4. COMMENTS AND COORDINATION

Early and continuing coordination with the general public and public agencies is an essential part of the environmental process. It helps planners determine the necessary scope of environmental documentation and the level of analysis required, and to identify potential impacts and avoidance, minimization and/or mitigation measures and related environmental requirements. Agency and tribal consultation and public participation for this Project have been accomplished through a variety of formal and informal methods, including interagency coordination meetings, public meetings, public notices, Project Development Team (PDT) meetings. This chapter summarizes the results of the Department's efforts to fully identify, address, and resolve projectrelated issues through early and continuing coordination.

4.1 Consultation and Coordination with Public Agencies:

The following provides a summary of all coordination relevant to the development of the Project during the Project Approval and Environmental Document (PA&ED) phase.

4.1.1 Cultural Resources

4.1.1.1 Historic Properties

Letters were sent on August 21, 2017 to the Anaheim Historical Society, Orange Community Historical Society, and Orange County Historical Society. Follow up emails were sent on December 20, 2017. No responses were received.

4.1.1.2 Native American Consultation

Native American Heritage Commission

The NAHC was contacted initially on March 24, 2017 to request a search of its Sacred Lands Database. The NAHC responded on March 28, 2017 that the search did not yield any information regarding the presence of Native American sacred lands or cultural resources within one-mile of the APE. The same response was provided by the NAHC on August 24, 2017 upon the request to confirm the results.

A Local Government Tribal Consultation List Request was submitted to the NAHC on September 1, 2017 to obtain the CEQA Tribal Consultation list. The NAHC responded on September 7, 2017 requesting that 19 Tribal Contacts be consulted.

Native American Tribes, Groups and Individuals

Caltrans District 12 sent a total of 21 letters to the Native American tribal representatives on September 29, 2017 to meet the requirements of Assembly Bill 52 and Section 106. Follow up attempts were made on October 13, 2017 and October 23, 2017 by phone and email. A total of four responses were received and are summarized below:

- Gabrielino Band of Mission Indians-Kizh Nation, Andrew Salas, Chairperson: Responded on October 11, 2017 and requested consultation.
- Gabrieleno Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council, Robert F. Dorame, Chairperson: Responded on October 23, 2017 and requested a digital version of the Tribal Consultation Letter be sent to a gmail account. A digital version of the letter was sent that day and no additional response from Mr. Dorame was received.
- Gabrielino/Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians, Anthony Morales, Chairperson: Responded on October 23, 2017 and requested due diligence in the form of archaeological and Native American monitoring be conducted because the Project crosses over the Santa Ana River, which the Tribe considers culturally sensitive. Mr Morales also requested that the Tribe be retained for Native American monitoring.
- Juaneno Band of Mission Indians Acjachemen Nation, Joyce Perry, Tribal Manager: Responded on October 14, 2017 that the Tribe has no comments or concerns.

On October 11, 2017 in response to the request for consultation by Mr. Andrew Salas, Chairman for the Gabrielino Band of Mission Indians-Kitz Nation, Caltrans initiated consultation the same day. On October 31, 2017 Caltrans provided project details to assist the Tribe in identifying significant cultural resources within the project area. On December 7, 2017 Ms. Sinopoli (Caltrans Archaeologist), Mr. Baker (Caltrans Environmental Branch Chief) Chairman Andrew Salas (Chairman of the Gabrielino Band of Mission Indians-Kizh Nation) and Mr Teutimez (Natural and Cultural Resources Director of the Gabrielino Band of Mission Indians-Kizh Nation) met in the field to discuss the project APE. During consultations, Caltrans noted that of particular concern to the Tribe was the potential to encounter cultural resources within the Santa Ana River/Angel Stadium area. The Tribe requested more in-depth research regarding the village of Houtkngna, historic and prehistoric flows of the Santa Ana River, and additional information clarifying the use of artificial fill for construction of SR 57.

On January 29, 2018 Caltrans provided the results of the additional research requested by the Tribe. Based on the additional research conducted and evidence provided, Caltrans noted that their conclusion was that the potential to encounter cultural resources on this Project was low. On February 23, 2018 Mr. Teutimez requested additional discussion noting that the Tribe did not agree with Caltrans determination and that they felt the methods used to make the determination missed the reason for tribal consultation. Mr. Teutimez requested another meeting with Caltrans, and Caltrans management in particular, as the Tribe knows the area and would like the Tribes documentation and oral information to be correctly represented. On February 27, 2018, after reviewing Mr Teutimez's response and notes from the December 7, 2017 field visit in great detail, Caltrans responded to each of the Tribe's concerns and requested that the Tribe clarify which aspects of the research they disagreed with so that they could be addressed and resolved.

On March 5, 2018 Mr. Teutimez stated that the specific concerns related to the village location of Houtkngna, the origins of the fill material used for the construction of SR 57 and the potential for ground disturbance within the Santa Ana River to uncover cultural resources were the Tribe's key concerns. Mr Teutimez requested protective mitigation measures be set in place to preserve unknown cultural resources within the fill material unless it could be proven that the fill materials do not contain tribal cultural resources and/or human remains. On March 28, 2018 Caltrans responded to Mr Teutimez's concerns and noted that they welcomed the Tribe's oral information regarding the village location of Houtkngna, based on the information presented to date (including as-built plans) Caltrans views the potential to encounter cultural resources within the fill material as very low, and additional record search information regarding the Santa Ana River showed only three cultural resources (two historic refuse scatters and one prehistoric isolate).

Additional communications via email between Caltrans and the Tribe resulted in the location of the Village of Hutuknga being revised in the study. However, Caltrans concluded that based on their research the potential for encountering cultural resources was extremely low and given the lack of evidence to the contrary, Caltrans would maintain their conclusion. In an email on April 17, 2018 from Mr. Baker to Mr. Salas and Mr. Teutimez, he noted that based on Caltrans conclusions, funding for archaeological or Native American monitoring during construction would not be provided. Caltrans offered to make arrangements for the Tribe to conduct monitoring or spot checking on an unpaid, voluntary basis; however, no further response was received. A summary of the correspondence is provided in **Table 4-1: Native American Tribes, Groups, and Individuals Contacted for the Project**.

According to Caltrans Policy and practice, Native American monitoring is solicited only in the following cases: during archaeological excavations, during construction activities in areas adjacent to know Native American archaeological or cultural sites, and during construction activities in areas where there is a high probability that there may be buried deposits. The identification efforts summarized in Section 2.1.11 of this document for the Project did not identify either a historic property within or adjacent to the project area, or a high probability of intact, buried cultural deposits.

		Summary of Coordination			
Notes: *Letter from Caltrans: Caltrans requests information or concerns regarding cultural resources in the project area. *Follow up: by phone and email.					
Name/Affiliation	Date	Activity	Response Received?		
Ralph Goff, Chairperson Campo Band of Mission Indians	September 29, 2017	*Letter from Caltrans	None		
	October 13, 2017	*Follow up.			
	October 23, 2017	*Follow up.			
Robert Pinto, Chairperson Ewiiaapaayp Tribal Office	Same information as e	ntry above.	None		
Michael Garcia, Vice Chairperson Ewiiaapaayp Tribal Office					
Andrew Salas,	September 29, 2017	*Letter from Caltrans	Yes		
Chairperson Gabrielino Band of	October 11, 2017	Email. Requested consultation with Caltrans.			
Mission Indians-Kizh Nation	October 31, 2017	Ms. Sinopoli (Caltrans archaeologist) sent information on project activities.			
	November 1, 2017	Sinopoli emailed additional information. Suggested on site/ in field consultation.			
	December 7, 2017	Sinopoli and Mr. Charles Baker (Environmental Branch Chief) of Caltrans and Chairperson Andrew Salas and Natural & Cultural Resources Director Matthew Teutimez of the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation met in field. Discussed concerns and provided information about concerns within SAR/Angel Stadium concerning potential resources.			
	December 8, 2017	Sinopoli notified Tribe that field meeting notes would be shared with OCTA's archeology consultant, Cogstone Resource Management, Inc.			

Summary of Coordination					
Notes: *Letter from Caltrans: Caltrans requests information or concerns regarding cultural resources in the project area. *Follow up: by phone and email.					
Name/Affiliation	Date	Activity	Response Received?		
	January 29, 2018	Sinopoli notified tribe that Cogstone completed additional research.			
	February 7/22, 2018	Baker & Sinopoli followed up the Kizh Tribe to capture any responses regarding the Project.			
	February 23, 2018	Teutimez requested to further discussion with Caltrans due to disagreements regarding the assessment of the project's impacts on potential tribal resources.			
	February 27, 2018	Sinopoli reviewed tribe-provided information. Addressed concerns. Teutimez was notified that the Environmental Analysis Deputy was to join the team as a member of Caltrans management, based on his request.			
	March 5, 2018	Teutimez requested to discuss with Caltrans specific topics including the Tribes' knowledge of the triiaballe resources in the project area, Caltrans comments regarding artificial fills according to the as-built plans, and Tribal proposed protective mitigation measures.			
	March 6, March 28, April 16, April 17, April 24, April 25, and April 27 of 2018	Correspondence to evaluate available information on tribal resources and assessment of project impacts.			
	April 27, 2018	Sinopoli, Baker, Salas met in field to review information provided by Salas.			

Summary of Coordination					
Notes: *Letter from Caltrans: Caltrans requests information or concerns regarding cultural resources in the project area. *Follow up: by phone and email.					
Name/Affiliation	Date	Activity	Response Received?		
	May 8, 2018	Baker corresponded with Salas and Teutimez to inform them that the information they provided lead to adjustment in the location of the evaluated resourcesVillage of Hutunkngna (outside the APE); however, Caltrans determined that the evidence still shows that the potential to encounter cultural resources during construction is low.			
Robert F. Dorame, Chairperson Gabrielino Tongva Indians of CA Tribal Council	October 23, 2017	Dorame requested a digital version of the letter sent by Caltrans requesting information. The digital form of the letter was sent on the same day. No other response.	Yes		
Sandonne Goad,	September 29, 2017	*Letter from Caltrans	None		
Chairperson and Sam Dunlap.	October 13, 2017	*Follow up.			
Gabrielino/Tongva Nation	October 23, 2017	*Follow up.			
Gabrielino/Tongva	September 29, 2017	*Letter from Caltrans	Yes		
San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians,	October 13, 2017	*Follow up.			
Anthony Morales, Chairperson	October 23, 2017	Morales requested archaeological and Native American monitoring be conducted at SAR.			
Gabrielino-Tongva	September 29, 2017	*Letter from Caltrans	None		
Tribe, Charles Alvarez, Chairperson: No response.	October 13, 2017	*Follow up.			
	October 23, 2017	*Follow up.			

		Summary of Coordination			
Notes: *Letter from Caltrans: Caltrans requests information or concerns regarding cultural resources in the project area. *Follow up: by phone and email.					
Name/Affiliation	Date	Activity	Response Received?		
Linda Candelaria, Co-Chairperson Gabrielino-Tongva Tribe	Same information as en	None			
Erica Pinto, Chairperson Jamul Indian Village			None		
Sonia Johnston, Chairperson Juaneno Band of Mission Indians,			None		
Joyce Perry, Tribal	September 29, 2017	*Letter from Caltrans	Yes		
Manager Juaneno Band of Mission	October 13, 2017	*Follow up.			
Indians Acjachemen	October 23, 2017	*Follow up.			
Nation	October 14, 2018	Responded to indicate no concerns.			
Juaneno Band of	September 29, 2017	*Letter from Caltrans	None		
Mission Indians	October 13, 2017	*Follow up.	1		
Acjachemen Nation, Matias Belardes, Chairperson	October 23, 2017	*Follow up.			

		Summary of Coordination				
Notes: *Letter from Caltrans: Caltrans requests information or concerns regarding cultural resources in the project area. *Follow up: by phone and email.						
Name/Affiliation	Date	Activity	Response Received?			
Juaneno Band of Mission Indians Acjachemen Nation, Teresa Romero, Chairperson	Same information as ent	ry above.	None			
La Posta Band of Mission Indians, Javaughn Miller, Tribal Administrator						
La Posta Band of Mission Indians, Gwendolyn Parada, Chairperson						
Angela Elliot Santos, Chairperson Manzanita Band of Kumeyaay Nation,						
John Valenzuela, Chairperson San Fernando Band of Mission Indians						
Allen E. Lawson, Chairperson San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians						

Summary of Coordination				
Notes: *Letter from Caltrans: Caltrans requests information or concerns regarding cultural resources in the project area. *Follow up: by phone and email.				
Name/Affiliation	Date	Activity	Response Received?	
Cody J. Martinez, Chairperson Sycuan Band of the Kumeyaay Nation				
Robert J. Welch, Chairperson Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians				
Source: Caltrans District 12,	Cheryl Sinopoli's Corresponder	nce with Tribal Leaders, 2018.		

4.1.2 Interagency Coordination (TCWG)

A PM Conformity Hot Spot Analysis Project Summary Form for Interagency Consultation was prepared for the Project and presented for consideration by the SCAG Transportation Conformity Working Group (TCWG) at their January 23, 2018 meeting. In February 2018, the Project was posted to SCAG website indicating that the working group had determined the project is not a Project of Air Quality Concern (POAQC) and no quantitative PM hotspot analysis would be required for the Project.

4.1.3 Biological Resources

On August 9, 2017, an official USFWS List of Proposed, Threatened, and Endangered Species, and Critical Habitats was obtained through the USFWS Information System. On February 7, 2019 list was updated and is included in Appendix E.

The proposed project is a Covered Activity under the OCTA M2 Natural Community Conservation Plan/Habitat Conservation Plan (NCCP/HCP). On March 15, 2019 Caltrans sent a letter to USFWS and CDFW, collectively referred to as the Wildlife Agencies, requesting concurrence that the project is consistent with the NCCP/HCP. On March 26, 2019 a Certificate of Inclusion (COI) was received from the USFWS (**refer to Figure 4-1: Certificate of Inclusion**). The COI extends to Caltrans coverage under the permit issued to OCTA, which authorizes the take of certain "covered" species within the area covered by the NCCP/HCP.

4.1.4 Section 4(f) Resources

On August 25, 2018, a letter was sent to Stacy Blackwood at OC Parks to notify those with jurisdiction over the Santa Ana River Trail within the project boundary that the Project would cause a de minimis impact to the trail. A de minimis impact was determined by Caltrans for this Project's construction activities and would be presented as so within the draft environmental document for public review. Following public review, a letter of concurrence from OC Parks was requested. OC Parks provided written concurrence on February 7, 2019. A copy of the correspondence letters in this regard are included in Appendix E.

Figure 4-1: Certificate of Inclusion



U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office 2177 Salk Avenue, Suite 250 Carlsbad, California 92008

In Reply Refer To: FWS/CDFW-OR-19B0110-19CPA0136



CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE South Coast Region 3883 Ruffin Road San Diego, California 92123

> March 26, 2019 Sent by Email

Mr. Charles Baker California Department of Transportation – District 12 1750 East Fourth Street, Suite 100 Santa Ana, California 92705

Subject: OCTA M2 Natural Community Conservation Plan/Habitat Conservation Plan Consistency Review for the State Route 57 Northbound Project G Segment 1a in Orange County, California

Dear Mr. Baker:

This is in response to your March 18, 2019, letter regarding the State Route 57 (SR-57) Northbound Project G Segment 1a. The proposed project is a Covered Activity under the Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA) M2 Natural Community Conservation Plan/Habitat Conservation Plan (NCCP/HCP). Your letter requests concurrence from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (Department), collectively referred to as the Wildlife Agencies, that the project is consistent with the NCCP/HCP.

