed build alternatives.

Two build alternatives are being considered. Both build alternatives would require the relocation of utility infrastructure (underground electrical lines, telecommunication lines, and electrical poles) on Grand Avenue, Golden Springs Drive, and the new Grand Avenue overcrossing structure as required, as well as the addition of a High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) preferential lane to the westbound loop on-ramp after the construction of a new westbound direct on-ramp project being proposed by the City of Industry.

2.3.1 Alternative 2 – Combination Cloverleaf/Diamond Configuration

Alternative 2 would maintain the existing interchange configuration (compact-diamond) for the eastbound on- and off-ramps on SR-60. The interchange configuration at Grand Avenue for Alternative 2 would remain as a combination of partial cloverleaf for the westbound direction. The westbound SR-60 loop on-ramp would join the freeway as an auxiliary lane that would be constructed from the dropped lane from the SR-57 connector to the Grand Avenue westbound off-ramp, creating a two-lane exit ramp to Grand Avenue. An auxiliary lane would also be added in the eastbound direction that extends from the eastbound on-ramp at Grand Avenue to the new connectors that bypass the north/east SR-57/SR-60 interchange. A southbound SR-57 drop lane will be extended to a re-aligned westbound SR-60 off-ramp to Grand Avenue, creating a two-lane exit ramp.

A new bypass off-ramp is proposed on eastbound SR-60 west of the southern/western SR-57/SR-60 junction. The existing northbound SR-57 to eastbound SR-60 connector would be realigned to accommodate the new bypass ramp and existing connector structure. A bypass connector would also be built at the northern/eastern SR-57/SR-60 junction, and this connector would require new overcrossing structures at Prospector Road and Diamond Bar Boulevard as well as re-alignment of the Diamond Bar Boulevard on-ramp.

The existing Grand Avenue overcrossing would be replaced with a new overcrossing structure over SR-60. Two 450-foot-long double left-turn lanes would be constructed on southbound Grand Avenue to provide access to the eastbound SR-60 on-ramp at Grand Avenue. The new Grand Avenue overcrossing would be widened to accommodate eight through lanes and double left-turn lanes.

The widening of Grand Avenue would continue south to Golden Springs Drive. Golden Springs Drive would be widened to allow additional through lanes, double left-turn lanes, and one right-turn lane on three legs of the intersection of Grand Avenue and Golden Springs Drive. One right-turn lane would be provided on Grand Avenue on the northbound approach to Golden Springs Drive. Approximately 600 feet of Grand Avenue in the northbound direction, south of the intersection at Golden Springs, would be restriped to three lanes.

The improvements along the proposed eastbound on- and off-ramps would require partial takes of property from the public golf course south of SR-60. Sliver takes of property would also be required from behind a motel parking lot between Prospectors Road and Diamond Bar Boulevard. The proposed realignment of the eastbound on-ramp on Diamond Bar Boulevard would also require a sliver take of a commercial property east of Diamond Bar Boulevard.

This alternative may also require retaining walls along the freeway mainline widening, auxiliary lanes, and on- and off-ramps. The locations and design of any potential retaining walls would be determined upon further project study.

2.3.2 Alternative 3 – Partial Cloverleaf Configuration

Under Alternative 3, the existing eastbound on- and off-ramps at Grand Avenue, which form a compact diamond interchange, would be reconfigured as a partial cloverleaf interchange. The new intersection of Grand Avenue and the new eastbound on- and off-ramps would be located approximately 500 feet south of the existing intersection, or mid-way between the freeway and Golden Springs Drive. The new eastbound on-ramp would be a loop on-ramp that would join SR-60 as a new eastbound auxiliary lane. The existing eastbound on-ramp would be realigned to accommodate the widened Grand Avenue and would merge into the eastbound auxiliary lane created by a new southbound Grand Avenue to eastbound SR-60 loop on-ramp. The auxiliary lane would continue until joining an existing auxiliary lane on the eastbound SR-60 after the SR-57/SR-60 split. A southbound SR-57 drop lane will be extended to a re-aligned westbound SR-60 off-ramp to Grand Avenue, creating a two-lane exit ramp.

As in Alternative 2, a new bypass off-ramp is proposed on eastbound SR-60 west of the southern/western SR-57/ SR-60 junction. The existing northbound SR-57 to eastbound SR-60 connector would be realigned to accommodate the new bypass ramp and existing connector structure. A bypass connector would also be built at the northern/eastern SR-57/SR-60 junction, and this connector would require new overcrossing structures at Prospector Road and Diamond Bar Boulevard as well as re-alignment of the Diamond Bar Boulevard on-ramp.

Similar to Alternative 2, the existing Grand Avenue overcrossing would be replaced with a new overcrossing structure over SR-60. However, unlike Alternative 2, a double left-turn lane from southbound Grand Avenue to the eastbound on-ramp would not be required, since vehicles traveling on southbound Grand Avenue would access northbound SR-57 and eastbound SR-60 by way of the new loop on-ramp on the west side of Grand Avenue. The new Grand Avenue overcrossing would be widened to accommodate the eight through lanes with a center divider/median.

Alternative 3, like Alternative 2, would also widen Grand Avenue south to Golden Springs Drive. Golden Springs Drive would be widened to allow additional through lanes, double left-turn lanes, and one right-turn lane on three legs of the intersection of Grand Avenue and Golden Springs. One right-turn lane would be provided on Grand Avenue on the northbound approach to Golden Springs Drive. Approximately 600 feet of Grand Avenue in the northbound direction south of the intersection at Golden Springs would be restriped to three lanes.

The improvements along the proposed eastbound on- and off-ramps would require partial takes of property from the public golf course south of SR-60. Sliver takes of property would also be required from a motel parking lot between Prospectors Road and Diamond Bar Boulevard. The proposed realignment of the eastbound on-ramp on Diamond Bar Boulevard would also require a sliver take of a commercial property east of Diamond Bar Boulevard.

3.0 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

This description of the affected environment is based on data from the U.S. Census Bureau, the California Department of Finance, and state, county, and metropolitan planning organization (MPO) sources including the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). County, city, and tract-level data are primarily available from the 2010 census. This section describes demographic characteristics of Los Angeles County, the City of Industry, the City of Diamond Bar, and when detailed data are available, the census tracts within which the study area is located.

