

*Readers' Guidance:*

*This chapter includes updates to the subject from that reported in the Draft EIR/EIS in April 2004.*

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK

## CHAPTER 6 - AGENCY COORDINATION

### 6-1 FEDERAL AGENCIES

The proposed project was presented to responsible federal agencies with jurisdiction over and or interest in the proposed project through the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) during the scoping process. The text of the Scoping report can be found in Chapter 8, Public Outreach. The full scoping report, *Gold Line Phase II Extension Pasadena to Montclair Scoping Report, September 5, 2003*, is available upon request.

The NEPA Scoping period for the proposed project commenced on July 2, 2003, with FTA's signing of the Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The NOI was published in the Federal Register on July 9, 2003 (FR 41749, Vol. 67, No. 118.). The NEPA Scoping period closed on August 1, 2003.

The NOI announced the FTA's intent to prepare an EIS in accordance with NEPA. This provided formal notice of the opportunity to comment in writing and/or at the public scoping meetings. The NOI also included information on the project background, study area, potential alternatives, probable effects to be studied, FTA procedures, relevant scoping meeting information, and contact information.

Fourteen Federal agencies and seven Members of Congress received a Notice of Preparation (NOP) and Initial Study Checklist via the scoping process for the CEQA process. Please see Chapter 8, Public Outreach for a description of the scoping process.

Two meetings were held with the Federal Transit Administration in the fall 2003 during the DEIS/DEIR process. These meetings were attended by representatives from FTA, the Construction Authority, and the consultant team. The purpose of the meetings was to discuss the project and schedule, as well as any other potential issues. Additional meetings were held with FTA representatives throughout the environmental process.

### 6-2 STATE RESOURCE AGENCIES

The proposed regionally significant transportation project was presented to twenty-four responsible and trustee State agencies; transportation agencies within a 10-mile radius; and other interested parties through the CEQA scoping process. The scoping process was initiated by posting the NOP and Initial Study Checklist with the State of California, Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse on June 27, 2003, and the Los Angeles County Clerk on June 28, 2003.

The NOP announced the Authority's intent to prepare an EIR pursuant to CEQA. Like the NOI, it provided formal notice of the opportunity to comment in writing and/or at the public scoping meetings and commenced the CEQA scoping period. The NOP advised California agencies of their obligation to comment on the proposed project within 30 days. The NOP also included information on the proposed project, alternatives, and anticipated effects (based on an environmental screening of alternatives included in the Planning Alternatives Analysis), as well as scoping meeting and contact information. The CEQA Scoping period closed on August 1, 2003.

Consultation and coordination with the California Air Resources Board and the Public Utilities Commission have been initiated. A letter was sent to the Native American Heritage Commission on

October 10, 2003, requesting the contact information for tribal representatives who may have an interest in the proposed project. The Native American Commission responded with the information requested and the Native American representatives were placed on the Scoping Mailing list, thus receiving Notices of Preparation and Initial Study Checklists.

## 6-3 SECTION 106 CONSULTATION

Compliance with Section 106 of the Historic Preservation Act, as amended is documented in Section 3.5, Cultural Resources. The following is a summary of the Section 106 consultation process.

The Section 106 regulations require that a federal agency evaluate all properties within the area of Potential Effect (APE) and identify historic properties by gathering information from consulting parties, applying the National Register Criteria, and seeking concurrence from the SHPO or Indian tribe, as appropriate. During the preparation of this EIS, FTA identified the following consulting parties for historic properties within the APE:

- California State Historic Preservation Office – Dr. Knox Mellon
- Gabrielino Cahuilla Lusieno - Samuel H. Dunlap
- Beverly Salazar Folkes
- Ti'At Society – Cindi Alvitre
- Island Gabrielino Group – John Jeffredo
- John Valenzuela
- Gabrieleno/Tongva Indians of California – Robert F. Dorame, Chairperson
- Gabrieleno/Tongva Tribal Council – Anthony Morales, Chairperson
- Gabrieleno/Tongva - Craig Torres
- Coastal Gabrieleno Diguero - Jim Velasques
- Alfred L. Valenzuela.

FTA sent a letter to the California SHPO on September 16, 2003, initiating Section 106 consultation. Notice of Preparation (NOP) letters were sent to the listed Native American groups and individuals on July 30, 2003.

In addition, five Scoping meetings (four for the general public and one for public agencies) were held in an open house format with information stations and illustrated display boards. The meetings were staffed by members representing the Authority and the project consultant team, all of whom were well versed about the proposed project and potential environmental impacts. In addition to answering questions at the meeting, staff invited attendees to submit their comments in writing. Comment forms were provided at each Scoping meeting. Chinese and Spanish interpreters were present at the meeting for non-English speaking members of the public. Public Scoping Meetings were held in the cities of San Dimas, Claremont, South Pasadena, and Arcadia during the weeks of July 14 and 21, 2003. A meeting for public agencies was held on July 22, 2003 at the Authority Offices in South Pasadena. Letters were sent to other potentially interested parties on November 7, 2003, including the following:

- AIA Los Angeles
- Arcadia Historical Society

- Azusa Historical Society
- California Historical Society
- California Preservation Foundation
- California State Railroad Museum
- Chinese Historical Society
- Claremont Heritage, Inc.
- City of Arcadia Development Services Department
- City of Azusa Community Development Department
- City of Claremont Planning Department
- City of Duarte Community Development Department
- City of Glendora Planning Department
- City of Irwindale Planning Department
- City of La Verne
- City of Los Angeles Community Redevelopment Agency
- City of Los Angeles Cultural Heritage Commission
- City of Los Angeles Planning Department
- City of Monrovia Community Development Department
- City of Montclair Community Development Department
- City of Pomona Planning Department
- City of San Dimas
- Cooper Museum/Chaffey Communities Cultural Center
- Duarte Historical Society, Museum & Friends of the Duarte Library
- Glendora Community Conservancy
- Glendora Historical Society
- Historical Society of Pomona Valley
- Historical Society of Southern California
- La Verne Heritage Foundation
- Lomita Railroad Museum
- Los Angeles City Historical Society
- Los Angeles Conservancy
- Los Angeles County Historic Landmarks and Records Commission
- Los Angeles Forum for Architecture and Urban Design
- Los Angeles Railroad Heritage Foundation

- Monrovia Historical Society
- Monrovia Old House Preservation Group
- Pacific Railroad Society
- Pasadena Heritage
- Pomona Heritage
- Rivers and Mountains Conservancy
- San Bernardino Railroad Historical Society
- San Dimas Historical Society
- San Dimas Pacific Railroad Museum
- Sierra Club, Los Angeles Chapter
- Sierra Madre Historical Society
- Society of Architectural Historians, Southern California Chapter
- Southern Pacific Historical & Technical Society
- Train Riders Association of Southern California
- Train Web, Inc.
- The Transit Coalition
- The Transportation and Land Use Collaborative of Southern California
- Travel Town Transportation Museum
- Wheel Clicks.

Response letters were received from the cities of Monrovia, Irwindale, Azusa, and Glendora, and from the San Gabriel Rivers and Mountains Conservancy. These letters are summarized below, and are included in the Draft Historic Property Survey and Effects Report.

City of Monrovia: The City of Monrovia has been awarded grants for the rehabilitation of the Monrovia Depot at 1709 Myrtle Avenue, and has hired a consultant to complete an historical background survey as part of the Section 106 requirements. All work on the depot will follow the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. (The Monrovia Depot was previously determined eligible for the National Register. See APE Map No. 2.)

City of Irwindale: The City of Irwindale reviewed property files and researched pertinent documents, such as the City's General Plan, and found no evidence that there are any sites that contain or represent any significant archeological, architectural, or historical resources within the APE.

City of Azusa: The City of Azusa mentioned that there are two properties on the City's List of Potential Historic Landmarks within the project APE boundaries: the historic Santa Fe Depot at 129 East Santa Fe Avenue, and a historic citrus packing house at 836-840 North Soldano Avenue. Both properties are on the City's list of Potential Historic Landmarks as being significant because they are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local and regional history and the cultural heritage of

California. (The Azusa Santa Fe Railroad Depot was previously determined eligible for the National Register. The citrus packing house does not appear to meet National Register Criteria. See APE Map No. 6.)

City of Glendora: The City of Glendora mentioned that there may be one property on Vista Bonita Avenue that may qualify as a historic resource under the California Register and National Register within the boundaries of the APE. (APE Map No. 8.)

The Rivers and Mountains Conservancy attached a list of historical resources catalogued in December 2002 that are located within its jurisdiction. (Two of these are within the APE: the Monrovia Santa Fe Depot in Monrovia [APE Map No. 2.] and the Atchison Topeka and Santa Fe Railroad Station in Claremont [APE Map No. 17.]

As of ~~January 30, 2004~~ September 1, 2005 no other written responses were received from the parties listed above.

## 6-4 REGIONAL/LOCAL AGENCIES

Agency consultation and participation has been ongoing throughout the life of the project. Weekly Project Development Team (PDT) meetings were held at the Construction Authority's offices in South Pasadena and Monrovia from the beginning of the EIS/EIR, and these meetings are scheduled to continue throughout the life of the proposed project. The PDT meetings were among the Construction Authority, LACTMA, and the project consultant team, with occasional attendance by other agencies.

Stakeholder briefings have taken place during the life of this project. The purpose of the stakeholder briefings is to ensure that local elected officials, agencies, and bureaus remain up to date on the study's progress. Information presented included discussing the existing corridor transportation problems, potential solutions, and anticipated environmental impacts. Information was also presented at policy and technical committee meetings. At each meeting, attendees were presented with opportunities to identify issues, raise concerns, and seek clarifications, which have been incorporated into this document.

~~Three~~ Seven cycles of meetings with the individual cities occurred ~~following Scoping~~ during the environmental process. The first round of meetings included a detailed project briefing including the four alternatives under consideration, collection and discussion of planning and traffic data that had been requested prior to the meeting, discussion of public and city issues raised during and subsequent to Scoping, identification of potential station and parking locations, discussion of public outreach needs, and review of the project schedule.

The second round of meetings reviewed the results of early conceptual engineering, and focused on proposed station layouts, parking locations and forecasted parking demand.

The third round of meetings included copies of the projects' purpose and need statement, alternatives descriptions, and conceptual engineering drawings. A preview of environmental impacts, such as probable locations of soundwalls and traffic impacts, was presented, along with potential mitigation. The third round also included review of the overall schedule and identification of potential public hearing dates and formats. The remainder of the meetings focused on city-specific issues, review of design and construction, or environmental aspects of the proposed project.

In addition to the city staff briefings, the Construction Authority Board and the Gold Line Foothill Extension Joint Powers Authority Board received periodic reports on the progress of technical studies, conceptual engineering, and environmental documentation.