The project includes the construction of a 550-foot general purpose lane in the northbound direction of SR-57 through the Katella Avenue interchange, upgrades to the median and sight distances, and reconfiguration of the existing on- and off-ramps between the Orangewood Avenue and Katella Avenue interchanges. The project occurs in the City of Anaheim, Orange County.

On June 19, 2017, the Service and Department issued section 10(a)(1)(B) (TE 32842C-0) and NCCP (2835-2017-001-05) permits under the Federal Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*), and Section 2835 of the California Fish and Game Code, respectively, to OCTA for the NCCP/HCP. The NCCP/HCP established a multiple species conservation program to minimize and mitigate habitat losses and the incidental take of Covered Species in association with implementation of Covered Activities addressed by the permits.

In accordance with 50 CFR § 13.25(d), a permittee may extend its incidental take authorization to certain third parties, provided such third parties are under the permittee's direct control or under contract with permittee for purposes of implementing the requirements of the permit. The NCCP/HCP and Section 7.1 of the Implementing Agreement provide that OCTA may extend take coverage under the State and Federal permits to the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) by executing a Certificate of Inclusion. A Certificate of Inclusion was executed for Caltrans for the proposed project at OCTA's request on March 15, 2019.

Mr. Charles Baker (FWS/CDFW-OR-19B0110-19CPA0136)

Caltrans has determined that the project will have "no effect" on federally listed species. However, the project is a Covered Activity under the NCCP/HCP and has the potential to affect non-listed Covered Species. Therefore, Caltrans has requested concurrence by the Wildlife Agencies that the project is consistent with the NCCP/HCP.

As described in the document entitled "OCTA M2 Natural Community Conservation Plan/Habitat Conservation Plan Project G Review" dated March 12, 2019, Caltrans has determined that the proposed project will be implemented consistent with the NCCP/HCP, and based on the information provided, the Wildlife Agencies agree with this determination.

In addition, it is the Department's understanding that Caltrans will coordinate with the Department to identify and minimize potential project impacts to fish passage as required under California Senate Bill 857, once more detailed project design information is available. We encourage initiating this process as early as possible in order to prevent any potential delays to project implementation.

Thank you for your coordination on this project. If you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact Colleen Draguesku of the Service at 760-431-9440, extension 221, or Simona Altman of the Department at (858) 467-4283.

Sincerely,

JONATHAN SNYDER

Digitally signed by JONATHAN SNYDER Date: 2019.03.26 14:42:11 -07'00'

Karen A. Goebel Assistant Field Supervisor U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Crail & Saman

Gail K. Sevrens Environmental Program Manager California Department of Fish and Wildlife

cc: Simona Altman, Department Colleen Draguesku, Service Lesley Hill, OCTA David Mayer, Department Kyle Rice, Department Chris Waterston, Caltrans 2 ver

4.2 Public Outreach

4.2.1 PDT Meetings

Caltrans, OCTA, and consultants comprise the Project Development Team (PDT), which has held and will continue to hold monthly project meetings with the cities of Anaheim and Orange. These PDT meetings discuss project design, status, and schedule.

The Cities of Orange and Anaheim have participated in the project review process and have not indicated concern regarding the Project and potential impacts for emergency services.

4.2.2 OCTA Outreach Campaign

Since the start of the PSR-PDS phase of the Project, public outreach has included the Project webpage (<u>www.octa.net/57fwy</u>), project alerts over email and social media, and a public information open house. As the Project progresses through alternatives development and project design phases, public outreach will also include elected official briefings, community presentations, social media alerts and updates, a telephone helpline, and constituent services.

4.2.3 Public Information Meeting

As part of the public outreach effort for the Project, an open-house style public information meeting took place on June 22, 2017. To promote awareness of the public information open house, a public notification and engagement campaign was developed to effectively communicate with and involve key decision-makers, stakeholders, commuters, media, and adjacent property owners and business owners near the project area. The stakeholder list included local businesses, school districts, transportation centers, public and safety works, and city chambers of commerce.

At the public meeting project information and exhibits were available to provide the project information. Multilingual project team members who are fluent in Spanish were also present to assist with potential interpretation and/or translation needs. The Caltrans Title VI Brochure was available in English and Spanish.

The public was notified of the meeting by mailing approximately 4,770 postcards to adjacent properties, distributing hundreds of fliers, conducting one-on-one outreach, sending email invitations, and posting on social media. Ads also ran in local newspapers, including the Anaheim Bulletin, Orange City News, the Orange County Register, and Unidos, Orange County's leading Spanish-language newspaper (see Figure 4-2: Public Notice).

4.2.4 Public Hearing

A public hearing was held on June 22 from 5 to 8 pm at Portola Middle School in the City of Orange. The three-hour meeting was held in an open house format to allow participates to review exhibits and literature at their leisure. The meeting was held to provide information to the public,

allow the public to ask questions and to solicit feedback on topics relevant to the project. Participants had the opportunity to speak one-on-one with OCTA, Caltrans and the technical team to ask questions and obtain information about the project. The public hearing was advertised in local and regional newspapers, by direct mail postcards, distributed flyers, targeted emails and social media. The newspaper ads were ¼ page ads placed in four different newspapers, including Orange County's leading Spanish-language newspaper, Unidos. The draft environmental document was circulated for public review from October 11, 2018 to November 9, 2018 during which time the public had the opportunity to comment on the project. During public circulation, as well as during the open house, the public provided comments verbally, via comment cards and through mail and email.

Figure 4-2: Public Notice



Notice of Opportunity: Public Information Open House State Route 57 Northbound Improvement Project from Orangewood Avenue to Katella Avenue

WHAT'S BEING PLANNED?

The California Department of Transportation, in partnership with the Orange County Transportation Authority, proposes to increase capacity, improve operations and enhance safety on northbound SR-57 in the cities of Anaheim and Orange, between Orangewood Avenue and Katella Avenue.

The purpose of the proposed project is to improve both existing and future mobility along this segment of northbound SR-57 while minimizing environmental and economic impacts.

The proposed project seeks to improve overall efficiency, alleviate congestion, and facilitate regional circulation of goods and services on northbound SR-57 by extending the 5th generalpurpose lane to improve lane continuity.



WHY THIS AD?

This notice is to tell you of the start of the environmental process and to inform you of an upcoming public information open house (noted below) to discuss the proposed project that will be studied. An Initial Study [IS] and Environmental Assessment [EA], leading to an anticipated Mitigated Negative Declaration [MND] and Finding of No Significant Impact [FONS] will be prepared to evaluate potential effects that could result from the proposed project.

WHAT'S AVAILABLE?

The purpose and need for the project, current project schedule and other exhibits will be available for viewing at the open house. In addition, Caltrans, OCTA and project team specialists in engineering, planning, traffic, and environmental will be available to hear your comments.

WHERE YOU COME IN

You will have the opportunity to ask questions and provide comments about the proposed project to OCTA and Caltrans staff.

WHEN AND WHERE?

DATE: Thursday, June 22, 2017		
TIME:	5 p.m. to 8 p.m.	
LOCATION:	Portola Middle School Cafeteria 270 North Palm Drive Orange, CA 92868	

Individuals who require special accommodation (American Sign Language interpreter, accessible seating, documentation in alternate formats, etc.) are requested to contact Caltrans District 12 Public Affairs Office at (657) 328-6000 at least 7 days prior to the scheduled open house date. TD users may contact California Relay Service TTY line at (800) 735-2929 or Voice Line at (800) 735-2922.

CONTACT

For more information about this study, please call Andrea Hamman, OCTA Community Relations Specialist, at (714) 560-5573 or visit the project webpage www.octa.net/57fwy.



State Route 57 Improvement Project (Northbound) Notice of Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration

Notice of Availability of an Initial Study/Environmental Assessment

Study Results Available

Announcement of Public Hearing (Open House Format)



WHAT'S BEING PLANNED?

The California Department of Transportation (Caliform) District 12, in cooperation with Grange County Transportation Authority (OCTA), proposes to widen and make improvements to Northbound (NB) State Route (SR) 57, Post Mile (PM) 11.5 to 12.5, in Orange and Anaheim, This segment of SR-57 croases the Santa Ana River and OCTA/SCRRA/BNSF Railroad and is near ARTIC, Angel Stadum and the Honda Centre. In addition to the No Build Alternative, three Build Alternatives are under consideration. All Build Alternatives consider a fifth NB general purpose (GP) lane lane from Orangewood Avenue to Katella Avenue.

WHY THIS AD?

Catrans has studied the effects this project may have on the environment. Studies show it will not significantly affect the quality of the environment. The report that explains why is called an Initial Study/Environmental Assessment (SK-A).This notice is to tell you of the availability of the draft RS/FA with a proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration (MMD). A public hearing (open house formally will be hald to give you an opportunity to learn about the proposed project and potential Impacts before a build alternative is recommended and exproved.

WHAT'S AVAILABLE?

The proposed NND & ISEA and other project information are available for neview and copying (for a fee) at the Californe District 12 Office at 1750 East 4th Shreet, Suite 100, Sama Ana, CA 82705, on veekdays from 8:00 am to 5:00 pm. The proposed NND & IS/ EA are also available for review at the following locations during normal business hours: - Oity of Orange Library, *SOU* W Broadway, Anaheim - In addition, the documents are available online at: - http://www.dot.ca.gov/d12/DEA/S7/0M970

WHERE YOU COME IN

Do you have any comments about processing the project with a proposed MND and IS/EA? Do you disagree with the findings of our study as set forth in the proposed MND? Would you care to make any other comments on the project?

Please submit your comments in writing no later than 5:00 pm, November 3 to Kathleen Dove, Associate Environmental Planner, Caltrans District 12, Division of Environmental analysis, 1750 East 4th Street, Sufte 100, Santa Ana, CA 9275 or via e-mail to SR87/ImprovementProject@dot.ca.gov. The date we will begin accepting comments is October 11. If there are no major comments, Caltrans will proceed with the project's design.

WHEN AND WHERE?

DATE:	Thursday, October 25, 2018
TIME:	Stop by any time between 5:30 - 7:30 p.m
LOCATION:	Portola Middle School Cafeteria 270 North Palm Drive Orange, CA 92868

Served by Orange County Transportation Authority public transit: Route 54: Garden Grove - Orange Route 53: Orange - Invine Route 53X: Orange - Invine xpress Route 453X: Orange Transportation Center - St. Joseph Hospital

CONTACT

Individuals who require special accommodation (American Sign Language interpreter, accessible seating, documentation in alternate formats, etc.) are requested to contact Van Nguyen at District 12°s Public Information Office by phone at (557) 528-5353 or by e-mail at Van.NguyendidoLca.gov at least 21 days prior to the scheduled hearing date, or use California Relay Service, 1 (800) 735-2928 (TTY), 1 (800) 735-2922 (voice).

For more information about this study or any other transportation matter, call Van Nguyen at District 12's Public Information Office at (657) 328-6363 or e-mail her at Van.Nguyen@dot.ca.gov

🗲 ANUNCIO PÚBLICO 🔨

Proyecto de mejoramiento de la carretera SR-57 (Norte) • Aviso de Intención para adoptar una declaración/Resultado negativo aternado sin un efecto importante • Aviso de disponibilidad de un Estudio inicial/Evaluación ambiental · Aviso Resultados de estudio disponible · Anuncio de audiencia pública



¿Qué se está planificando?

¿que se esta planimaria de california (Califrans), en sociedad con la Autoridad de Transporte de l'adondado de Orango (OCTA), proponen ensanchar y mejorar las operaciones de la carretera estatal (SR) 57 norte (NB), entre Post Mile (PM) 11.5-12.5 en las ciudades de Anaheim y Crango. Este segmento de SR-57 pasa por el Río Santa Ana y el Ferrocarril OCTA/SCRRA/BNSF y es cerca de ATIC, Angel Stadium y el Honda Center. Además de No construir, se están considerando tres alternativas de construcción. Todas las Alternativas de construcción considera un quínto carril de propósito general (GP) de Orangewood Avenue a Katella Avenue.

¿Por qué este aviso?

¿Fun que este avisoi f Catrans han estudiado los efectos que este proyecto podrá tener en el medioambiente. Nuestros estudios muestran que este no afectaría considerablemente la calidad del medioambiente. El reporte que explica estos resultados se llama Estudio inicial/ Evaluación ambiental (IS/EA). Este anuncio público tiene como fin informarle sobre la preparadir del bornador IS/EA con una propuesta Declamoión de alternativa atenuada (MAD). Una adaría la oportunidad da aprender acita la ellevará a cabopara a dar la oportunidad da aprender acita la ellevará a cabopara a la enortunidad da antes de recomendar y aprobar una alternativa de construcción.

¿Qué está disponible?

¿Que está disponible: Mapas del propiesto MND e (S/EA y otra información de proyecto están disponibles para revisión y copia (por un cargo) en la Oficina del Departamento del Distrito 12 de Calstrana, 1750 East 4th Street, Suite 100, Santa Ana, CA 92705, en días de la semana de a.m. a 5 p.m. El proyuesto MND e (S/EA también está disponible para revisión durante horas laborables en los siguientes lugares:

· Biblioteca de la Ciudad de Orange, 407 E Chapman Ave, Orange · Biblioteca de la Cludad de Anaheim, 500 W Broadway, Anaheim

· Además los documentos estarán disponibles en línea e:

http://www.dot.ca.gov/d12/DEA/57/0M970

Dónde participa usted

¿Tiene comentarios sobre procesar el proyecto con un propuesto MND el S/EA? ¿Está en desacuerdo con los resultados de nuestro estudio como se describen en el MND? ¿Le gustaría hacer otros comentarios al proyecto?

vontenuanus a proyecto? Usted puede anviar sus comentarios por escrito a más tardar a las 6 pm. el 9 de noviembre 2018 a Kathlean Dove, Planificadora Asociada de Medicambiente, Diatrito 12 de Catrans, División de Análisis Ambiental, 1750 East 4th Street, Suite 100, Santa Ano, CA 92705 o por correo electrinolo a SASTampovementProject® dot.ca gov Se empezará a aceptar comentarios el 11 de octubre 2018, Si no hay comentarios importantes, Caltrans procederá con el diseño del proyecto.

¿Cuándo y dónde?

Una audiencia pública (formato de casa abierta) se llevará a cabo:

FECHA: Jueves, 25 de octubre	
HORA:	Entre 5:30-7:30 p.m.
LOCALIDAD:	Cafetería de Portola Middle School 270 North Palm Drive Orange, CA 92868

Rutas de servicio de transporte público de la Autoridad de Transporte del Condado de Orange: Ruta 54: Garden Grove - Orange Ruta 53: Orange - Irvine Ruta 53:: Orange - Irvine xpress Ruta 453: Orange Transportation Center - St. Joseph Hospital

Contacto

Se pide a las personas que requieran adecuaciones especiales (intérprete de lengua de signos americana, asientos accesibles, documentos en formatos alternos, etc.) que contacten a Van Nguyen, Distrito 12 de Caltrans 12, Oficina de Información Pública al (557) 328-8635 o por correo electrónico a Van Nguyen@dct.ca.gov al menos 21 días antes de la fecha programada de la casa abierta, o contacte a la línea de California Relay Service al 1(800) 735-2929 (TTV), o a Voice Line al (800) 735-2922.