No changes in the affected environment description have occurred since the CIA document was approved in December 2010; the study area boundaries and existing land uses are the same as those described in the 2010 CIA. Refer to the 2010 CIA for graphics of the study area boundaries.

3.1 Study Area

3.1.1 Affected Community

The project is located within the Cities of Industry and Diamond Bar, in southeastern Los Angeles County. The City of Industry and the City of Diamond Bar may be directly and/or indirectly affected by the proposed project through the expansion or modification of roadways, and right-of-way acquisition; therefore, the demographics and general plans of both cities were analyzed for this assessment, and the information for both cities is presented separately in some sections, as appropriate.

3.1.2 Project Study Area

The study area is defined to include areas anticipated to be directly, indirectly, and/or cumulatively affected by the proposed project, and correlates closely with the project Area of Potential Effect (APE), which delineates the limits of disturbance. The study area includes the grading limits and areas of potential permanent and temporary right-of-way acquisition, and is within the boundaries of six census tracts (Census Tracts 4033.12, 4033.16, 4033.19, 4033.21, 4033.22 and 4033.23) from the 2010 census. One of these census tracts (4033.12) falls within City of Industry boundaries (and it also includes portions of the City of Diamond Bar), and the remaining five census tracts fall within City of Diamond Bar boundaries only.

The census tracts include residential, industrial, institutional, and commercial land uses, community services and facilities, and other neighborhood features that may be indirectly or cumulatively affected by the proposed project. The study area census tracts include an area much larger than that directly affected by project construction and right-of-way acquisition, but it provides a more focused picture of the area affected by the project than the City and County demographics can provide. Census tracts were used because they are the most complete data set for the level of detail required for this analysis, and the use of census tract data was appropriate based on the size of the project. Census tracts are also used to incorporate populations that may not be directly affected by the project but may be indirectly affected by project construction and operation. Data boundaries with finer level of detail such as census blocks were not selected due to incomplete data in some of the required demographic categories necessary for the community impact analysis. Detailed information concerning the affected environment is provided at city and countywide levels for certain topics.

The study area is located within the boundaries of the Cities of Industry and Diamond Bar and is transected diagonally by the SR-57/60 confluence. The northwestern portion of the study areas falls within the City of Industry, which has a small population of 219 (according to the 2010 Census). According to the City of Industry's *General Plan Map* and *Zoning Map* (October 2009), there is no residential zoning located within city boundaries; the homes

located there are all legal non-conforming uses. The City of Industry, including this portion of the study area, is comprised of predominately industrial and commercial uses, with no residences in close proximity to the project area. Thus, there are no residential neighborhood or community characteristics.

The southeastern portion of the study area falls within the City of Diamond Bar, which has a larger population of 55,544 (according to the 2010 Census), most of which reside in the residential areas located at varying distances to the south and east of the study area, ranging anywhere from immediately adjacent to the study area near the eastern city limits, to over a mile away from the study area near the southern city limits. A large part of this portion of the study area is bordered by the Diamond Bar Golf Course and several eating and lodging establishments, which serve the regional population and SR-57/SR-60 commuters. These uses do not constitute neighborhood uses, nor contain any traits characteristic of neighborhoods or communities.

A Scoping Meeting was held by Caltrans and the City of Industry on September 9, 2009, and was attended by thirty-nine members of the public (see Section 4.0, *Environmental Consequences and Mitigation* for discussion regarding public response to this project). A public meeting will be held during the Draft EIR/EA public review period. According to the project study area characteristics described above, no communities or neighborhoods would be directly affected by this project. Direct effects could occur as a result of the proposed project through the expansion or modification of roadways, and right-of-way acquisition.

3.2 Social

3.2.1 Population and Growth Demographics

Table 3.1: *Local and Regional Population and Population Growth*, reports the population figures for the 1990, 2000 and 2010 Census counts for Los Angeles County, the City of Industry, and the City of Diamond Bar. The U.S. Census Bureau reports that the population in Los Angeles County totaled 8,863,164 in 1990. In the 20 years that followed, the population grew to 9,818,605 (10.8 percent). The California Department of Finance projects that this growth will continue for the next three decades and that population in Los Angeles County will rise over 25 percent to 11,920,289 by 2030. SCAG projects that population in Los Angeles County will rise 26 percent to 12,015,889 by 2030.

City of Industry

The City of Industry has experienced a negative rate of population growth as compared to Los Angeles County since 1990. According to the U.S. Census, the City of Industry's population totaled 631 in 1990. The population decreased approximately 65 percent to 219

in 2010. The city's population is one of the lowest in Los Angeles County; in fact, it was ranked 87th out of 88 cities in Los Angeles County¹. The City's population has been stable due to the fact that no new housing has been built, in light of the city's predominate industrial land uses. It is likely that the city will continue to promote such uses on the remaining developable land and that the residential population within the city will remain low.

City of Diamond Bar

The City of Diamond Bar has experienced a significantly slower rate of population growth as compared to Los Angeles County since 1990. The city became incorporated in 1989. The first available census data in 1990 shows a population in the city of 53,672. The population rose slightly (4.9 percent) to 56,287 in 2000, and decreased slightly (-1.3 percent) to 55,544 in 2010. SCAG projects that the city will experience steady growth of about 21 percent to 67,240 by 2030.

Table 3.1: Local and Regional Population and Population Growth

	1990	2000	2010	Percent Change from 1990 to 2010
Los Angeles County	8,863,164	9,519,338	9,818,605	+10.8%
City of Industry	631	777	219	-65.3%
City of Diamond Bar	53,672	56,287	55,544	+3.5%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 1990, 2000, 2010

Detailed information regarding the cities' population growth policies can be found in the December 2010 CIA document.

3.2.2 Age

Table 3.2: *Age Distribution*, shows the distribution of the population by age within Los Angeles County, the City of Industry, the City of Diamond Bar, and the study area census tracts. The distribution of the population by age within the study area census tracts is comparable to the distribution within the cities and county.

City of Industry

According to the *City of Industry General Plan Housing Element*, the age distribution of the city's residents as reported in the 1990 Census indicated that nearly half (48 percent) of Industry's population were aged 25-54, 15 percent were over age 64, and another 21

¹ Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), *Profile of the City of Industry*, May 2011.

percent were pre-school or school-aged children. The figures for the 2010 Census have remained fairly consistent with relatively little change in the age distribution.

City of Diamond Bar

According to the *City of Diamond Bar 2008 Housing Element*, the city’s population is aging. Between 1980 and 2000, the median age for Diamond Bar increased from 27.5 years to 36.5 years. The senior population also grew; the share of the population aged 65 years and above increased from 2 to 7.5 percent in 2000. In terms of actual numbers, the senior population increased from approximately 600 persons in 1980 to over 4,200 persons in 2000. It is anticipated that the city will continue to experience growth in its senior population as the post-World War II “Baby Boom” generation² reaches retirement age³. Census tract 4033.16, located in the northeast corner of the study area within the City of Diamond Bar, has a concentration of the senior population at 14 percent.

Table 3.2: Age Distribution

	Population < 18	Population 18-64	Population > 64
Los Angeles County	24.5%	64.7%	10.9%
City of Industry	26.9%	63.0%	10.0%
City of Diamond Bar	21.4%	66.9%	11.7%
Census Tract 4033.12	23.1%	66.2%	10.7%
Census Tract 4033.16	20.1%	65.8%	14.0%
Census Tract 4033.19	20.3%	69.3%	10.4%
Census Tract 4033.21	21.4%	67.0%	11.6%
Census Tract 4033.22	21.2%	66.1%	12.7%
Census Tract 4033.23	21.9%	65.6%	12.5%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2010

3.2.3 Ethnicity

Table 3.3: *Race and Ethnic Composition by County and City for 2000 and 2010*, shows the race and ethnic composition of Los Angeles County, the City of Industry, and the City of Diamond Bar for both 2000 and 2010, including the percentage of composition change from 2000 to 2010. Table 3.4: *Race and Ethnic Composition by Census Tract for 2010*, shows the race and ethnic composition of the study area census tracts for 2010.

It should be noted that the Federal government considers race and Hispanic origin to be two separate and distinct concepts. For the 2000 and 2010 Census, there were two

² “Baby Boomers” are those born between 1946 and 1964. In 2008, the first Boomers reached age 62.

³ City of Diamond Bar 2008 Housing Element, Revised Draft, April 17, 2009, p. I-1.

minimum categories for ethnicity: *Hispanic or Latino* and *Not Hispanic or Latino*. Hispanics and Latinos may be of any race; therefore, the Hispanic category overlaps with other categories. Thus, in Tables 3.3 and 3.4, both “race” and “ethnicity” are included to ensure inclusion of all categories, and for the purposes of this analysis, “race” includes the categories of White, Black, American Indian, Asian, Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, and Other/Two or More Races, whereas “ethnicity” includes the Hispanic category.

Race and ethnicity in the Cities of Industry and Diamond Bar have gone through significant changes since 2000, with a general increase in the number and proportion of residents who identified themselves as Asian/Pacific Islander or Hispanic/Latino. The White population decreased by 19 percent in the City of Diamond Bar, while the Asian population increased by 22.7 percent. Likewise, the Asian population increased by 110.3 percent in the City of Industry, and 15.1 percent overall in Los Angeles County. The Hispanic population increased by 8.6 percent in the City of Diamond Bar, and 7 percent in the County.

Compared to Los Angeles County, the City of Industry has the highest White, Other/Two of More Races, and Hispanic population, whereas the City of Diamond Bar has the highest Asian population. The cities’ Black, American Indian, and Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander populations were fairly consistent with each other, while differing somewhat from that of the County.

City of Industry

The race and ethnic distribution of the city’s residents as reported in the 2010 Census indicated that 58.9 percent of the city’s population was White, up slightly from 54.8 percent in 2000. The proportion that identified themselves as Hispanic decreased slightly from just over 60 percent in 2000 to 52.5 percent in 2010.

City of Diamond Bar

The *City of Diamond Bar 2008 Housing Element* also confirms that the ethnic composition of Diamond Bar is distinctly different from Los Angeles County as a whole. As noted above, the 2000 and 2010 Censuses revealed that the city’s demographic makeup includes a higher Asian population and lower Hispanic population than the county.⁴

⁴ City of Diamond Bar 2008 Housing Element, Revised Draft, April 17, 2009, p. I-1.

Table 3.3: Race and Ethnic Composition by County and City for 2000 and 2010

White	Black	American Indian	Asian	Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	Other/Two or More Races	Hispanic ⁵ Ethnicity
Los Angeles County						
2000						
48.7%	9.8%	0.8%	11.9%	0.3%	28.4%	44.6%
2010						
50.3%	8.7%	0.7%	13.7%	0.3%	26.3%	47.7%
Percent Change						
+3.3	-11.2	-12.5	+51.1	0.0	-7.4	+7.0
City of Industry						
2000						
54.8%	4.2%	2.7%	3.9%	0.0%	34.4%	60.2%
2010						
58.9%	0.5%	0.0%	8.2%	0.0%	23.5%	52.5%
Percent Change						
+7.5	-88.1	-100.0	+110.3	0.0	-5.5	-12.8
City of Diamond Bar						
2000						
41.0%	4.8%	0.3%	42.8%	0.1%	11.0%	18.5%
2010						
33.2%	4.1%	0.3%	52.5%	0.2%	9.7%	20.1%
Percent Change						
-19.0	-14.6	0.0	+22.7	+100.0	-11.8	+8.6

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 and 2010

⁵ The Federal government considers race and Hispanic origin to be two separate and distinct concepts. Hispanics and Latinos may be of any race; therefore, the Hispanic category overlaps with other categories. As a result, percentages do not add to 100 percent due to this overlap. The White, Black, American Indian, Hawaiian, and Other categories include persons identified with only one race.