Para más información sobre este estudio, llame a Van Nguyen, Van Nguyen, Distrito 12 de Caltrans 12, Oficina de Información Pública al (657) 328-6363 o por correo electrónico a Van Nguyen@dot.ca.gov.



4.3 Public Review

4.3.1 Comments & Responses

After public circulation of the Draft IS/EA, which occurred from October 11, 2018 to November 9, 2018, comment letters were received from state and local agencies, as well as the general public through a variety of means (e.g., email and mail). Comments were also received during the public open house held on October 25, 2018 from 5:30 to 7:30 PM at Portola Middle School in Orange, California.

The following _comment letters were received. Comments are organized in categories by sender type – federal, state or local agencies, or the public. In each category, they are then numbered and each comment letter is broken down into individual comments which are represented by a letter (e.g., S-1a, S-1b, etc.).

4.3.1.1 Federal Agencies

No comments were received from federal agencies.

4.3.1.2 State Agencies



State of California – Natural Resources Agency DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE South Coast Region 3883 Ruffin Road San Diego, CA 92123 (858) 467-4201 www.wildlife.ca.gov EDMUND G. BROWN JR., Governor CHARLTON H. BONHAM, Director



November 8, 2018

Kathleen Dove California Department of Transportation District 12 1750 East Fourth Street, Suite 100 Santa Ana, CA 92705 SR57ImprovementProject@dot.ca.gov

Subject: Comments on the Initial Study with Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration for the State Route 57 Improvement Project from Orangewood Avenue to Katella Avenue, Orange County (SCH# 2018101029)

Dear Ms. Dove:

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (Department) has reviewed the abovereferenced Initial Study with Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) for the State Route 57 (SR-57) Improvement Project from Orangewood Avenue to Katella Avenue (Project) dated October 2018. The following statements and comments have been prepared pursuant to the Department's authority as Trustee Agency with jurisdiction over natural resources affected by the proposed project (California Environmental Quality Act [CEQA], Guidelines § 15386) and pursuant to our authority as a Responsible Agency under CEQA Guidelines section 15381 over those aspects of the proposed project that come under the purview of the California Endangered Species Act (CESA; Fish and Game Code [FGC] § 2050 et seq.) and FGC section 1600 et seq. The Department also administers the Natural Community Conservation Planning (NCCP) program. The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) is a Participating Special Entity in the Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA) M2 NCCP/Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). The comments provided herein are based on the information provided in the IS/MND, the Natural Environment Study and Jurisdictional Delineation (NES) dated June 2018, the OCTA M2 NCCP/HCP, and our knowledge of sensitive and declining habitats.

The Project, identified as Project G1a in the NCCP/HCP, proposes to widen the northbound side of the SR-57 freeway from 0.3 mile south of the Orangewood Avenue undercrossing north to the Katella Avenue undercrossing. The Project includes widening the SR-57 Orangewood Avenue undercrossing bridge and the Santa Ana River Bridge. An alternative scenario would also widen the Statium overhead bridge. The Project would be funded by OCTA as part of the Renewed Measure M (M2) Freeway Program and covered as "Project G1a" under the OCTA M2 NCCP/HCP, signed June 2017.

The Project is located within a heavily developed area within the cities of Orange and Anaheim. The NES indicates that no native plant communities or natural communities of special concern occur within the Biological Study Area (BSA) nor does any riparian habitat exist within the BSA. Additionally, no special status fish or wildlife species were detected during baseline surveys. However, the Project would result in temporary impacts to approximately 4.9 acres and

Conserving California's Wildlife Since 1870

Kathleen Dove California Department of Transportation District 12 November 9, 2018 Page 2 of 3

permanent impacts to 0.02 acre, of the Santa Ana River. The Santa Ana River is subject to Fish and Game Code section 1600. Additionally, suitable bat roosting habitat exists within the SR-57 Santa Ana River overpass.

The Department evaluated the biological assessment and proposed protection measures in the IS/MND and found them to be generally consistent with those established in the NCCP/HCP. However, the Department provides the following specific comments and recommendations to assist Caltrans in avoiding or minimizing potential impacts to sensitive species and habitats.

- 1. Avoidance measure BIRD BAT-1 states, "Despite the lack of presence of bats in the project site during initial surveys, if vegetation clearing and bridge construction is scheduled during the bat breeding season, a qualified biologist will conduct outflight census activities to determine the presence or absence of bat roosts within 72 hours prior to any clearing of vegetation or bridge construction. The location of any bat roosts will be mapped, and an appropriate activity exclusion area or exclusion devices will be installed to preclude bats from being taken when project work occurs. The exclusion area will be clearly visible and remain in place until bat roosts are deemed inactive by a qualified biologist. If warranted bat exclusion devices, and deterrent protocols and procedures shall be pre-approved by resource agencies prior to being implemented by OCTA."
 - a. While breeding season surveys are appropriate, the Department recommends exclusions be conducted outside the breeding and/or bat maternity season and hibernation seasons, to avoid the risk of entrapping young birds or non-volant bat pups.
 - b. If roosting bats are detected, the Department recommends the biologist report and consult with the Department prior to commencing project activities within 500 feet of the bat detection site(s).
 - c. If a bat maternity colony is detected, the Department recommends alternate roosting habitat be created and/or identified and monitored to ensure habitat is successfully occupied prior to exclusion.
 - d. The Department recommends the bat maternity season be defined. A typical maternity season extends from April 1 through August 24.
- 2. IS/MND Section 2.3.6.4 measure PLANT-1 quotes the NCCP/HCP Section 5.6.1 measure prohibiting the use of known invasive species (i.e., plant species listed in California Invasive Plant Council's California Invasive Plant Inventory with a High or Moderate rating) for construction, revegetation, and landscaping activities. However, this measure does not appear to be included in Appendix C Environmental Commitments Record (ECR). To ensure consistency with the NCCP/HCP and that all parties comply with the measure, the Department recommends the IS/MND include PLANT-1 in the ECR.

S-1e

S-1a

S-1b

S-1c

S-1d

Kathleen Dove California Department of Transportation District 12 November 8, 2018 Page 3 of 3

The Department appreciates the cooperation of Caltrans in protecting sensitive biological resources. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the IS/MND. If you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact Simona Altman at (858) 467-4283 or email simona.altman@wildlife.ca.gov.

Sincerely, 0

Gail K. Sevrens Environmental Program Manager South Coast Region

ec: State Clearinghouse, Sacramento

Simona Altman, California Department of Fish & Wildlife Kyle Rice, California Department of Fish & Wildlife

Jonathan Snyder, Division Chief, US Fish and Wildlife Service jonathan_d_snyder@fws.gov

Lesley Hill, Project Manager, Environmental Mitigation Program, Orange County Transportation Authority Ihill@octa.net

S-1a. California Department of Fish and Wildlife. November 8, 2018. Letter.

Comment: While breeding season surveys are appropriate, the Department recommends exclusions be conducted outside the breeding and/or bat maternity season and hibernation seasons, to avoid the risk of entrapping young birds or non-volant bat pups.

Response: A new Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation measure was added to the IS/MND to address this comment. The new measure is labeled BIRD BAT-1. The original measure BIRD BAT-1 is now labeled BIRD BAT-3. The Environmental Commitments Record was also updated to add the new measure and re-label the original measure.

S-1b. California Department of Fish and Wildlife. November 8, 2018. Letter.

Comment: If roosting bats are detected, the Department recommends the biologist report and consult with the Department prior to commencing project activities within 500 feet of the bat detection site(s).

Response: Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measure BIRD BAT-3 (originally labeled BIRD BAT-1) was modified to address the Departments recommendation. The following language was added to BIRD BAT-3: "*If roosting bats are detected, the biologist shall report and consult with resource agencies prior to commencing project activities within 500 feet of the bat detection site(s).*"

S-1c. California Department of Fish and Wildlife. November 8, 2018. Letter.

Comment: If a bat maternity colony is detected, the Department recommends alternate roosting habitat be created and/or identified and monitored to ensure habitat is successfully occupied prior to exclusion.

Response: The following Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measure has been added to the IS/MND and Environmental Commitment Record to address this comment: "*BIRD BAT-2*. *If a bat maternity colony is detected, alternate roosting habitat shall be created or identified and monitored to ensure habitat is successfully occupied prior to exclusion.*"

S-1d. California Department of Fish and Wildlife. November 8, 2018. Letter.

Comment: The Department recommends the bat maternity season be defined. A typical maternity season extends from April 1 through August 24.

Response: The new measure BIRD BAT-1 identifies the typical maternity season as April 1 to August 24.

S-1e. California Department of Fish and Wildlife. November 8, 2018. Letter.

Comment: IS/MND Section 2.3.6.4 measure PLANT-1 quotes the NCCP/HCP Section 5.6.1 measure prohibiting the use of known invasive species. (i.e., plant species listed in California Invasive Plant Council's California Invasive Plant Inventory with a High or Moderate rating) for construction, revegetation, and landscaping activities. However, this measure does not appear to be included in Appendix C Environmental Commitments Record (ECR). To ensure consistency

with the NCCP/HCP and that all parties comply with the measure, the Department recommends the IS/MND include PLANT-1 in the ECR.

Response: Thank you for noting this omission. Measure PLANT-1 has been added to Appendix C, Environmental Commitments Record (ECR).

	EDMUND G. BROWN Jr., Governor
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL	
Santa Ana Area 2031 E. Santa Clara Avenue	
Santa Ana, CA 92705	A CONTRACTOR OF THE OWNER OWNER OF THE OWNER
714)567-6000	
800) 735-2929 (TT/TDD) 800) 735-2922 (Voice)	
133-2922 (VOICE)	0
November 27, 2018	
File No.: 675.15878.14745	Gavernars Other of Planning & Research
	Maria Alagano
tate Clearing House	NOV 30 2018
400 Tenth Street, Room 121	STATE OLD
acramento, CA 95814	STATE CLEARINGHOUSE
E: SCH#2018101029	
he Santa Ana Area office of the California Highway F	Patrol (CHP) received the "Notice of
completion" of the Environmental document for the pr	
tate Route 57 (SR-57) from Orangewood Avenue (PM	
ities of Orange and Anaheim, (SCH) #2018101029. N	dinor detours and night work is
nticipated as a result of this project which is expected	to last two to three weers. After our
eview, we have concerns with the potential impact this	a project could have on traffic congection
stren, we have concerns with the potential impact this	project could have on traine congestion.
ur concern relates to the notential impact on department	
	ental operations, with primary emphasis
n increased traffic and changes in traffic congestion pa	ental operations, with primary emphasis satterns during the construction stage. The
n increased traffic and changes in traffic congestion pa ajor interchange of Interstate 5, State Route 22, and S	ental operations, with primary emphasis atterns during the construction stage. The state Route 57, in the County of Orange, is
n increased traffic and changes in traffic congestion pa ajor interchange of Interstate 5, State Route 22, and S acated approximately one mile south of the proposed p	ental operations, with primary emphasis atterns during the construction stage. The state Route 57, in the County of Orange, is project. The proposed project would have
n increased traffic and changes in traffic congestion pa ajor interchange of Interstate 5, State Route 22, and S becated approximately one mile south of the proposed p negative impact on our operations due to the increased	ental operations, with primary emphasis atterns during the construction stage. The state Route 57, in the County of Orange, is project. The proposed project would have d traffic congestion, which would
n increased traffic and changes in traffic congestion pa jajor interchange of Interstate 5, State Route 22, and S ocated approximately one mile south of the proposed p negative impact on our operations due to the increases eccessitate the need for additional traffic control measu	ental operations, with primary emphasis atterns during the construction stage. The state Route 57, in the County of Orange, is project. The proposed project would have d traffic congestion, which would stress to mitigate the potential increase in
n increased traffic and changes in traffic congestion pa hajor interchange of Interstate 5, State Route 22, and S boated approximately one mile south of the proposed p negative impact on our operations due to the increases eccessitate the need for additional traffic control measu	ental operations, with primary emphasis atterns during the construction stage. The state Route 57, in the County of Orange, is project. The proposed project would have d traffic congestion, which would stress to mitigate the potential increase in
n increased traffic and changes in traffic congestion pa bajor interchange of Interstate 5, State Route 22, and S becated approximately one mile south of the proposed p negative impact on our operations due to the increase eccessitate the need for additional traffic control measu affic collisions.	ental operations, with primary emphasis atterns during the construction stage. The state Route 57, in the County of Orange, is project. The proposed project would have d traffic congestion, which would res to mitigate the potential increase in S-
n increased traffic and changes in traffic congestion pa ajor interchange of Interstate 5, State Route 22, and S boated approximately one mile south of the proposed p negative impact on our operations due to the increased eccessitate the need for additional traffic control measu affic collisions.	ental operations, with primary emphasis atterns during the construction stage. The state Route 57, in the County of Orange, is project. The proposed project would have d traffic congestion, which would res to mitigate the potential increase in S-
n increased traffic and changes in traffic congestion pa ajor interchange of Interstate 5, State Route 22, and S boated approximately one mile south of the proposed p negative impact on our operations due to the increased eccessitate the need for additional traffic control measu affic collisions.	ental operations, with primary emphasis atterns during the construction stage. The state Route 57, in the County of Orange, is project. The proposed project would have d traffic congestion, which would res to mitigate the potential increase in S-
n increased traffic and changes in traffic congestion pa ajor interchange of Interstate 5, State Route 22, and S boated approximately one mile south of the proposed p negative impact on our operations due to the increased eccessitate the need for additional traffic control measu affic collisions. You have any questions regarding these concerns, ple 67-6000.	ental operations, with primary emphasis atterns during the construction stage. The state Route 57, in the County of Orange, is project. The proposed project would have d traffic congestion, which would res to mitigate the potential increase in S-
n increased traffic and changes in traffic congestion pa jajor interchange of Interstate 5, State Route 22, and S bacted approximately one mile south of the proposed p negative impact on our operations due to the increased eccessitate the need for additional traffic control measu affic collisions. You have any questions regarding these concerns, ple 57-6000.	ental operations, with primary emphasis atterns during the construction stage. The s- state Route 57, in the County of Orange, is project. The proposed project would have d traffic congestion, which would res to mitigate the potential increase in s-
n increased traffic and changes in traffic congestion pa ajor interchange of Interstate 5, State Route 22, and S boated approximately one mile south of the proposed p negative impact on our operations due to the increased eccessitate the need for additional traffic control measu affic collisions. You have any questions regarding these concerns, ple 67-6000.	ental operations, with primary emphasis atterns during the construction stage. The state Route 57, in the County of Orange, is project. The proposed project would have d traffic congestion, which would res to mitigate the potential increase in S-
n increased traffic and changes in traffic congestion pa jajor interchange of Interstate 5, State Route 22, and S bacted approximately one mile south of the proposed p negative impact on our operations due to the increased eccessitate the need for additional traffic control measu affic collisions. You have any questions regarding these concerns, ple 57-6000.	ental operations, with primary emphasis atterns during the construction stage. The state Route 57, in the County of Orange, is project. The proposed project would have d traffic congestion, which would res to mitigate the potential increase in S-
n increased traffic and changes in traffic congestion pa ajor interchange of Interstate 5, State Route 22, and S becated approximately one mile south of the proposed p negative impact on our operations due to the increased eccessitate the need for additional traffic control measu affic collisions. You have any questions regarding these concerns, ple 57-6000. Incerely,	ental operations, with primary emphasis atterns during the construction stage. The s- state Route 57, in the County of Orange, is project. The proposed project would have d traffic congestion, which would res to mitigate the potential increase in s-
n increased traffic and changes in traffic congestion pa hajor interchange of Interstate 5, State Route 22, and S boated approximately one mile south of the proposed p negative impact on our operations due to the increased eccessitate the need for additional traffic control measu affic collisions. You have any questions regarding these concerns, ple 67-6000.	ental operations, with primary emphasis atterns during the construction stage. The s- state Route 57, in the County of Orange, is project. The proposed project would have d traffic congestion, which would res to mitigate the potential increase in s-
n increased traffic and changes in traffic congestion pa ajor interchange of Interstate 5, State Route 22, and S be ated approximately one mile south of the proposed p negative impact on our operations due to the increased eccessitate the need for additional traffic control measu affic collisions. You have any questions regarding these concerns, ple 57-6000. Incerely, SHACKLEFORD, Captain ommander	ental operations, with primary emphasis atterns during the construction stage. The s- state Route 57, in the County of Orange, is project. The proposed project would have d traffic congestion, which would res to mitigate the potential increase in s-
n increased traffic and changes in traffic congestion pa ajor interchange of Interstate 5, State Route 22, and S be ated approximately one mile south of the proposed p negative impact on our operations due to the increased eccessitate the need for additional traffic control measu affic collisions. You have any questions regarding these concerns, ple 57-6000. Incerely, SHACKLEFORD, Captain ommander	ental operations, with primary emphasis atterns during the construction stage. The s- state Route 57, in the County of Orange, is project. The proposed project would have d traffic congestion, which would res to mitigate the potential increase in s-
n increased traffic and changes in traffic congestion pa ajor interchange of Interstate 5, State Route 22, and S boated approximately one mile south of the proposed p negative impact on our operations due to the increased eccessitate the need for additional traffic control measu affic collisions. You have any questions regarding these concerns, ple 67-6000. Incerely, SHACKLEFORD, Captain ommander anta Ana Area	ental operations, with primary emphasis atterns during the construction stage. The s- state Route 57, in the County of Orange, is project. The proposed project would have d traffic congestion, which would res to mitigate the potential increase in s-
n increased traffic and changes in traffic congestion pa hajor interchange of Interstate 5, State Route 22, and S boated approximately one mile south of the proposed p negative impact on our operations due to the increased eccessitate the need for additional traffic control measu affic collisions. Fyou have any questions regarding these concerns, ple 67-6000. incerely, SHACKLEFORD, Captain ommander anta Ana Area	ental operations, with primary emphasis atterns during the construction stage. The s- state Route 57, in the County of Orange, is project. The proposed project would have d traffic congestion, which would res to mitigate the potential increase in s-
n increased traffic and changes in traffic congestion pa hajor interchange of Interstate 5, State Route 22, and S boated approximately one mile south of the proposed p negative impact on our operations due to the increased eccessitate the need for additional traffic control measu affic collisions. Fyou have any questions regarding these concerns, ple 67-6000. incerely, SHACKLEFORD, Captain ommander anta Ana Area e: Border Division	ental operations, with primary emphasis atterns during the construction stage. The state Route 57, in the County of Orange, is project. The proposed project would have d traffic congestion, which would res to mitigate the potential increase in S-
n increased traffic and changes in traffic congestion pa hajor interchange of Interstate 5, State Route 22, and S boated approximately one mile south of the proposed p negative impact on our operations due to the increased eccessitate the need for additional traffic control measu affic collisions. You have any questions regarding these concerns, ple 67-6000. incerely, SHACKLEFORD, Captain ommander anta Ana Area e: Border Division	ental operations, with primary emphasis atterns during the construction stage. The s- state Route 57, in the County of Orange, is project. The proposed project would have d traffic congestion, which would res to mitigate the potential increase in s-
n increased traffic and changes in traffic congestion pa hajor interchange of Interstate 5, State Route 22, and S boated approximately one mile south of the proposed p negative impact on our operations due to the increased eccessitate the need for additional traffic control measu affic collisions. You have any questions regarding these concerns, ple 67-6000. incerely, SHACKLEFORD, Captain ommander anta Ana Area e: Border Division	ental operations, with primary emphasis atterns during the construction stage. The state Route 57, in the County of Orange, is project. The proposed project would have d traffic congestion, which would res to mitigate the potential increase in S
Dur concern relates to the potential impact on department n increased traffic and changes in traffic congestion parajor interchange of Interstate 5, State Route 22, and S boated approximately one mile south of the proposed pregative impact on our operations due to the increased eccessitate the need for additional traffic control measurable collisions. If you have any questions regarding these concerns, ple 67-6000. incerely, SHACKLEFORD, Captain ommander anta Ana Area e: Border Division Special Projects Section	ental operations, with primary emphasis atterns during the construction stage. The state Route 57, in the County of Orange, is project. The proposed project would have d traffic congestion, which would res to mitigate the potential increase in S