Table 3.4: Race and Ethnic Composition by Census Tract for 2010

White	Black	American Indian	Asian	Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	Other/Two or More Races	Hispanic Ethnicity ⁶
Census Tract 4033.12						
43.6%	4.7%	0.8%	35.4%	0.3%	16.1%	33.8%
Census Tract 4033.16						
44.6%	6.9%	0.4%	34.6%	0.1%	13.4%	27.3%
Census Tract 4033.19						
36.5%	6.1%	0.3%	48.0%	0.1%	9.0%	22.3%
Census Tract 4033.21						
40.8%	5.8%	0.2%	40.3%	0.3%	12.6%	26.3%
Census Tract 4033.22						
37.9%	2.7%	0.7%	48.6%	0.2%	9.9%	20.5%
Census Tract 4033.23						
26.1%	2.9%	0.1%	65.7%	0.1%	5.1%	11.8%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2010

3.2.4 Other Demographics

Table 3.5: *General Demographics (2010 Census)*, provides a snapshot of other demographic characteristics of Los Angeles County, the City of Industry, and the City of Diamond Bar, as reported in the last census survey. As shown in Table 3.5, the median household income of both cities is higher than the median household income of Los Angeles County. The poverty rates of both cities vary substantially from the poverty rate of the county. The City of Industry's poverty rate is twice the poverty rate of the county, whereas the City of Diamond Bar's poverty rate is about one-third that of the county. Also, the City of Diamond Bar has a higher median household income than both the City of Industry and Los Angeles County.

Between 2000 and 2010, both cities, as well as the county, experienced an increase in median household income, although at different paces. Los Angeles County's median household income increased from \$42,189 to \$54,878, an increase of over 30 percent. The City of Industry's median household income increased from \$49,423 to \$75,521, a 53 percent increase, and the City of Diamond Bar's median household income increased from \$68,871 to \$85,163, a 24 percent increase.

⁶ The Federal government considers race and Hispanic origin to be two separate and distinct concepts. Hispanics and Latinos may be of any race; therefore, the Hispanic category overlaps with other categories. As a result, percentages do not add to 100 percent since the White, Black, American Indian, Hawaiian, and Other categories include persons identified with only one race.

Homeownership rates of the cities vary compared to homeownership rates of the county. The City of Industry’s homeownership rate of almost 32 percent is below the Los Angeles County rate of almost 48 percent. The City of Diamond Bar’s homeownership rate is significantly higher than the City of Industry and Los Angeles County at over 81 percent.

Table 3.5: General Demographics (2010 Census)

	Population Change (2000 to 2010)	Median Household Income	Persons Below Poverty	Home Ownership Rate	Persons Per Household
Los Angeles County	+3.1%	\$54,878	16.3%	47.7%	2.98
City of Industry	0.0%	\$75,521	37.3%	31.9%	3.10
City of Diamond Bar	-1.3%	\$85,163	5.6%	81.2%	3.10

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 1990 and Census 2000

3.3 Housing

3.3.1 Housing Characteristics

The study area consists of a variety of urbanized land uses within the cities of Industry and Diamond Bar, and non-residential uses represent the majority of the study area. The portion of the study area that is in the City of Industry is located entirely within an industrial (planned development overlay) land use designation; thus, there are no residential uses for the portion of the study area in the City of Industry. The portion that is in the City of Diamond Bar is located within multiple land use designations, including commercial, industrial, office, and open space (Diamond Bar Golf Course) through most of the study area’s mid-portion, with small areas of single-family residential land use designations at the northeast end of the study area.

The figures for owner-occupied and renter-occupied units within the state, county, cities, and study area census tracts are shown in Table 3.6: *Housing Characteristics*, below. Overall, the rates of owner-occupied units in the City of Diamond Bar and the census tracts within the City of Diamond Bar are significantly higher than those of the state and the county. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, a majority of the homes in the study area census tracts (72 percent) were built during the 1970s and 1980s, while the median values for all owner-occupied units range from \$435,300 to \$583,400. The average home price in

the study area (City of Diamond Bar only) was \$417,000 as of February 2012⁷, which is higher than Los Angeles County's average home price of \$336,400 (average home prices within the City of Industry are not available; however, the Census cites the City's median home value at \$366,700, which is slightly lower than the County's median home value of \$370,900). The City of Industry has a lower percentage of owner-occupied housing units (33.8 percent) than the County (46.9 percent), whereas the percentage of owner-occupied housing units in the City of Diamond Bar (82.9 percent) is significantly higher than both the City of Industry's and Los Angeles County's percentage.

Table 3.6: Housing Characteristics

	Total Housing Units	Housing Units Occupied	Owner-Occupied Housing Units	Renter-Occupied Housing Units	Median Home Value
California	13,682,976	12,406,475	6,903,175 (55.6%)	5,503,175 (44.4%)	\$370,900
Los Angeles County	3,444,870	3,202,353	1,501,448 (46.9%)	1,700,905 (53.1%)	\$429,500
City of Industry	75	71	24 (33.8%)	47 (66.2%)	\$366,700
City of Diamond Bar	18,127	17,453	14,466 (82.9%)	2,987 (17.1%)	\$541,900
Census Tract 4033.12	1,608	1,588	1,264 (79.6%)	324 (20.4%)	\$435,300
Census Tract 4033.16	2,490	2,423	1,933 (79.8%)	490 (20.2%)	\$490,200
Census Tract 4033.19	1,637	1,493	1,048 (70.2%)	445 (29.8%)	\$526,200
Census Tract 4033.21	1,967	1,939	1,658 (85.5%)	281 (14.5%)	\$583,400
Census Tract 4033.22	1,257	1,231	998 (81.1%)	233 (18.9%)	\$551,000
Census Tract 4033.23	1,727	1,689	1,461 (86.5%)	228 (13.5%)	\$570,900

Source: US Census Bureau, 2010

Detailed information regarding the cities' projections of housing stock and housing policies and programs can be found in the December 2010 CIA document.

3.4 Regional and Community Economic Conditions

3.4.1 Employment and Income

The City of Industry and City of Diamond Bar employment is shown in Table 3.7: *Employment by Occupation by County and City*, and for the six study census tracts in Table 3.8: *Employment by Occupation by Census Tract*, in comparison to the Los Angeles County average.

⁷ www.zillow.com, accessed on April 11, 2012.

The City of Industry

The City of Industry has provided and preserved a center for industry and commerce for the San Gabriel Valley and the Los Angeles metropolitan area⁸. There are several factors contributing to the city's strong industrial employment base.

The city's land use plays a large part in its commerce. As discussed previously, the City of Industry is unique in that it is predominately developed with industrial, office and commercial uses and has no land zoned for residential use within its boundaries.

The city's location and accessibility to major freeways are also a significant consideration. There are few areas in Southern California that offer the accessibility which the City of Industry provides. For almost the whole of its 15-mile length, the city is bounded by freeway. The city is presently served directly by 13 interchanges from the San Gabriel River and Pomona freeways and indirectly by seven interchanges from the San Bernardino (I-10) Freeway. This accessibility to the existing freeway system and to programmed major freeway developments provides the City of Industry with unmatched distribution potential.⁹

Also, the city has access to rail. Both the Southern Pacific and Union Pacific railroads, like the freeway system, serve the entire length of the city. There are major switching facilities maintained within the city providing "quick" access to the national rail network.¹⁰

Table 3.7: *Employment by Occupation by County and City* below shows the percentages of workers in the production, transportation, and material moving occupation to be similar at 10.7 percent to that of Los Angeles County at 13 percent, and the City of Diamond Bar is at 5.6 percent. The city's service worker percentage was also similar (nearly identical) at 18.4 percent to Los Angeles County at 18.2 percent, and the City of Diamond Bar is lower than both City of Industry and the County at 12.0 percent. In addition, the city's management, professional, and related occupation percentage was below the other areas of the study area at 29.1 percent; Los Angeles County was higher at 34.9 percent, and the City of Diamond Bar was significantly higher at 48.8 percent.

The City of Diamond Bar

In contrast to the size of its population, the City of Diamond Bar has a relatively small employment base. In 2000, there were approximately 16,000 jobs in the city compared to about 18,000 housing units. Major employers include Allstate Insurance, Travelers Insurance, South Coast Air Quality Management District, and the Walnut Valley Unified

⁸ City of Industry General Plan, May 1971, p. 12.

⁹ Ibid, p. 12.

¹⁰ Ibid, p. 12.

School District. While the city actually lost jobs during the early 1990s like many California communities hit by recession, the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) projects a significant increase in employment between through 2020.¹¹

In 2010, 48.8 percent of the city's working residents were employed in management and professional occupations. A significant percentage of workers (29.2 percent) were employed in sales and office-related occupations. Approximately 12 percent were employed in service-related occupations such as food servers and beauticians. Blue collar occupations such as machine operators, assemblers, farming, transportation, handlers and laborers constituted 10 percent of the workforce.

Table 3.7: Employment by Occupation by County and City (2010 Census)

	Los Angeles County	City of Industry	City of Diamond Bar
Management, business, science and arts	1,572,201 (34.9%)	30 (29.1%)	13,190 (48.8%)
Service	822,298 (18.2%)	19 (18.4%)	3,239 (12.0%)
Sales and office	1,157,849 (25.7%)	43 (41.7%)	7,877 (29.2%)
Natural resources, construction and maintenance	370,745 (8.2%)	0 (0.0%)	1,191 (4.4%)
Production, transportation and material moving	585,975 (13.0%)	11 (10.7%)	1,525 (5.6%)
TOTAL	4,509,068	103	27,022

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2010

¹¹ City of Diamond Bar 2008 Housing Element, p. I-1.

Table 3.8: Employment by Occupation by Census Tract (2010 Census)

	Census Tract 4033.12	Census Tract 4033.16	Census Tract 4033.19	Census Tract 4033.21	Census Tract 4033.22	Census Tract 4033.23
Management, business, science and arts	898 (36.0%)	1,501 (42.4%)	1,087 (49.4%)	1,453 (47.6%)	675 (42.1%)	1,481 (55.2%)
Service	237 (9.5%)	512 (14.5%)	427 (19.4%)	252 (8.2%)	174 (10.9%)	198 (7.4%)
Sales and office	868 (34.8%)	1,172 (33.1%)	479 (21.8%)	884 (28.9%)	516 (32.2%)	841 (31.3%)
Natural resources, construction and maintenance	180 (7.2%)	196 (5.5%)	56 (2.5%)	151 (4.9%)	102 (6.4%)	52 (1.9%)
Production, transportation and material moving	308 (12.4%)	155 (4.4%)	152 (6.9%)	315 (10.3)	136 (8.5%)	112 (4.2%)
TOTAL	2,491	3,536	2,201	3,055	1,603	2,684

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2010

3.4.2 Commuting Patterns

Traffic congestion and long commutes have a negative impact on personal perceptions of quality of life and on regional air quality. As employment and population continue to increase, hours of traffic delays and daily vehicle miles traveled per person are projected to increase as well.

According to the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA) *2009 Long Range Transportation Plan*, truck miles traveled in Los Angeles County are projected to grow by 33 percent on the freeways by 2030. Most truck traffic will occur in the same corridors that serve as major truck routes today, including the SR-60, which is a critical truck route through the county serving the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach (via the I-710 freeway), as well as major industrial areas in Los Angeles, San Bernardino and Riverside counties. The increase in truck trips, in addition to increased car trips, will result in increased traffic congestion along the SR-60.

Los Angeles County's 10 million residents generated approximately 29 million daily trips in 2004, resulting in almost 160 million daily vehicle miles traveled (VMT). By 2040, this would

grow to almost 230 million daily VMT.¹² The LACMTA 2009 Long Range Transportation Plan projects that today's level of mobility can be maintained and that transit ridership in the county can be doubled by 2040¹³ reflecting assumptions that much of the new population and employment growth will be focused in the urban core areas and along transit corridors.

Table 3.9: *Transportation (2010 Census)* below shows the mean travel time to work for commuters in Los Angeles County and the cities of Industry and Diamond Bar, and the percentages of various means of travel for these commuters.

City of Industry

According to the US Census Bureau (2010), the mean travel time to work for City of Industry residents was 18.8 minutes. Of these trips, none were on public transportation, 11.1 percent of commuters walked to work, and none used a bicycle. The mean travel time to work for Los Angeles County residents was 29.0 minutes. Of these trips, 7.1 percent were on public transportation, 2.9 percent walked to work, and 0.7 percent used a bicycle. In comparison to Los Angeles County commuting pattern data, the city's mean travel time to work was lower, and none of the city's workers had used public transportation or bicycles as their mode of transportation. However, the number of workers who walked to work was significantly higher than the county's.