S-2a. Department of California Highway Patrol. November 11, 2018. Letter.

Comment: Our concern relates to the potential impact on departmental operations, with primary emphasis on increased traffic and changes in traffic congestion patterns during the construction stage.

Response: The Project includes a Traffic Management Plan (TMP) that identifies measures to address changes in traffic patterns resulting from lane and ramp closures. The TMP includes a public awareness and information campaign to assist motorists in choosing alternate routes to avoid congested areas. The TMP also proposes real time traffic information for motorists, changeable message signs, stakeholder outreach, freeway service patrol and a traffic management team (TMT) to help manage construction related traffic issues. TMT-identified measures help to provide advanced warning to motorists of abnormal downstream traffic congestion on the highway. The TMT identifies towing services and Caltrans staff responsible for activating changeable message signs (CMS) and portable CMS, as well as representatives from OCTA, local agencies, local law enforcement, California Highway Patrol (CHP), and Caltrans public affairs. The Project would also be required to implement the Construction Zone Enhanced Enforcement Program (COZEEP). COZEEP specified for this project by the Project's TMP was designated for congestion relief as outlined by DD-60-R2.

S-2b. Department of California Highway Patrol. November 11, 2018. Letter.

Comment: The major interchange of Interstate 5, State Route 22, and State Route 57, in the County of Orange, is located approximately one mile south of the proposed project.

Response: In addition to its proximity to the I-5/SR 22/SR 57 interchange (the Orange Crush) the Project would also be required to consider other major traffic generators, such as Angel Stadium and the Honda Center. The TMP addresses stakeholder coordination and requires the TMP coordinator to prepare Lane Requirement Charts to overlay the construction activities with scheduled events, as well as other incidents that may affect circulation within the project limits.

S-2c. Department of California Highway Patrol. November 11, 2018. Letter. Comment: The proposed project would have a negative impact on our operations due to the increased traffic congestion

Response: The Project, in and of itself, would not generate additional traffic. The Project is intended to address future projected increases in traffic by providing additional capacity within the northbound segment of the project corridor. Current traffic congestion is a result of a lack in lane continuity on the freeway mainline. The Project proposes to close the existing gap in the fifth general purpose lane, as well as extend the existing auxiliary lane through the Orangewood Avenue interchange to the Katella Avenue off-ramp, to address current congestion and future traffic increases.

S-2d. Department of California Highway Patrol. November 11, 2018. Letter.

Comment: Which would necessitate the need for additional traffic control measures to mitigate the potential increase in traffic collisions.

Response: The Project cost estimates include assumptions for implementing COZEEP, including CHP assistance in incident management.

4.3.1.3 Local Agency



Hahn & Bowersock, A Veritext Company 800.660.3187

		1
1	1 Orange, California	
2	2 Thursday, October 25, 2018, 5:30 p.m 7:30 p.m.	
3	3 ***	
4	4	
5 ORANGE COUNTY TRANSIT AUTHORITY	5 DOUGLAS KEYS: Good evening. My name is	
6 PUBLIC MEETING	6 Douglas Kyes. I am a transportation analyst for the	
7	7 City of Orange.	
8	8 I have been asked by my director to make a	
9	9 statement for the record regarding concerns the City of	
10	10 Orange has regarding the potential alternatives for the	
11	11 State Route 57 improvements between Orangewood Avenue	
12 Transcript of Public Meeting, taken at 270 North Palm	12 and Katella Avenue. This recorded statement will be	
13 Drive, Orange, California, beginning at 5:30 p.m. and	13 followed up with a formal comment letter from the City	
14 ending at 7:30 p.m., on Thursday, October 25, 2018,	14 of Orange prior to the November 9th deadline.	
15 before Heidi Hummel-Grant, Certified Shorthand Reporter	15 City staff is currently reviewing the	
16 No. 12556.	16 environmental document.	
17	17 Unfortunately, while City of Orange staff has	
18	18 been included in the original project design team, PDT,	
19	19 staff was not allowed to start reviewing the document	
20	20 until it was released for public review. This is of	
21	21 particular concern relative to the traffic operations	L-1a
22	22 analysis, TOA. This document was completed in	L-1a
23	23 April 2018, but the City, a PDT member, was not allowed	
24 25	24 to see the document for six months. City 25 representatives on the PTD should be allowed to review	
Page 2	25 representatives on the PTD should be allowed to review Page 4	
	1 all documents at the same time as the other PDT members.	
2 2 SPEAKERS	2 The City of Orange has a series concerns	1
3 SPEAKERS: 4 DOUGLAS KEYS	3 relative to Alternatives 2-A and 2-B. Both of these	
4 DOUGLAS KEYS 5	4 alternatives propose to eliminate a northbound direct	
6	5 on ramp at Orangewood Avenue and replace it with a loop 6 on ramp. The TOA states that even with the UOV design	
7	6 on ramp. The TOA states that even with the HOV design 7 exception, quote, the ramp configuration does not meet	L-1b
8	8 the storage requirements for the ramp meter, end quote.	
9	9 The City believes that an obvious consequence of	
10	10 inadequate ramp storage length is that vehicles will	
11	11 back up onto Orangewood Avenue.	
12	12 The TOA goes on to say that, quote, in summary,	
13	13 along with this proposed three general purpose lane	
14	14 configuration to maximize the available storage length,	
15	15 the available storage on the arterial street turn lanes	
16	16 to the Orangewood loop on ramp and the signal timing	
17	17 will need to be addressed in the final design phase of	
18	18 the project, end quote.	
19	19 This plan to put off the problem of inadequate	L-1c
20	20 storage length until the final design is completely	
21	21 unacceptable to the City of Orange. In the opinion of	
22	22 the City of Orange staff, the very large lack of ramp	
23	23 storage space on the proposed loop ramp is a fatal flaw	1
24	24 for both alternatives 2-A and 2-B.	1
25	25 Interestingly, a review of Alternative 2 shows	
Page 3	Page 3	Г
	2 (Pages 2 - 5)	
	111 1 10	





Hahn & Bowersock, A Veritext Company

800.660.3187

[1 - length]

	analysis 4:22	csr 1:17	further 7:11,13
1	analysis 4.22 analyst 4:6	currently 4:15	
1 1:18	april 4:23		g
12556 1:17 2:16	arterial 5:15	d	gain 6:5
7:22	asked 4:8	day 7:17	general 5:13 6:9
15048 7:21	authority 1:1 2:5	deadline 4:14 6:18	goes 5:12
2	available 5:14,15	design 4:18 5:6,17	good 4:5
2 5:3,3,24,24,25	avenue 4:11,12 5:5	5:20	grant 1:16 2:15
6:3,15	5:11 6:12	direct 5:4 6:2,12	7:21
2018 1:10 2:14 4:2	b	direction 7:10	h
4:23 7:17		director 4:8	heidi 1:16 2:15
25 1:10 2:14 4:2	b 5:3,24	distance 6:5	7:21
270 2:12	back 5:11	document 4:16,19	help 6:10
5	beginning 2:13	4:22,24	hov 5:6
57 4:11 6:8,11	believes 5:9	documents 5:1 douglas 3:4 4:5,6	hummel 1:16 2:15
5:30 2:13 4:2	C	drive 2:13	7:21
7	california 1:9 2:13		i
	4:1 7:5	e	implementation
7 1:18	caltrans 6:1,7,18	earlier 6:17	6:16
7:30 2:14 4:2 6:20	certification 7:1	efforts 6:7	improve 6:8,11
8	certified 2:15 7:2	eliminate 5:4	improvements
8th 7:17	7:4,22	employee 7:15	4:11
9	certify 7:5,13	environmental	inadequate 5:10
9th 4:14 6:19	changing 6:11	4:16	5:19
Construction and the Addressed	city 4:7,9,13,15,17	evening 4:5	included 4:18
a	4:23,24 5:2,9,21	exception 5:7	interchange 6:13
accurate 7:11	5:22 6:7,14	extend 6:3	interested 7:14
action 7:14	comment 4:13	f	interestingly 5:25
addition 6:9	6:18	fact 6:2	irreparable 6:13
additional 6:10	completed 4:22	fatal 5:23	k
addressed 5:17	completely 5:20 concern 4:21	fifth 6:9	katella 4:12 6:10
advocate 6:14	concerns 4:9 5:2	final 5:17,20	keys 3:4 4:5
allow 6:4	concluded 6:20	financially 7:14	kyes 4:6
allowed 4:19,23	conditions 6:8	flaw 5:23	1
4:25	configuration 5:7	followed 4:13	1386
alternative 5:25	5:14	foregoing 7:6,11	lack 5:22
6:3,15,16 alternatives 4:10	consequence 5:9	formal 4:13 6:17	lane 5:13 6:9
5:3,4,24	county 1:1 2:5	forth 7:7	lanes 5:15 6:10
amp 6:1	create 6:13	forward 6:16	large 5:22
amp 0.1	cicate 0.15	freeway 6:8	length 5:10,14,20

Page 1

Hahn & Bowersock, A Veritext Company 800.660.3187

[letter - witness]

letter 4:13 6:17	original 4:18	record 4:9 7:8	submitted 6:18
longer 6:5	0	recorded 4:12	subscribe 7:16
loop 5:5,16,23	р	regarding 4:9,10	summary 5:12
6:12	p.m. 2:13,14 4:2,2	relative 4:21 5:3	supports 6:7
	6:20	7:14	1111 all 1110
m	pages 1:18	released 4:20	t
machine 7:9	palm 2:12	replace 5:5	taken 2:12 7:6
mainline 6:6	particular 4:21	reported 1:16	team 4:18
match 6:5	parties 7:15	reporter 2:15 7:2	thereof 7:12
maximize 5:14	pdt 4:18,23 5:1	7:5,22	three 5:13
meet 5:7 6:1	phase 5:17	representatives	thursday 1:10
meeting 1:2 2:6,12	place 7:7	4.25	2:14 4:2
member 4:23	plan 5:19	requirements 5:8	time 5:1 7:7
members 5:1	point 6:3	6:2	timing 5:16
mentioned 6:17	potential 4:10	review 4:20,25	toa 4:22 5:6,12 6:4
merge 6:3	preferred 6:15	5:25	traffic 4:21 6:4,6
merging 6:4	prior 4:14 6:18	5:25 reviewing 4:15,19	transcribed 7:10
meter 5:8 6:1	problem 5:19	route 4:11 6:8	transcript 2:12
months 4:24	problems 6:13	Toute 4.11 0.0	transcription 7:12
moved 6:16	proceedings 6:20	S	transit 1:1 2:5
n	7:6,8	see 4:24	transportation 4:6
name 4:5 7:16	project 4:18 5:18	series 5:2	turn 5:15
need 5:17	propose 5:4	set 7:7	u
neither 7:13	proposed 5:13,23	shorthand 2:15	unacceptable 5:21
north 2:12	ptd 4:25	7:2,4,9,22	undersigned 7:4
northbound 5:4	public 1:2 2:6,12	shows 5:25	unfortunately
november 4:14	4:20	signal 5:16	4:17
6:19 7:17	purpose 5:13 6:9	signature 7:21	
0	put 5:19	six 4:24	V
1/15/15	q	space 5:23	vehicles 5:10
obvious 5:9	quote 5:7,8,12,18	speakers 3:3	verbatim 7:8
october 1:10 2:14	6:4,6	speed 6:5,5	W
4:2	r	staff 4:15,17,19	whereof 7:16
operation 6:11		5:22	witness 7:16
operations 4:21	ramp 5:5,6,7,8,10	start 4:19	
opinion 5:21	5:16,22,23 6:2,10	state 4:11 6:8 7:5	
orange 1:1,9 2:5	6:12,12	statement 4:9,12	
2:13 4:1,7,10,14	ramps 6:1	states 5:6	
4:17 5:2,21,22 6:7	realigned 6:2	storage 5:8,10,14	
6:14	recommendation	5:15,20,23 6:1	
orangewood 4:11	6:15	street 5:15	
5:5,11,16 6:12			

Page 2

Hahn & Bowersock, A Veritext Company 800.660.3187

L-1a. City of Orange, Douglas Keys. October 25, 2018. Public Meeting at OCTA.