City of Diamond Bar

According to the US Census Bureau (2010), the mean travel time to work for City of Diamond Bar was 34.7 minutes. Of these trips, 1.6 percent were on public transportation, 1.5 percent of commuters walked to work, and 0.1 percent used a bicycle. As noted above, the mean travel time to work for Los Angeles County residents was 29.0 minutes. Of these trips, 7.1 percent were on public transportation, 2.9 percent walked to work, and 0.7 percent used a bicycle. In comparison to Los Angeles County commuting pattern data, the city's mean travel time to work was higher, and fewer workers used public transportation, bicycles, or walking as their mode of transportation.

¹² Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA) 2009 Long Range Transportation Plan, p. 15.

¹³ Ibid, p. 21.

Table 3.9: Transportation (2010 Census)

Commute	Los Angeles County	City of Industry	City of Diamond Bar
Mean Travel Time to Work (minutes)	29.0 minutes	18.8 minutes	34.7 minutes
Car, truck, or van	83.4%	80.8%	90.2%
Public Transportation	7.1%	0.0%	1.6%
Walk	2.9%	11.1%	1.5%
Bicycle	0.7%	0.0%	0.1%
Taxi, motorcycle, or other means	1.3%	0.9%	0.0%
Worked at home	4.6%	5.8%	8.1%

Source: US Census Bureau, 2010

4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES AND MITIGATION

4.1 Methodology

As discussed in Section 3.0 above, no changes in the affected environment description have occurred since the CIA document was approved in December 2010, and the environmental consequences (impacts) for the build alternatives are similar to those discussed in the December 2010 CIA. The study area boundaries and existing land uses are the same as those described in the 2010 CIA. Refer to the 2010 CIA for graphics of the study area boundaries.

The evaluation of community impacts requires data collection from various sources, in addition to the application of a variety of analysis techniques. An initial assessment of the proposed project was completed through the review of aerial photographs and maps of the project study area. A vehicle survey of the study area was then conducted to gain a perspective of the study area to be potentially impacted by the proposed project.

The socioeconomic analysis was completed using data from the 2010 decennial census, the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transit Agency (LACMTA), and information from local (City of Industry and City of Diamond Bar) agencies. Demographic data for the study area census tracts were evaluated for characteristics such as population and population growth, race and ethnicity, household income, age, travel patterns, and housing characteristics (see Section 3.0, Affected Environment).

The data were evaluated in spreadsheets and figures to describe the potential socioeconomic impacts of the proposed project. To identify potential social impacts of the proposed project, the census tracts affected by the project were evaluated in comparison to the demographic characteristics of the Cities of Industry and Diamond Bar and Los Angeles County. Potential economic impacts were quantified based upon potential displacements as well as the loss of city property tax revenue. While the affected area related to social impacts includes the study area census tracts, the affected area related to land use and economics includes the parcels within the study area to be directly and indirectly impacted by the proposed project.

4.2 Growth Inducement

Growth inducement is defined as the relationship between the proposed transportation project and growth within the project area.

No Build

The No Build Alternative would not induce growth in the project area. However, this alternative also would not accommodate growth as envisioned in the City of Industry's and the City of Diamond Bar's General Plans.

Alternative 2

Alternative 2 would result in an increase in capacity, which will result in increased traffic safety by improving the merge and diverge operations of the SR-57 and SR-60 freeways in the vicinity of the Grand Avenue interchange. Increased traffic volumes along the SR-60 by 2035, along with the inadequate existing geometry of the interchange and freeway are expected to result in the deterioration of operating conditions along the SR-57/60 freeway. With implementation of Alternative 2, the existing spillback and congestion, paired with the short weaving condition, would be reduced. Although this alternative will add roadway capacity, it is not expected that it would add traffic trips within the study area and will not promote future economic or population growth. Therefore, Alternative 2 is not expected to induce additional growth within the city; rather it would improve existing conditions for the community and would accommodate planned growth within the city.

Alternative 3

Implementation of Alternative 3 would have similar impacts as Alternative 2. This alternative is also not anticipated to induce growth; rather, it would meet the project's purpose of increasing safety and accommodating existing and future traffic volumes more effectively.

4.3 Social Impacts

The demographic characteristics of the Cities of Industry and Diamond Bar and the study area are discussed in Section 3.2.1, Population and Growth Demographics.

4.3.1 Neighborhood Disruptions/Community Cohesion

Community cohesion is the degree to which residents have a "sense of belonging" to their neighborhood, a level of commitment of the residents to the community, or a strong attachment to neighbors, groups, and institutions, usually as a result of continued association over time. Cohesion refers to the degree of interaction among the individuals, groups, and institutions that make up a community. Roadway improvements may affect communities and neighborhoods in ways other than direct property acquisition and displacements. Roadway improvement projects have the potential to physically or

psychologically divide neighborhoods, separate resident children from schools, or fragment the edges of cohesive groups of people, thereby adversely affecting how a community or neighborhood functions.

Construction Impacts

No Build

While there are no cohesive neighborhoods present within the study area due to the predominance of industrial and commercial land uses, the No Build Alternative will maintain the existing conditions as is, which will continue to result in queue spillback onto the freeway at the eastbound off-ramp at Grand Avenue, and congestion and accident rates resulting from the existing short weave conditions on SR-57/60. However, no impacts would occur to cohesive neighborhoods since none are present.

Alternative 2

There are no cohesive neighborhoods present within the proposed project study area due to the prominence of industrial and commercial land uses. Residential areas within the City of Industry are small and are interspersed throughout the City. The portion of the proposed project located within the City of Industry is entirely within an industrial land use designation. The portion of the proposed project located within the City of Diamond Bar is located within multiple land use designations and uses. Since the proposed project improvements are not located within cohesive neighborhoods, construction activities would not adversely affect neighborhood cohesion.