Comment: Unfortunately, while City of Orange staff has been included in the original project design team, PDT, staff was not allowed to start reviewing the document until it was released for public review. This is of particular concern relative to the traffic operations analysis, TOA. This document was completed in April 2018, but the City, a PDT member, was not allowed to see the document for six months. City representatives on the PTD should be allowed to review all documents at the same time as the other PDT members.

Response: The Project Development Team (PDT) members are an important part of the interdisciplinary approach to project development and decision making. Caltrans appreciates the city's participation in the PDT process, particularly in representing the community of Orange as a potentially affected group. The purpose of the PDT is to help inform project development and environmental analysis by providing specialized input for consideration in developing project alternatives and evaluating environmental effects. Members of the PDT can direct the course of studies by providing specialized knowledge of local conditions and constraints. Members of the PDT can also make recommendations and help accumulate data for evaluation during the environmental process. The environmental analysis then considers information provided by the PDT in evaluating all aspects of the project's effects on the environment and community. Once the environmental analyses have been completed, they are summarized in the environmental document. The environmental document presents information on all aspects of the project and their potential effects on the environment and community. It's during the public review period that members of the public are asked to review and comment on the benefits and impacts of the project. The PDT then considers public input in making a recommendation on a preferred alternative (PA). As a member of the public and as a member of the PDT, the city will have an opportunity to comment on the environmental findings, as well as weigh in on recommending a PA.

L-1b. City of Orange, Douglas Keys. October 25, 2018. Public Meeting at OCTA.

Comment: The City of Orange has a series concerns relative to Alternatives 2-A and 2-B. Both of these alternatives propose to eliminate a northbound direct on ramp at Orangewood Avenue and replace it with a loop on ramp. The TOA states that even with the HOV design exception, quote, the ramp configuration does not meet the storage requirements for the ramp meter, end quote. The City believes that an obvious consequence of inadequate ramp storage length is that vehicles will back up onto Orangewood Avenue.

Response: The ramp meter queuing analysis described in the TOAR states that with a two-lane on-ramp (plus an HOV bypass lane) "a queue storage length of approximately 1,100 feet per lane is required to accommodate general-purpose vehicles; however, the reconstructed loop on-ramp in Alternatives 2A & 2B provides an estimated available queue storage length of only 490 feet per lane." Additional queuing space totaling 1,220 feet (1,100x2 - 490x2 = 1,220) would be necessary in the turn bays for the eastbound right turn and the westbound left turn. Two-thirds of the turning vehicles are coming from the eastbound right turn and one-third is coming from the westbound left turn. Assigning two-thirds of the storage to the eastbound right turn would mean that 813 feet of storage would be required, or 407 feet per lane in the two-lane right turn bay. For the westbound left turn, 407 feet of storage would be required or 204 feet per lane in the two-

lane left turn bay. The concept plans for Alternatives 2A and 2B show that there is approximately 420 feet of storage per lane for the eastbound right turn, and 180 feet of striped storage plus 60 feet of unstriped bay opening per lane for the westbound left turn so all queued vehicles are forecast to be stored in the turn lanes and not impact the through lanes on Orangewood Avenue. If the HOV bypass lane Design Exception is granted, 247 feet of storage per lane would be required for the eastbound right turn and 123 feet of storage per lane would be required for the westbound left turn so that all queued vehicles are forecast to be stored in the turn lanes and not impact the through lanes on Orangewood Avenue.

Caltrans Ramp Metering Design Manual (April 2016) Section 1.4 states, "Local streets in the vicinity of a metered entrance ramp may be improved to provide more queue storage when the traffic demand exceeds available storage length at the entrance ramp. Local street improvements may include widening or lengthening existing roadways or intersections to provide additional storage capacity for the appropriate movements. Adjusting the signal timing at upstream intersections that direct traffic to the entrance ramp also helps to mitigate arrivals of platoons. These improvements require coordination with local agencies to be consistent with the regional traffic operations strategies. The ideal strategy would be a system-wide adaptive ramp metering system that coordinates with local roadway signal systems."

L-1c. City of Orange, Douglas Keys. October 25, 2018. Public Meeting at OCTA.

Comment: The TOA goes on to say that, quote, in summary, along with this proposed three general purpose lane configuration to maximize the available storage length, the available storage on the arterial street turn lanes to the Orangewood loop on ramp and the signal timing will need to be addressed in the final design phase of the project, end quote. This plan to put off the problem of inadequate storage length until the final design is completely unacceptable to the City of Orange. In the opinion of the City of Orange staff, the very large lack of ramp storage space on the proposed loop ramp is a fatal flaw for both alternatives 2-A and 2-B. Interestingly, a review of Alternative 2 shows that all ramps meet Caltrans amp meter storage requirements. In fact, the realigned direct on ramp in Alternative 2 would extend the merge point, according the TOA, quote, would allow merging traffic to have a longer distance to gain speed to match the speed of mainline traffic, end quote.

Response: The final sentence on page 58 will be revised to read, "…available storage on the arterial street turn lanes to the Orangewood loop on-ramp and the signal timing <u>will be designed</u> <u>to manage the queued traffic</u> in the final design phase of the project." Additionally, the ramps in Alternative 2 do not meet the Caltrans ramp meter storage requirement, however, the eastbound and westbound right turn lanes would be sufficient to store the queued vehicles so they would have minimal impact on the through lanes.

L-1d. City of Orange, Douglas Keys. October 25, 2018. Public Meeting at OCTA.

Comment: The City of Orange supports, Caltrans' efforts to improve freeway conditions on State Route 57. The addition of the fifth general purpose lane and additional lanes for the Katella off ramp will help improve the operation of the 57. However, changing the direct on ramp at Orangewood Avenue to a loop on ramp will create irreparable problems at this interchange. The

City of Orange will advocate for the recommendation of Alternative 2 as the preferred alternative to be moved forward for implementation.

Response: Thank you for your support of the proposed improvements to SR 57 northbound operations. The addition of the fifth general purpose lane meets the project's purpose and need to establish lane continuity and improve mobility and the addition of a second lane to the Katella Avenue off-ramp will improve storage capacity on the off-ramp. Analysis of the proposed modifications at Orangewood under all three Build Alternatives were determined to be feasible and no operational issues were identified. Thank you for your input and recommendation concerning the project alternatives.

L-1e. City of Orange, Douglas Keys. October 25, 2018. Public Meeting at OCTA.

Comment: As mentioned earlier, a formal letter will be submitted to Caltrans prior to the comment deadline of November 9th.

Response: This letter has been received and responded to within this Section.

IS/EA SR 57 Northbound Improvement Project 4 Comments and Coordination

DIRACTORS DENIS R. BILODEAU, P.E. SHAWN DEWANE CATHY GREEN DINA NGUYEN VICENTE SARMIENTO STEPHEN R. SHELDON TRI TA JAMES VANDERBILT BRUGE WHITAKER ROGER C, YON, P.E.



ORANGE COUNTY WATER DISTRICT

GRANGE COUNTY'S BROUNDWATER AUTHORITY

orncons President DENIS R. BILODEAU, P.E.

First Vice President WACANT

Second Vice President SHAWN DEWANE

General Manager MICHAEL R. MARKUS, P.E., D.WRE

November 1, 2018

Ms. Kathleen Dove California Department of Transportation, District 12 Division of Environmental Analysis 1750 4th Street #100 Santa Ana, CA 92075

Dear Ms. Dove:

Subject: Initial Study/Environmental Assessment for State Route 57 Northbound Improvement Project, SCH Number: 2018101029

The Orange County Water District (OCWD) appreciates the opportunity to review and comment on the State Route 57 Northbound Improvement Project. OCWD was established by the State of California in 1933 to manage the Orange County Groundwater Basin. Water produced from the basin is the primary water supply for approximately 2.5 million residents in Orange County.

The proposed project involves improvements to the northbound SR 57 from Orangewood Avenue to Katella Avenue and includes the section of SR 57 that crosses the Santa Ana River. OCWD facilities located within the project limits include OCWD monitoring well SAR-3 (coordinates: 6066892.0, 2238409.3) and the Groundwater Replenishment System Pipeline, located in the Santa Ana River levee. These facilities are shown in the map below.

L-2a

Please consider the location of these facilities in any planning and construction activities related to this project. If you have any questions, please contact Greg Woodside, Executive Director of Planning and Natural Resources at 714-378-3275 (gwoodside@ocwd.com).

PO 80x 8300 Fountain Valley, CA 92728-8300 18700 Ward Street Fountain Valley, CA 92708 (714) 378-3200 (714) 378-3373 fax

www.ocwd.com

Ms. Dove November 1, 2018 Page 2 of 2



Thank you for the opportunity to submit these comments.

Sincerely,

Michael R. Markus, P.E., D.WRE, BCEE, F.ASCE General Manager
L-2a. Orange County Water District, Michael R. Markus. November 1, 2018. Letter.

Comment: OCWD facilities located within the project limits include OCWD monitoring well SAR-3 (coordinates: 60668920, 22384093) and the Groundwater Comment Replenishment System Pipeline, located in the Santa Ana River levee. These facilities are shown in the map below. Please consider the location of these facilities in any planning and construction activities related to this project.

Response: Caltrans acknowledges the presence of these two facilities and agrees with the locations shown in the map provided by OCWD. Subsurface construction for the project is expected to be on the northbound side of the freeway, on the north side of the Santa Ana River bridge. No construction activity is anticipated in the area around the SAR-3 monitoring well. The Groundwater Replenishment System Pipeline, located within the Santa Ana River levee has been considered in the development of this project. The approximate horizontal and vertical location of the pipe places it in a way that it is not in conflict with the project and will not require relocation. Location confirmation via potholing will be accomplished during final design. Any changes that occur during final design that could potentially affect the Groundwater Replenishment System Pipeline will be coordinated with OCWD.

ANGE Resources Our Community, Our Commitment

DYLAN WRIGHT DIRECTOR OC COMMUNITY RESOURCES November 8, 2018

CYMANTHA ATKINSON DEPUTY DIRECTOR

OC COMMUNITY RESOURCES MIKE KAVIANI

DIRECTOR OC ANIMAL CARE

JULIA BIDWELL DIRECTOR OC HOUSENG & COMMUNETY DEVELOPMENT

JIM WHEELER MANAGER CONTINUUM OF CARE

RENEE RAMIREZ DIRECTOR OC COMMUNITY SERVICES

STACY BLACKWOOD DIRECTOR OC PARKS

HELEN FRIED COUNTY LIBRARIAN OC PUBLIC LIBRARIES Kathleen Dove Caltrans District 12 Division of Environmental Analysis 1750 East 4th Street, Suite 100 Santa Ana, CA 92705

Subject: State Route 57 Improvement Project (Northbound)

Dear Ms. Dove:

OC Parks appreciates the opportunity to comment on the aforementioned project. Because the project impacts access to the Santa Ana River Trail, OC Parks understands that pursuant to Section 2-14 of the IS/MND document, Caltrans proposes:

Equipment crossing(s) the SART/Bicycle Path would be managed by flagmen to ensure trail user safety and continued access. In addition to equipment crossing(s) false work to support the bridge structure during reconstruction would need to be installed (and later dismantled) over the SART/Bicycle Path. To install and tear down the false work, the trail would be temporarily closed for a period of 12 hours at the beginning and end of the 9-month construction period. During construction, the trail would remain open to users during public access hours (7 a.m. - 6 p.m. Nov. 1 to Feb 28 and 7 a.m. - 9 p.m. Mar. 1 to October 31). The temporary closures would occur during non-public access hours.

- 1. Please clarify how notification of the project and detour information will be conveyed to the trail using public.
- 2. Please clarify if afterhours operations are required in terms of construction and/or dismantling of the required scaffolding and falsework.
- 3. Will Caltrans be seeking Section 4(f) De Minimis concurrence L-3c from OC Parks?



13042 OLD MYFORD ROAD IRVINE, CA 92602 PHONE: 866.0CPARKS FAX: 714-667-6511

Sincerely

Car Ellas

Eric E. Hull, AICP Entitlement Manager, OC Parks

L-3a

L-3b

L-3a. OC Parks. November 8, 2018. Letter.

Comment: Please clarify how notification of the project and detour information will be conveyed to the trail using public.

Response: The project's Traffic Management Plan (TMP) requires that the contractor place signs in appropriate locations to notify the public of construction related detours. In addition, the TMP includes a Public Awareness Campaign (PAC) to notify the public of detours. The PAC includes the use of brochures, mailers and press releases to assist in reaching the public and notifying them of closures and detours. The TMP includes development of a community task force that will include key stakeholders that may be impacted by the work zone activities. The community task force will meet on a regular basis to determine project timelines, special events, known public impacts, street and lane closures, detours, and more. The task force will discuss how to best communicate impacts to the public. The most directly affected stakeholders can be identified and sent targeted information during construction on a regular basis through periodic meetings, e-mail, fax notices and social media.

Per the Project's TMP the public will be made aware of potential disruptions to trail access, such as times and frequency of closures. The TMP includes measures to assist the public with their travel plans and options during construction. One of these measures includes the PAC, which uses project brochures and mailers, press releases and media alerts, a project website, telephone help line, community taskforce, construction team workshop and select stakeholder communication to notify the public of detours and route options.

L-3b. OC Parks. November 8, 2018. Letter.

Comment: Please clarify if afterhours operations are required in terms of construction and/or dismantling of the required scaffolding and falsework.

Response: To avoid impacts to the Santa Ana River Trail/Bicycle Path, the project proposes to close the trail/bicycle path afterhours to install (and later dismantle) falsework at the Santa Ana River bridge. The trail would be temporarily closed for a 12-hour period at the beginning of construction and another 12-hour period at the end of construction. No other afterhours operations would be required.

L-3c. OC Parks. November 8, 2018. Letter.

Comment: Will Caltrans be seeking Section 4(f) De Minimis concurrence 4(f) from OC Parks?