Construction activities would require multiple, short-term freeway and connector closures to remove existing structures and erect falsework. During these closures, detours would be required. Construction-related impacts would occur to public and community facilities and emergency services such as fire and police protection and school bus service for the duration of construction. As discussed in the approved 2010 CIA document, the nearest fire station is located 0.75 miles southeast of the Grand Avenue interchange (Los Angeles County Fire Department, Station 120, Battalion Headquarters at 1051 South Grand Avenue in the City of Diamond Bar), and the nearest police station is located 1.5 miles north of the Grand Avenue interchange (Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department at 21695 Valley Boulevard in the City of Walnut). Emergency vehicles responding to calls from these stations would experience decreased response times when calls require them to traverse the Grand Avenue overcrossing.

In addition, the Pomona Unified School District has school bus routes that utilize the Grand Avenue overcrossing. The time to transport students to and from schools within the vicinity of the project area would increase and delays would be experienced for the duration of construction. The use of alternate routes may be required for emergency service vehicles

and school buses, and a detailed Transportation Management Plan (TMP) would be prepared to reduce these impacts. The TMP would be prepared during the PA/ED and PS&E phases for implementation during construction to mitigate the traffic impacts caused by construction of the proposed project. The TMP will identify potential measures as public awareness, changeable message signs (CMS), and Construction Zone Enhanced Enforcement Program (COZEEP) since night closure of SR-60/SR-57 would be required.

Also, pedestrian paths on Grand Avenue would also be disrupted by lane closures due to construction activities. Although the impacts associated with construction activities would be temporary, circulation and access would be adversely affected and mitigation would be required.

Alternative 3

Construction of Alternative 3 would have similar impacts as construction of Alternative 2; see discussion above. The project would be required to develop and implement a detailed Transportation Management Plan (TMP) to reduce construction-related traffic impacts on public services, community facilities, and pedestrian circulation.

Operational Impacts

Alternative 2

Beneficial impacts such as improved safety would be experienced with implementation of Alternative 2. Motor vehicles traveling along the SR-57/SR-60 Confluence would benefit from the additional safety due to the increased weaving distances that would be offered by the proposed project. Since there are no cohesive neighborhoods and Alternative 2 would result in improvements to travel time and provide pedestrian enhancements, no adverse operational impacts would result from implementation of this alternative. Alternative 2 would not divide a community, nor would it create barriers to access for motorists; rather, it would improve an existing transportation facility as well as improve access for motorists.

Alternative 3

Similar to Alternative 2, Alternative 3 would not divide a community or create barriers to access. Rather, it would improve safety and access for motorists. No operational impacts regarding community cohesion would occur with implementation of Alternative 3.

Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

COM-1 The project shall develop and implement a Transportation Management Plan (TMP) to reduce construction-related traffic impacts on public services, community facilities, and pedestrian circulation. The TMP would be prepared during the PA/ED and PS&E phases for implementation during construction to mitigate the traffic impacts caused by construction of the

proposed project. The TMP will identify potential measures as public awareness, changeable message signs (CMS), and Construction Zone Enhanced Enforcement Program (COZEEP) since night closure of SR-60/SR-57 would be required.

4.3.2 Title VI and Environmental Justice

Title VI requires that no person, because of race, color, religion, national origin, sex, age, or handicap, be excluded from participation in, denied benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination by any federal aid activity. Executive Order 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in disproportionately high and adverse health or environmental impacts to minority and low-income populations be avoided or minimized to the extent feasible.

The environmental justice analysis was conducted using census tract information from the 2010 census. The following analysis provides a comparison of three measures with which to evaluate environmental justice:

- Percentage of non-White minority residents including Hispanic/Latino
- Percentage of population below poverty level
- Median household income

Minority Population

The percentage of minority residents was calculated by subtracting the number of White residents (one race only, as identified by the 2010 Census) from 100 percent. As identified in Table 3.3, *Race and Ethnic Composition by County and City for 2000 and 2010*, above, the 2000 and 2010 Censuses revealed that the demographic makeup in the City of Diamond Bar includes a higher Asian population and lower Hispanic population (66.8 percent) than both the City of Industry (41.1 percent) and Los Angeles County (49.7 percent).

The study area census tracts all contain a relatively high percentage of minority populations ranging from 55.4 percent to 73.9 percent; more than half the populations in all tracts are minority populations. Also, there is a concentration of Asian residents in the study area census tracts, ranging from a low of 34.6 percent to a high of 65.7 percent, and also in the City of Diamond Bar at 52.5 percent. These figures are high as compared to the Asian populations in the City of Industry at 8.2 percent and Los Angeles County at 13.7 percent.

Poverty

According to the 2009 Poverty Guidelines of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), the poverty threshold for a family of four is \$22,050.¹⁴

As identified in Table 3.5, *General Demographics*, both cities in the project study area have higher median household incomes than the Los Angeles County median of \$54,878, with the City of Industry having a 37.6 percent higher median of \$75,521, and the City of Diamond Bar having a 55.2 percent higher median of \$85,163. The percentage of persons below the poverty level is fairly low in the City of Diamond Bar (5.6 percent) and in Los Angeles County (16.3 percent). The percentage of persons below the poverty level is somewhat higher in the City of Industry at 37.3 percent, just over one-third of the city's total population.

Since the study area does include a higher percentage of minority populations as compared to the cities and county and also pockets of low income, an environmental justice analysis is warranted.

Construction Impacts

No Build

Under the No Build Alternative, no roadway construction associated with reconfiguration of the overcrossing would occur. The No Build Alternative would maintain existing conditions, and there would be no permanent impacts. The existing congestion conditions would continue to affect the general and environmental justice populations. Therefore, no temporary construction-related or long-term operational environmental justice impacts would occur with project implementation.

Alternatives 2 and 3

Construction of either of the proposed alternatives would result in temporary impacts such as short-term traffic congestion resulting from lane closures, and air quality impacts from construction activities (please see the Air Quality Report prepared for the project for further discussion of Air Quality impacts). These impacts would occur for all drivers and pedestrians traversing the project area and would not be limited to minority or low-income populations. Therefore, impacts to minority and low-income populations within the project area would not be disproportionate or adverse. Construction impacts would be temporary in nature. Construction-related traffic impacts would be reduced with implementation of Mitigation Measure COM-1 above, development of a Transportation Management Plan (TMP), which would be implemented for the duration of construction. Mitigation Measure

¹⁴ <http://aspe.hhs.gov/poverty/09poverty.shtml>

COM-1 would be effective for all populations in the study area, including minority and low-income populations. Construction-related air quality impacts would be reduced through compliance with South Coast Air Quality Management District's (SCAQMD) Rule 403 requirements, adherence to all Best Management Practices (BMPs) and Construction Guidelines of all applicable jurisdictions, and compliance with adopted 2007 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) emissions control measures.