Response: Yes, to fulfill the requirements of Section 4(f), Caltrans will be seeking concurrence on the *de minimis* determination for impacts to the Santa Ana River Trail (SART) and co-located bike path. A Preliminary De Minimis Determination coordination letter was sent to OC Parks on August 23, 2018 (see Appendix E), that outlined the Section 4(f) requirements, described the proposed project and explained the associated impacts to the SART and bike path. Following public circulation of the Draft Environmental Document, which occurred from October 11, 2018 to November 9, 2018, Caltrans reviewed comments received from agencies and the public regarding the project. The only comments received regarding Section 4(f) resources were from OC Parks. Caltrans will complete the Section 4(f) process by requesting concurrence from OC Parks, as the official with jurisdiction over the resource, to obtain written concurrence with the *de minimis* determination.



Kathleen Dove, DOT November 9, 2018 Page 2 of 2

storage is 860 feet per lane, while only 490 feet per lane of storage will be provided. That means that approximately 275 feet of storage per turn lane will need to be provided on Orangewood Avenue, assuming equal utilization of all four turning lanes. Given that this demand would be significantly greater for afternoon events at Angel Stadium, any queue spillover onto Orangewood Avenue will significantly impact traffic flows egressing the stadium during peak hours. The City of Anaheim cannot accept an alternative that by design will result in on-ramp spillover queuing onto Orangewood Avenue. This is not a pre-existing condition like the southbound on-ramp from Orangewood Avenue. In comparison, this is not an impact for Alternative 2 with the HOV bypass design exception (per page 55 of the TOAR), since the existing NB slip ramp would remain.

Furthermore, the 2025 and 2045 weaving analysis indicates that under Alternatives 2A and 2B, the weaving segment LOS will be slightly worse than under Alternative 2 for both peak hours, even though Alternatives 2A and 2B eliminate the non-standard weaving segment under Alternative 2 and existing conditions. In 2045, the AM peak hour is projected to be LOS D under Alternative 2, but is projected to be LOS E under Alternatives 2A and 2B.

While we understand the desire to eliminate the northbound non-standard weaving distance between Orangewood and Katella, the TAOR clearly indicates that Alternative 2 is superior for both the freeway and for Orangewood Avenue.

If you have any questions regarding these comments, please do not hesitate to contact Rafael Cobian at (714) 765-4991 or regionalectropy.com (714) 765-4991 or regionalectropy.com (714) 765-4991 or regionalectropy.com (714) 765-491 or regionalectropy.com (714) 765-491 or regionalectropy.com (714) 765-760 or <a href="mailto:regionalectr

Sincerely,

Rudy Emami Director of Public Works

Cc: Rafael Cobian, Principal Traffic Engineer

I-4e

L-4f

L-4d

continued

L-4a. City of Anaheim. November 9, 2018. Letter.

Comment: The City of Anaheim would like to request a meeting to discuss the traffic items in more detail to assist in resolving these comments.

Response: Thank you for being available to discuss your comments. Should there be a need for additional clarification Caltrans will arrange for a meeting.

L-4b. City of Anaheim. November 9, 2018. Letter.

Comment: The City of Anaheim supports Alternative 2.

Response: Thank you for your input and recommendation concerning the project's alternatives.

L-4c. City of Anaheim. November 9, 2018. Letter.

Comment: The Design Plans in Appendix G for Orangewood Avenue at the northbound SR-57 ramps show two eastbound right turn lanes for vehicles turning right onto the realigned loop ramp for all build alternatives. Under all analysis scenarios, the right turn volume onto the on—ramp is metered by the southbound ramp intersection. Specifically, there is only one eastbound through lane available for traffic bound for northbound SR—S7 at the southbound ramps intersection. As a result, we believe that the second right turn lane is excessive. Additionally, a second right turn lane is not advised at locations with a crosswalk, as vehicles in the outer turn lane have greater difficulty observing pedestrians that may be in the crosswalk. Removal of the additional right turn lane would also improve flexibility in lane widths under the bridge. We recommend a quick analysis of the Orangewood Ave/northbound SR—57 ramps intersection to be analyzed for the build alternatives with one eastbound right turn lane, and if it operates acceptably, the additional right turn lane should be removed.

Response: The northbound ramp intersection was evaluated with a single right turn lane for level of service (LOS) and the analysis shows that the intersection is forecast to operate at an acceptable LOS with a single right turn lane. However, the ramp meter queuing analysis described in the TOAR states that with a two-lane on-ramp (plus an HOV bypass lane) "a queue storage length of approximately 1,100 feet per lane is required to accommodate the generalpurpose vehicles; however, the reconstructed loop on ramp, in Alternatives 2A and 2B, provides an estimated available queue storage length of only 490 feet per lane." Additional queuing space totaling 1,220 feet (1,100x2 - 490x2 = 1,220) would be necessary in the turn bays for the eastbound right turn and the westbound left turn. Two-thirds of the turning vehicles are coming from the eastbound right turn and one-third is coming from the westbound left turn. Assigning two-thirds of the storage to the eastbound right turn would mean that 813 feet of storage would be required, or 407 feet per lane in the two-lane right turn bay. For the westbound left turn, 407 feet of storage would be required or 204 feet per lane in the two-lane left turn bay. The concept plans for Alternatives 2A and 2B show that there is approximately 420 feet of storage per lane for the eastbound right turn and 180 feet of striped storage plus 60 feet of unstriped bay opening per lane for the westbound left turn so all queued vehicles are forecast to be stored in the turn lanes and not impact the through lanes on Orangewood Avenue. If the HOV bypass lane Design Exception is granted, 247 feet of storage per lane would be required for the eastbound right turn and 123 feet of storage per lane would be required for the westbound left turn so that all queued vehicles would be stored in the turn lanes and not impact the through lanes on Orangewood Avenue. As such dual right turn lanes are recommended.

L-4d. City of Anaheim. November 9, 2018. Letter.

Comment: Page 58 of the Traffic Operations Analysis Report, under the Ramp Metering and Storage section, states that for Alternatives 2A and 2B, the ramp configuration, even without the HOV bypass lane, will not meet the storage requirements for a ramp meter. With the HOV bypass lane design exception, the required queue storage is 860 feet per lane, while only 490 feet per lane of storage will be provided. That means that approximately 275 feet of storage per turn lane will need to be provided on Orangewood Avenue, assuming equal utilization of all four turning lanes. Given that this demand would be significantly greater for afternoon events at Angel Stadium, any queue spillover onto Orangewood Avenue will significantly impact traffic flows egressing' the 6-D stadium during peak hours. The City of Anaheim cannot accept an alternative that by design will result in on-ramp spillover queuing onto Orangewood Avenue. In comparison, this is not an impact for Alternative 2 with the HOV bypass design exception (per page 55 of the TOAR), since the existing NB slip ramp would remain.

Response: The ramp meter queuing analysis described in the TOAR states that with a two-lane on-ramp (plus an HOV bypass lane) "a queue storage length of approximately 1,100 feet per lane is required to accommodate the general-purpose vehicles, however, the reconstructed loop onramp, in Alternatives 2A and 2B, provides an estimated available queue storage length of only 490 feet per lane." Additional queuing space totaling 1,220 feet (1,100x2 - 490x2 = 1,220) would be necessary in the turn bays for the eastbound right turn and the westbound left turn. Two-thirds of the turning vehicles are coming from the eastbound right turn and one-third is coming from the westbound left turn. Assigning two-thirds of the storage to the eastbound right turn would mean that 813 feet of storage would be required, or 407 feet per lane in the two-lane right turn bay. For the westbound left turn, 407 feet of storage would be required or 204 feet per lane in the two-lane left turn bay. The concept plans for Alternatives 2A and 2B show that there is approximately 420 feet of storage per lane for the eastbound right turn and 240 feet of storage per lane for the westbound left turn so all queued vehicles are forecast to be stored in the turn lanes and not impact the through lanes on Orangewood Avenue. If the HOV bypass lane Design Exception is granted, 247 feet of storage per lane would be required for the eastbound right turn and 123 feet of storage per lane would be required for the westbound left turn so that all queued vehicles are forecast to be stored in the turn lanes and not impact the through lanes on Orangewood Avenue. Additionally, the ramps in Alternative 2 do not meet the Caltrans ramp meter storage requirement, however, the eastbound and westbound right turn lanes would be sufficient to store the queued vehicles so they would have minimal impact on the through lanes.

It is standard practice to analyze peak hour traffic because it generally represents the worst **recurring** congestion. Event traffic "for afternoon events at Angel Stadium" is typically outside the peak hour, and is considered non-recurring. Of the 80 or so home games at Angel Stadium, nearly all are at times that do not coincide with the peak hour or are on the weekend. In 2018 only one weekday baseball game was scheduled to begin before 7 PM. Non-baseball events also typically begin at or after 6:30 PM while the peak hour is typically between 4 and 6 PM.

L-4e. City of Anaheim. November 9, 2018. Letter.

Comment: Furthermore, the 2025 and 2045 weaving analysis indicates that under Alternatives 2A and 2B, the weaving segment LOS will be slightly worse than under Alternative 2 for both

peak hours, even though Alternatives 2A and 2B eliminate the non-standard weaving segment under Alternative 2 and existing conditions. In 2045, the AM peak hour is projected to be LOS D under Alternative 2, but is projected to be LOS E under Alternatives 2A and 2B.

Response: The weave analysis methodology prescribed by the Highway Capacity Manual (2016) places greater emphasis on the weaving volume than the weaving length. As such, Alternatives 2A and 2B, that aggregate all entering vehicles onto one on-ramp, have a higher weaving volume than Alternative 2 and thus are forecast to operate slightly worse than Alternative 2. It is important to note that the upper limit for LOS D for density is 35.0 passenger cars per mile per lane (pc/mi/ln) and the density for Alternative 2 in 2045 in the AM peak hour is 34.9 pc/mi/ln. While the analysis reports the level of service of Alternative 2 as D and the level of service of Alternatives 2A and 2B as E (density = 38.2 pc/mi/ln), Alternative 2 is very nearly LOS E.

L-4f. City of Anaheim. November 9, 2018. Letter.

Comment: While we understand the desire to eliminate the northbound non-standard weaving distance between Orangewood and Katella, the TAOR clearly indicates that Alternative 2 is superior for both the freeway and for Orangewood Avenue.

Response: The determination of a "superior" alternative is based on a holistic evaluation of all aspects of each proposed alternative, such as traffic, as well as other differentiators. The PDT will consider each differentiator when making a recommendation for a Preferred Alternative.



CITY OF ORANGE

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT ENGINEERING DIVISION (714) 744-5544 FAX: (714) 744-5573

(714) 532-6480 FAX: (714) 532-6444 TRAFFIC DIVISION (714) 744-5540 FAX: (714) 744-5573 WATER DIVISION (714) 288-2475 FAX: (714) 744-2973

November 9, 2018

Kathleen Dove sent via email: SR57ImprovementsProject@dot.ca.gov Caltrans 1750 East 4th Street, Suite 100 Santa Ana, CA 92705

Subject: State Route 57 Improvement Project (Northbound) Mitigated Negative Declaration/Initial Study/Environmental Assessment

Dear Ms. Dove:

Thank you for providing the City of Orange (City) with the opportunity to review and comment on the Mitigated Negative Declaration/Initial Study/Environmental Assessment for the State Route 57 Improvement Project (Northbound). The project is located within the cities of Anaheim and Orange, and extends one mile from 0.3 mile south of the Orangewood Avenue undercrossing to the Katella Avenue undercrossing. The proposed project would widen the SR-57 freeway and proposed operational improvements would include construction of the missing section of the fifth GP lane, extension of the existing auxiliary lane from the Orangewood Avenue off-ramp, and adding a second lane to the Katella Avenue off-ramp to provide additional storage capacity, and extension of the merge length between the existing freeway on-/off-ramps to improve weaving distance. Four alternatives are evaluated in detail for the proposed project.

Due to the location within the City of Orange, the City has an interest in ensuring that the environmental document addresses potential adverse impacts to Orange residents and infrastructure. As such, we offer the following comments on the Traffic Operations Analysis Report:

 Page 8: Table 1-1 indicates that on-street parking spaces are displaced as a part of Alternatives 2A and 2B. A review of the project plans (Sheet L-5) does not show the displaced parking. Please provide information showing the number and location of the on-street parking spaces to be displaced as a part of Alternatives 2A and 2B.

ORANGE CIVIC CENTER

٠

300 E. CHAPMAN AVENUE
ORANGE, CA 92866-1591
P.O. BOX 449
Printed on Recycled Paper

L-5a



- Page 33: What is the Platinum Triangle Expansion Project growth factor that is
 used to estimate 2045 intersection turning movements? No numerical value is
 given in the report. Please clarify in the report.
- Page 57: Although the weave lengths for Alternatives 2A and 2B meet Caltrans standard of 2,000 feet, neither alternative performs as well as Alternative 2 in the Weave Segment Analysis. Alternative 2, which has a nonstandard weave length, has a better Level of Service (LOS) in both 2025 and 2045 when compared to Alternatives 2A and 2B. Please include in the report an explanation why Alternative 2 has the best Weave Segment Analysis of the project alternatives analyzed.
- Page 58: In the section on Ramp Metering and Storage that discusses Alternatives 2A and 2B, the report indicates that the reconfigured loop on-ramp does not have the storage capacity to accommodate the vehicle demand. The report concludes that "No options to provide this storage are feasible nor practical due to the constraints of this site".

The City of Orange is concerned that this large shortage of sufficient storage space for the reconfigured loop on-ramp (more than 1,000 feet in total) will lead to vehicle back-up on Orangewood Avenue creating congestion at the interchange. The report's conclusion that, "no options to provide this storage are feasible nor practical due to the constraints of the site," leads the City to conclude that the design of Alternatives 2A and 2B is flawed and neither should be recommended as the preferred alternative.

- Page 58: Addressing the insufficient storage length "in the final design phase of the project" is not acceptable to the City of Orange. Based on the conclusions in the report, the storage length issue cannot be resolved, and that Alternatives 2A and 2B will create congestion problems at the Orangewood interchange.
- Page 63: The Summary of Results does not provide a meaningful comparison of the alternatives. The summary at the end of the section should provide facts. Instead, it appears to create confusion. The text says that removing the nonstandard weave distance could "potentially assist in lowering future accident rates". This statement is not supported by any of the analysis in the report. The report does show that Alternative 2, with its nonstandard weave distance, has a better LOS than either 2A or 2B. This is a fact that is downplayed by the summary saying that the change is only about 10%.

The City requests removing or editing the last sentence on Page 63. The fact that Alternative 2 has a better Weave Segment Analysis LOS than the other two alternatives should not be downplayed. L-5b

L-5d

L-5f

L-5g

 The City of Orange recommends Alternative 2 as the preferred alternative to be moved forward for implementation.

The City offers the following comments on the Traffic and Transportation/Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities section of the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration/Environmental Assessment:

- The analysis does not address potential increase in hazards due to a design feature. As discussed in the City's comments above on the Traffic Operations Analysis Report, the report states on page 58 that the proposed ramp configuration for Alternatives 2A and 2B does not meet the storage requirements for the ramp meter, and no options to provide this storage are feasible or practical. This issue would lead to vehicle back-up on Orangewood Avenue creating congestion at the interchange. There is no discussion in the environmental document of this potentially significant impact and no mitigation proposed in either the report or the environmental document.
- The analysis does not address potential impacts to emergency access. As discussed in the previous comment, under Alternatives 2A and 2B, there would be a potential vehicle back-up on Orangewood Avenue, which could significantly impact emergency access. There is no discussion or mitigation proposed in the environmental document. Although emergency access is discussed under Utilities and Emergency Services, it does not address the potential impacts to access caused by vehicle back up due to the lack of storage space under Alternatives 2A and 2B.
- Please include in the analysis under freeway merge and diverse segments a discussion of how the lack of storage requirements for the ramp meter for Alternatives 2A and 2B would impact LOS for both segment and intersections.
- Please include a clearer summary and table that describes the potential impacts of each Alternatives (i.e., which intersections or segments would be significantly impacted) and concluded what the potential impact differences would be between each alternative. There is a Summary of Results in the Traffic Operations Analysis Report that should be included in the analysis and conclusions of this section. Please refer to above comment on page 63 of the Traffic Operations Analysis Report.
- Page 2-63: The conclusion in the analysis for Freeway Weave Segment does not address that the LOS impact under Alternative 2 is less than the impact of Alternatives 2A and 2B. Please refer to above comment on page 57 of the Traffic Operations Analysis Report.
- Page 2-66: On Table 2-30, the North Katella Avenue direct on-ramp in the AM should be bolded for all three columns.
- Page 2-68: There is no discussion why Alternative 2A and 2B would have a greater impact to LOS compared to Alternative 2 and whether the difference is

L-5h

L-5i

L-51

L-5m

significance. There must be analysis and comparison of the alternatives in order to select the environmentally superior option.

The City offers the following comments on the Noise section of the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration/Environmental Assessment:

 The proposed project site is located near to single-family residential uses. The City requests that the environmental document identifies all feasible mitigation measures to reduce and minimize construction noise impacts and vibrations to Orange.

The City appreciates the opportunity to comment on the environmental document and we look forward to reviewing the final document upon completion. If you have any questions, please contact Douglas Keys, Transportation Analyst with the City of Orange, at (714) 744-5541 or at dkeys@cityoforange.org.

Sincerely,

Christopher S. Cash Public Works Director

cc: Rick Otto, City Manager, City of Orange William R. Crouch, Community Development Director Frank Sun, Assistant Public Works Director/City Engineer Anna Pehoushek, Assistant Community Development Director, City of Orange Ashley Brodkin, Associate Planner, City of Orange L-5p

L-50

Continued

L-5a. City of Orange. November 9, 2018. Letter.

Comment: Due to the location within the City of Orange, the City has an interest in ensuring that the environmental document addresses potential adverse impacts to Orange residents and infrastructure. As such, we offer the following comments on the Traffic Operations Analysis Report:

Page 8: Table 1-1 indicates that on-street parking spaces are displaced as a part of Alternatives 2A and 2B. A review of the project plans (Sheet L-5) does not show the displaced parking. Please provide information showing the number and location of the on-street parking spaces to be displaced as a part of Alternatives 2A and 2B.

Response: Table 1-1 is incorrect. No on-street parking will be displaced. The table will be revised.

L-5b. City of Orange. November 9, 2018. Letter.

Comment: Page 10: In the description of Alternative 2A, the report states that the newly constructed signalized intersection at Orangewood would control vehicle access to "loop and slip on-ramps". Alternative 2A removes the northbound slip on-ramp. Please correct the text in this section.

Response: The description for Alternative 2A is incorrect. Alternative 2A removes the slip on-ramp. The text will be revised.

L-5c. City of Orange. November 9, 2018. Letter.

Comment: Page 33: What is the Platinum Triangle Expansion Project growth factor that is used to estimate 2045 intersection turning movements? No numerical value is given in the report. Please clarify in the report.

Response: A compound growth rate of 3.6% was assumed for intersection forecast. This is the local growth assumption used for the Platinum Triangle Project. Since the OCTAM model Buildout condition is Year 2035, this growth factor was applied to the OCTAM 2035 model forecast to derive 2045 intersection volume estimates.

L-5d. City of Orange. November 9, 2018. Letter.

Comment: Page 57: Although the weave lengths for Alternatives 2A and 2B meet Caltrans standard of 2,000 feet, neither alternative performs as well as Alternative 2 in the Weave Segment Analysis. Alternative 2, which has a nonstandard weave length has a better Level of Service (LOS) in both 2025 and 2045 when compared to Alternatives 2A and 2B. Please include in the report an explanation why Alternative 2 has the best Weave Segment Analysis of the project alternatives analyzed.

Response: The weave analysis methodology prescribed by the Highway Capacity Manual (2016) places greater emphasis on the weaving volume than the weaving length. As such, Alternatives 2A and 2B, that aggregate all entering vehicles onto one on-ramp, have a higher weaving volume than Alternative 2 and thus are forecast to operate slightly worse than Alternative 2.

L-5e. City of Orange. November 9, 2018. Letter.

Comment: Page 58: In the section on Ramp Metering and Storage that discusses Alternative 2A and 2B, the report indicates that the reconfigured loop on—ramp does not have the storage capacity to accommodate the vehicle demand. The report concludes that "No options to provide this storage are feasible nor practical due to the constraints of this site".

The City of Orange is concerned that this large shortage of sufficient storage space for the reconfigured loop on—ramp (more than 1,000 feet in total) will lead to vehicle back-up on Orangewood Avenue creating congestion at the interchange. The report's conclusion that, "no options to provide this storage are feasible nor practical due to the constraints of the site," leads the City to conclude that the design of Alternatives 2A and 2B is flawed and neither should be recommended as the preferred alternative.

Response: The ramp meter queuing analysis described in the TOAR states that with a two-lane on-ramp (plus an HOV bypass lane) "a queue storage length of approximately 1,100 feet per lane is required to accommodate the general-purpose vehicles, however, the reconstructed loop onramp, in Alternatives 2A and 2B, provides an estimated available queue storage length of only 490 feet per lane." Additional queuing space totaling 1,220 feet (1,100x2 - 490x2 = 1,220) would be necessary in the turn bays for the eastbound right turn and the westbound left turn. Two-thirds of the turning vehicles are coming from the eastbound right turn and one-third is coming from the westbound left turn. Assigning two-thirds of the storage to the eastbound right turn would mean that 813 feet of storage would be required, or 407 feet per lane in the two-lane right turn bay. For the westbound left turn, 407 feet of storage would be required or 204 feet per lane in the two-lane left turn bay. The concept plans for Alternatives 2A and 2B show that there is approximately 420 feet of storage per lane for the eastbound right turn and 180 feet of striped storage plus 60 feet of unstriped bay opening per lane for the westbound left turn so all queued vehicles are forecast to be stored in the turn lanes and not impact the through lanes on Orangewood Avenue. If the HOV bypass lane Design Exception is granted, 247 feet of storage per lane would be required for the eastbound right turn and 123 feet of storage per lane would be required for the westbound left turn so that all queued vehicles are forecast to be stored in the turn lanes and not impact the through lanes on Orangewood Avenue. The text will be revised to state that, "No options to provide this storage on the on-ramp are feasible or practical due to the constraints of the site, however, queued vehicles are forecast to be stored in the turn lanes and not impact the through lanes on Orangewood Avenue."

L-5f. City of Orange. November 9, 2018. Letter.

Comment: Page 58: Addressing the insufficient storage length "in the final design phase of the project" is not acceptable to the City of Orange. Based on the conclusions in the report, the storage length issue cannot be resolved, and that Alternatives 2A and 2B will create congestion problems at the Orangewood interchange.

Response: So that the final sentence on page 58 relates to the discussion provided in the response to comment L-5e, it will be revised to read, "…available storage on the arterial street turn lanes to the Orangewood loop on-ramp and the signal timing <u>will be designed to manage the</u> <u>queued traffic</u> in the final design phase of the project."

L-5g. City of Orange. November 9, 2018. Letter.

Comment: Page 63: The Summary of Results does not provide a meaningful comparison of the alternatives. The summary at the end of the section should provide facts. Instead, it appears to create confusion. The text says that removing the nonstandard weave distance could "potentially assist in lowering future accident rates". This statement is not supported by any of the analysis in the report. The report does show that Alternative 2, with its nonstandard weave distance, has better LOS than either 2A or 2B. This is a fact that is downplayed by the summary saying that the change is only about 10%.

The City requests removing or editing the last sentence on Page 63. The fact that Alternative 2 has a better Weave Segment Analysis LOS than the other two alternatives should not be downplayed.

Response: The summary paragraph on page 63 will be revised as follows: "In summary, traffic operations for the three build alternatives (2, 2A, & 2B) are similar during both the opening (2025) and design (2045) years, operating at satisfactory levels of service. Both Alternatives 2A and 2B eliminate the nonstandard weave on the northbound SR-57 freeway mainline. The weave segment for Alternative 2 shows a better level of service compared to the weave segment for Alternatives 2A and 2B in the Opening Year (2025) PM peak hour (C compared to D) and in the Design Year (2045) AM peak hour (D compared to E). The density of the weave in Alternative 2 is 34.9 pc/mi/ln, whereas the density of the weave in Alternatives 2A and 2B is 38.2 pc/mi/ln. The density threshold between LOS D and LOS E is 35.0."

L-5h. City of Orange. November 9, 2018. Letter.

Comment: The City of Orange recommends Alternative 2 as the preferred alternative to be moved forward for implementation.

Response: Thank you for your input and recommendation concerning the project's alternatives.

L-5i. City of Orange. November 9, 2018. Letter.

Comment: The City offers the following comments on the Traffic and Transportation/Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities section of the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration/Environmental Assessment:

The analysis does not address potential increase in hazards due to a design feature. As discussed in the City's comments above on the Traffic Operations Analysis Report, the report states on page 58 that the proposed ramp configuration for Alternatives 2A and 2B does not meet the storage requirements for the ramp meter, and no options to provide this storage are feasible or practical. This issue would lead to vehicle back-up on Orangewood Avenue creating congestion at the interchange. There is no discussion in the environmental document of this potentially significant impact and no mitigation proposed in either the report or the environmental document.

Response: Per the response to L-5e, queued vehicles will be stored in the turn lanes and will not result in a "potentially significant impact." No additional discussion or mitigation is necessary.

L-5j. City of Orange. November 9, 2018. Letter.

Comment: The analysis does not address potential impacts to emergency access. As discussed in the previous comment, under Alternatives 2A and 2B, there would be a potential vehicle back-up on Orangewood Avenue, which could significantly impact emergency access. There is no discussion or mitigation proposed in the environmental document. Although emergency access is discussed under Utilities and Emergency Services, it does not address the potential impacts to access caused by vehicle back up due to the lack of storage space under Alternatives 2A and 2B.

Response: Per the response to L-5e, queued vehicles will be stored in the turn lanes and will not result in an impact to emergency access.

L-5k. City of Orange. November 9, 2018. Letter.

Comment: Please include in the analysis under freeway merge and diverse segments a discussion of how the lack of storage requirements for the ramp meter for Alternatives 2A and 2B would impact LOS for both segment and intersections.

Response: Per the response to L-5e, the ramp and the intersection operation will be acceptable due to the available storage in the right and left turn lanes of the intersection. In order to prevent the eastbound right turn traffic from filling up the on-ramp, a no-right-turn-on-red sign can be included as part of the intersection operations. This way, space will be available at the on-ramp to accommodate the westbound left turn traffic. This condition was evaluated for the Design Year (2045). The results show that with the no-right-turn-on-red sign, the intersection would also operate at LOS C. The ramp traffic would not impact the weave LOS on the freeway because the analysis is based on the peak hour volumes which remain unchanged.

L-5I. City of Orange. November 9, 2018. Letter.

Comment: Please include a clearer summary and table that describes the potential impacts—of each Alternatives (i.e., which intersections or segments would be significantly impacted) and concluded what the potential impact differences would be between each alternative. There is a Summary of Results in the Traffic Operations Analysis Report that should be included in the analysis and conclusions of this section. Please refer to above comment on page 63 of the Traffic Operations Analysis Report.

Response: Section 2.1.6.3, Environmental Consequences, provides summary tables for each project component (e.g freeway segments, weave segments, merge/diverge areas, intersection LOS and HOV lanes) comparing the impacts of each alternative. In addition, the following summary paragraph will be added at the end of Section 2.1.6.3:

The basic freeway segments for all Build Alternatives would operate at satisfactory levels of service (LOS D or better) for the opening (2025) and design (2045) years except for the segment north of the Katella Avenue on-ramp, which would operate at LOS E in the AM for the design year under all Build Alternatives. This is an improvement compared to Alternative 1, the No Build, where one segment operates at LOS E in the opening year (2025) and three segments operate at LOS E or F in the design year (2045). The HOV lane segments are anticipated to operate below capacity for all Build and No-Build Alternatives for both opening and design years. The study freeway weave segment is anticipated to operate at satisfactory levels of service (LOS D or better) for the opening and design years with the exception for the Orangewood Avenue to Katella Off-Ramp segment under Alternative 2A and 2B, which would operate at LOS E in the AM for the design year. This is also an improvement compared to Alternative 1, the No Build, where the weave segment would operate at LOS E or F in both the opening (2025) and design (2045) year. Lastly, the study area intersections are anticipated to operate at satisfactory levels of service (LOS D or better) during the AM and PM peak hours for all Build Alternatives, except for North Eckhoff Street and Chapman Avenue during both the AM and PM peak hours for all Build and No Build Alternatives for both opening and design year.

The following will also be added to Section 2.1.6.4:

The main purpose of the project is to complete the missing gap in the fifth general purpose lane to provide lane continuity and add capacity. Closing the gap in the fifth general purpose lane would help relieve existing and future congestion, as well as improve mobility within the corridor. In addition, the project also proposes to improve existing nonstandard features, which result in bottlenecks, traffic slowing and weaving challenges within the project segment of SR 57.

The proposed project would not worsen the existing HOV lane condition nor does it improve it. Therefore, the project would have no effect on the existing HOV lanes. Likewise, the project would not worsen existing conditions for the basic freeway segments, freeway weave segment and study intersections, and in some instances, would improve operations. Therefore, the project would have no effect or a beneficial effect on the basic freeway segments, freeway weave and study intersections.

Finally, a summary table will be included before Chapter 1. The Table compares alternatives and the associated temporary and permanent impacts for all topic areas discussed in the Environmental Document (e.g. traffic, air, biology, etc).

L-5m. City of Orange. November 9, 2018. Letter.

Comment: Page 2-63: The conclusion in the analysis for Freeway Weave Segment does not address that the LOS impact under Alternative 2 is less than the impact of Alternatives 2A and 2B. Please refer to above comment on page 57 of the Traffic Operations Analysis Report.

Response: The following will be added to the conclusion for Freeway Weave Segment analysis: "The LOS and density forecasted for Alternative 2 is better than the forecast for Alternatives 2A and 2B. Since the LOS for all three build alternatives in 2025 are D or better, all build alternatives are considered acceptable in urban areas where the LOS is required to be D or better."

L-5n. City of Orange. November 9, 2018. Letter.

Comment: Page 2-66: On Table 2-30, the North Katella Avenue direct on-ramp in the AM should be bolded for all three columns.

Response: Table 2-30 is incorrect. The Katella Avenue direct on-ramp density and LOS should be bolded in all three columns. The table will be revised.

L-50. City of Orange. November 9, 2018. Letter.

Comment: Page 2-68: There is no discussion why Alternative 2A and 2B would have a greater impact to LOS compared to Alternative 2 and whether the difference is significance. There must be analysis and comparison of the alternatives in order to select the environmentally superior option.