Minority or low-income populations identified in the project area would not be disproportionately affected by construction of the proposed project, as determined above.

Operational Impacts

Alternatives 2 and 3

As identified above, there are higher levels of minority populations (Asian populations), within the study area, specifically, in the City of Diamond Bar (52.5 percent) and all the study area census tracts (ranging from 34.6 percent to 65.7 percent). The low-income populations are lower than the City of Diamond Bar and County with the exception of one area studied, the City of Industry (37.3 percent). However, it is not anticipated that the proposed project would result in disproportionately high or adverse impacts to this tract. On the contrary, the project addresses existing circulation problems within the vicinity of the community, and would result in beneficial impacts to the community as a result of the proposed freeway improvements. Increased weaving distances would also be a beneficial impact, particularly in the portions of the project currently experiencing queue spillback onto the freeway at the eastbound off-ramp at Grand Avenue, and congestion and accident rates resulting from the existing short weave conditions on SR-57/60.

The proposed project would not result in any displacements; therefore, would not divide a minority population or impact the economic vitality of these populations. The proposed project is expected to reduce congestion and improve safety for all populations within the study area.

Minority or low-income populations identified in the project area would not be disproportionately affected by operation of the proposed project, as determined above.

Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

As identified above, there is not an elevated level of minority and low-income populations within the study area. It is not anticipated that the proposed project would result in disproportionately high or adverse impacts to these populations. On the contrary, the project addresses existing circulation problems within the vicinity of the community, and would result in beneficial impacts to the community as a result of the proposed freeway improvements, including increased quality of life due to reduced air quality and noise impacts, and increased safety, particularly in the portions of the project currently

experiencing queue spillback onto the freeway at the eastbound off-ramp at Grand Avenue, and congestion and accident rates resulting from the existing short weave conditions on SR-57/60. The proposed project would not result in any displacements; therefore, would not divide a minority population or impact the economic vitality of these populations. The proposed project is expected to reduce congestion and improve safety for all populations within the study area. No minority or low-income populations have been identified that would be adversely affected by the proposed project, as determined above. Therefore, this project is not subject to the provisions of Executive Order 12898.

4.4 Economics

Employment and income demographics were discussed in Section 3.4: *Regional and Community Economic Conditions*. Due to the potential for the project to increase employment temporarily during the construction phase of the project, economic impacts are discussed below.

Tax Revenue

Property Tax Revenue

Property taxes are based on the assessed value of all privately-owned property within each tax rate area of each city. Property taxes for properties within the study area are collected by the county and apportioned to local jurisdictions, the amount levied being approximately 1 percent of assessed property value. Property tax revenues generated in a tax rate area are then distributed to the county, city, special districts, and schools within the subject tax rate area based on tax rates for each tax rate area. Property tax revenues generated by the property are distributed in the county and city in which the property is located and to the special districts and schools in the tax rate area.

Sales Tax Revenue

An impact to sales tax revenue would occur if a project caused a business in the project area to lose business and thereby, experience reduced revenue. This in turn would reduce the sales tax funds remitted to a jurisdiction by that business. This generally could occur if a business were to be relocated and/or removed as a result of right-of-way acquisition associated with project implementation.

Construction Impacts

No Build

The No Build Alternative would not result in any construction-related impacts.

Alternatives 2 and 3

Temporary project impacts are defined as those that would occur during the construction of the proposed project. Construction-related impacts would occur with both Alternative 2

and Alternative 3. However, these temporary impacts would not occur prior to the construction effort and would cease upon completion and full operation of the project improvements. Temporary impacts would occur over a construction period of approximately 24 months.

Operational Impacts

Alternatives 2 and 3

Property Tax Revenue

The proposed project is anticipated to improve access and traffic circulation within the study area. Residential and non-residential property values within the study area (not directly impacted by full or partial acquisitions) may increase slightly as a result of these improvements, but a major change in property values is not anticipated with implementation of the proposed improvements. Access to the local businesses would be maintained in the long-term.

Because no residential acquisitions and only a very minor business right-of-way acquisition would occur with implementation of the proposed project, there would not be a significant loss of property tax revenue for the city. This is not considered to be a significant loss, and this loss would not significantly impact either city's ability to provide services to residents.

Sales Tax Revenue

The right-of-way acquisitions associated with the project would not cause any sales tax-generating businesses to be acquired or relocated. No loss of sales tax revenue is anticipated for the city, county, or state as a result of the proposed project.

Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required, since no economic impacts are anticipated with project implementation.

5.0 REFERENCES USED AND CONTACTS

5.1 References

California Association of Realtors (CAR) Website: www.car.org

California Employment Development Department (EDD) Website: www.edd.ca.gov

California Department of Finance (DOF) Website: www.dof.ca.gov

California Housing and Community Development Department (HCD) Website:
www.hcd.ca.gov

City of Diamond Bar General Plan Land Use and Transportation Element, City of
Diamond Bar, July, 1995.

City of Diamond Bar 2008 Housing Element, April 2009.

City of Diamond Bar Website, www.cityofdiamondbar.com

City of Industry General Plan Land Use and Transportation Element, May 1971.

City of Industry General Plan Housing Element, December 2007.

City of Industry Website, www.cityofindustry.org

Los Angeles County General Plan Land Use Element, 2008.

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA), *2009 Long
Range Transportation Plan*, 2009.

Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) Website: www.scag.ca.gov

Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), *Profile of the County of Los
Angeles*, May 2009.

U.S. Census Bureau Website: www.census.gov

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) Website: www.hhs.gov

Zillow Real Estate Website: www.zillow.com

5.2 Contacts

RBF Consulting

Monica Kling, LEED AP

Renee Randolph

ICF International

Mario Anaya