Response: The weave analysis methodology prescribed by the Highway Capacity Manual (2016) places greater emphasis on the weaving volume than the weaving length. As such, Alternatives 2A and 2B, that aggregate all entering vehicles onto one on-ramp, have a higher weaving volume than Alternative 2 and thus are forecast to operate slightly worse than Alternative 2. The following will be added to the conclusion for Freeway Weave Segment analysis: "The LOS and density forecasted for Alternative 2 is better than the forecast for Alternatives 2A and 2B. Since Alternative 2 is forecast to operate at LOS D, Alternative 2 is considered acceptable in urban areas where the LOS is required to be D or better. Alternatives 2A and 2B operate at LOS E in the AM peak hour which does not meet the threshold of acceptability."

L-5p. City of Orange. November 9, 2018. Letter.

Comment: The City offers the following comments on the Noise section of the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration/Environmental Assessment:

• The proposed project site is located near to single-family residential uses. The City requests that the environmental document identifies all feasible mitigation measures to reduce and minimize construction noise impacts and vibrations to Orange.

Response: The environmental document identifies noise compliance measures that all Build Alternatives would be required to comply with (refer to Section 2.2.7.3, Environmental Consequences). These measures include Caltrans Standard Specifications (Section 14.8-02), which require construction noise to be monitored and controlled, and sets 'not-to-exceed' limits for construction noise. The City of Orange Noise Control Ordinance (2700) also sets not-to-exceed noise limits for construction near residential areas.

COMMENTS Thank you for the tautostic pedestrian and bicyclist improvements at Oringewood - specifically the perpendicular controlled intersections to Northbound SR-57! While the design team and construction crews are nobilized at the Ketella ramps, make the same improvements to the P-10 ramp from Eastbound Katella to Northbourd SR-57. Perpendicular, signalized vamp to SR-57 at Katella. THANK YOU!

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

4.3.1.4

General Public

Public comments will be recorded and responded to in the Final Environmental Document. It is anticipated that the Final Environmental Document will be available to view in 2019.

Please keep me informed about the State Route 57 Northbound Improvement Project and add me to your email distribution list.

P-1a. Anonymous. October 25, 2018. Comment Card.

Comment: Thank you for the fantastic pedestrian and bicyclist improvements at Orangewood-specifically the pedestrian controlled intersections to Northbound SR-57! While the design team and construction crews are mobilized at the Katella ramps, make the same improvements to the ramp from Eastbound Katella to Northbound SR-57. Perpendicular, signalized ramp to SR-57 at Katella.

Response: Thank you for supporting these project improvements. The signalized intersection at Orangewood Avenue will provide improved safety for bicyclists and pedestrians. These improvements were necessitated due to the reconfiguration of the on-ramps at Orangewood under the Build Alternatives. The proposed improvements at the northbound Katella off-ramp would not require modifying the Katella Avenue intersection. The eastbound Katella Avenue on-ramp to northbound SR 57 is outside of the project limits and the scope of the proposed project improvements. Please refer to Section 1.3 of the Draft IS/EA, which provides further clarification on these proposed changes.

Comment Letter Received via Email on November 7th, 2018.

The Pearsons 2315 W. Beverly Drive Orange, CA 92868 714-978-2492 ppearson@elpolloloco.com

Re: SR-57 Northbound Freeway Improvement Project (the "Project")

Mr. & Mrs. Roger Pearson herein present their concerns regarding information presented at the Oct. 25, 2018 Public Hearing regarding the Project. We have reviewed the alternatives/options presented by the Development Committee in implementing the Project and have strong concerns regarding its implementation. We respectfully submit these comments during the mandatory 30-Day Public Review/Circulation Period as allowed under the Final Environmental Study.

As individuals who will be impacted by the project, our concerns include increased traffic and noise, poor to harmful air quality, water quality, visually and aesthetically displeasing surrounding areas and generally negative residential and community issues which most likely will have the effect of decreasing the surrounding community's property values. Among those matters effecting neighborhood perception and subsequent property values center around the following:

- Health & Safety The harm of living near a freeway is compounded when roads are widened and allow even more vehicles to expose the residents to higher pollution levels without adequate measures to reduce that risk. Traffic will be exacerbated by more individuals attempting to access Angels' stadium and the nearby newly-opened breweries because the Project allows such increased traffic patterns. We oppose the inevitable increase in dust particulates, chemicals, and other unknown pollutants, as well as additional vehicle emissions during and upon completion of project construction.
- 2. Traffic Current traffic on Orangewood is excessive in both directions. Installation of additional traffic signals as a part of the Project will compound the problem. As it stands, motorists approaching Orangewood from the North on Eckhoff will most likely continue Southbound on Eckhoff towards Chapman Avenue when encountering congestion on Orangewood. Notably, Eckhoff is the main thoroughfare used by residents, stadium attendees and commercial vehicles. Also of note is that Eckhoff and Sycamore have been in poor condition for some time and any projects considered for the area should have started with the resurfacing and restriping of those streets. Eckhoff is the main access point for residents living in the impacted area.
- Visual/aesthetics/crime In addition to road and construction debris anticipated by the Project, the residents of the area expect increased transient and panhandling issues at signaled intersections on Orangewood due to the increase in traffic and its desirable location. No accommodation has been made to ameliorate that risk.

P-2c

- 4. Local Involvement The cities of Anaheim and Orange are part of the Project's development team. We would like to hear more about their input with respect to the Project. Did they have any objections? What matters were considered in allowing the Project to commence? Further, we would like the opportunity to discuss this with a representative from the City of Orange with knowledge of the Project, as Orange did not have any representatives available at the meeting. Please advise who we may contact at the City of Orange to discuss the Project.
- Noise None of the alternative Plans allow for additional height to existing sound walls in nearby residential areas adjacent to the Northbound Orangewood off-ramp, e.g. West Beverly Drive. Increased traffic can only mean increased noise pollution.

As members of the impacted community, the only acceptable plan is Alternative 2. The others are unacceptable plan is Alternative 2. The others are unacceptable

Alternative 2 would sufficiently move and widen the Westbound vehicular access to a signaled Northbound onramp to 2 lanes. The Eastbound vehicular access to the Northbound Orangewood Avenue loop on-ramp would also be widened to 2 metered lanes.

We appreciate the opportunity to voice our comments, and hope that we have adequately described our concerns.

Kind regards,

Pam Pearson

P-2f

P-2a. Pam and Roger Pearson. November 7, 2018. Email.

Comment: As individuals who will be impacted by the project, our concerns include increased traffic and noise, poor to harmful air quality, water quality, visually and aesthetically displeasing surrounding areas and generally negative residential and community issues which most likely will have the effect of decreasing the surrounding community's property values.

Response: The Project, in and of itself, would not generate additional traffic. The Project is intended to address future projected increases in traffic by providing additional capacity within the northbound segment of the project corridor. Current traffic congestion is a result of a lack in lane continuity on the freeway mainline. The Project proposes to close the existing gap in the fifth general purpose lane, as well as extend the existing auxiliary lane through the Orangewood Avenue interchange to the Katella Avenue off-ramp, to address current congestion and future traffic increases.

During construction, some additional vehicle trips may occur due to construction efforts, thought that would be a temporary circumstance addressed by the Project's Traffic Management Plan (TMP), in addition to potential detours or delays. Once the Project is constructed, the improvements are expected to result in improved traffic flow and freeway operations.

Noise Permanent:

A noise analysis was conducted for the proposed project and as part of the analysis, noise measurements for noise sensitive receptors (i.e. residences, hotels, restaurants, etc.) were taken to evaluate existing and projected noise levels. Based on the analysis, additional heights for existing sound walls were not evaluated because predicted noise levels for receptors located behind the existing sound walls would not approach or exceed the noise abatement criteria and did not substantially exceed the existing noise levels. Therefore, noise impacts would not occur as defined by 23CFR772.5 and Caltrans Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol (policies and procedures).

Noise Temporary:

During construction, residential areas (considered noise sensitive receptors) may experience intermittent increased noise levels depending on their distance from operating construction equipment. Construction activities are required to comply with Caltrans Standard Specifications (Section 14-8.02), which sets 'not-to-exceed' limits for construction-related noise and requires noise to be monitored and controlled. In addition, any construction related noise would be temporary and short-term in nature.

Air Quality Permanent:

The Federal Clean Air Act and California Clean Air Act govern air quality. These laws set standards for air pollutant concentrations. These standards are set at levels that protect public health with a margin of safety. A Project-level air quality analysis was undertaken and determined to conform with prescribed standards. In addition, a parallel 'conformity' requirement based on FCAA Section 176(c) prohibits the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) from funding, authorizing or approving a project or program that does not conform to state implementation plan for air quality attainment. The project-level air quality conformity analysis was conducted and the project was determined to have no permanent impacts to air quality.

Air Quality Temporary:

During construction, short-term degradation of air quality may occur due to the release of particulate emissions. The project is required to implement measures to reduce these short-term effects. A detailed discussion can be found in Section 2.2.6.3.

Water Quality Permanent:

The project is a highway improvement project and as such would not influence water quality overall.

Water Quality Temporary:

During construction, there are increased pollutant sources that during a storm event could result in polluted runoff entering storm drains. To address this issue, all construction activities are required to prepare and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that would address all construction related activities that have the potential to affect water quality. SWPPPs include Best Management Practices (BMPs) to control pollutants, sediment from erosion, storm water runoff, and other construction-related impacts to water quality (see Section 2.2.2.3)

During construction, the presence of equipment, workers, material stockpiles, debris, lighting and signage would temporarily detract from the visual quality and character of the area. Demolition activities including vegetation clearing and grading could also reduce visual quality. These impacts would be temporary in nature and once construction is complete the area would be returned to preconstruction conditions including new and replacement landscape within Caltrans right-of-way. A three year plant establishment period is required to ensure replacement landscaping efforts are successful and community character and cohesion is restored.

Property Values:

A transportation project's impact on property value can be due to factors that affect the marketability of a business or property. These factors include changes to vehicle and pedestrian access, circulation of local travel patterns, parking, direct or indirect impacts on land use, and displacement of large employers. Other changes that may affect property value is a change in the environment such as traffic congestion, noise, air quality, and visual impacts. As stated in Section 2.1.4., the operation and construction of the project is not anticipated to have an impact on property values since it would not result in the displacement of businesses, affect access to business and parking, nor would it have a direct or indirect impact on land use and the urbanized nature of the project area. In addition, the project is found to have minimal impacts on noise, air quality, and visual resources.

P-2b. Pam and Roger Pearson. November 7, 2018. Email.

Comment: Health & Safety – The harm of living near a freeway is compounded when roads are widened and allow even more vehicles to expose the residents to higher pollution levels without adequate measures to reduce that risk. Traffic will be exacerbated by more individuals attempting to access Angels' stadium and the nearby newly-opened breweries because the Project allows such increased traffic patterns. We oppose the inevitable increase in dust particulates, chemicals, and other unknown pollutants, as well as additional vehicle emissions during and upon completion of project construction.

Response: Health & Safety -

Air Quality:

As discussed in comment P2-a, the Federal Clean Air Act and California Clean Air Act govern air quality and set standards at levels that protect public health with a margin of safety. A project-level air quality analysis was undertaken and was determined to conform with prescribed standards and have no permanent impacts to air quality. During construction, a potential increase of particulate matter and dust may occur due to the release of particulate emissions. Required mitigation measures and the implementation of best management practices will help to avoid and/or minimize these effects. A detailed discussion can be found in Section 2.2.6.3.

Traffic:

The Project will complete the missing segment of the fifth general purpose lane on the northbound SR 57 freeway and does not propose widening of local roads. By closing the missing gap, it would streamline traffic and reduce congestion. Traffic patterns impacted by local attractions are analyzed during the approval process for the attractions themselves when they are proposed as projects. However, the Project itself does not propose new or additional development that would generate traffic. The proposed project is listed in the Southern California Association of Government's (SCAG) 2016-2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) Amendment 2, and in SCAG 2017 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP). The Project is a congestion relief project proposing to address existing and projected increases in traffic on the northbound SR 57.

P-2c. Pam and Roger Pearson. November 7, 2018. Email.

Comment: Traffic – Current traffic on Orangewood is excessive in both directions. Installation of as additional traffic signals a part of the Project will compound the problem. As it stands, motorists approaching Orangewood from the North on Eckhoff will most likely continue Southbound on Eckhoff towards Chapman Avenue when encountering congestion on Orangewood. Notably, Eckhoff is the main thoroughfare used by residents, stadium attendees and commercial vehicles. Also of note is that Eckhoff and Sycamore have been in poor condition for some time and any projects considered for the area should have started with the resurfacing and restriping of those streets. Eckhoff is the main access point for residents living in the impacted area.

Response: The project does not include the installation of additional traffic signals. The project would complete the missing segment of the fifth general purpose lane on the northbound SR 57 freeway. This improvement would result in less congestion within this segment of the freeway, which is expected to have a beneficial effect on local circulation. The project is not intended to address local street deficiencies.

P-2d. Pam and Roger Pearson. November 7, 2018. Email.

Comment: Visual/aesthetics/crime – In addition to road and construction debris anticipated by the Project, the residents of the area expect increased transient and panhandling issues at signalized intersections on Orangewood due to the increase in traffic and its desirable location. No accommodation has been made to ameliorate that risk.

Response: Visual/aesthetics/crime -

Road and Construction Debris:

The project would be required to maintain good housekeeping (debris management, street sweeping, dust reduction, etc.) to reduce the potential for environmental impacts and risks to the public.

Increased Traffic:

This transportation project is a congestion relief project proposing to address existing and projected increases in traffic on northbound SR 57. The purpose of the project is to establish lane continuity on the northbound SR 57 to improve mobility (traffic movement) within the project segment of the freeway. In and of itself, the project does not propose new or additional development that would generate traffic and it is not growth inducing.

Transient and Panhandling Issues:

Neither Caltrans nor the cities of Anaheim or Orange have control over activities conducted within public rights-of-way that are not illegal or in violation of local municipal codes. Caltrans is responsible for the maintenance and operation of state facilities within their rights-of-way and does not have jurisdiction over local rights-of-way. City of Orange municipal code (OMC) 12.48.045 prohibits camping in city parks and OMC 12.66.030 prohibits camping and obstructing public rights of way including sidewalks. City of Anaheim municipal code Section 7.28.010 prohibits loitering on sidewalks and crosswalks and Section 7.30.030 prohibits aggressive panhandling. California Penal Code 647(c) prohibits accosting persons to solicit alms.

The Project does not propose new or added signalized intersections. Orangewood Avenue at the SR 57 northbound on- and off-ramps is currently signalized and will remain signalized under the proposed project.

P-2e. Pam and Roger Pearson. November 7, 2018. Email.

Comment: Local Involvement - The cities of Anaheim and Orange are part of the Project's development team. We would like to hear more about their input with respect to the Project. Did they have any objections? What matters were considered in allowing the Project to commence? Further, we would like the opportunity to discuss this with a representative from the City of Orange with knowledge of the Project, as Orange did not have any representatives available at the meeting. Please advise who we may contact at the City of Orange to discuss the Project.

Response: As a part of the Project Development Team (PDT), the cities of Orange and Anaheim provided specialized input for consideration in developing project alternatives and evaluating environmental effects. As members of the PDT the cities had the opportunity to direct the course of studies by providing specialized knowledge of local conditions and constraints. They also had the opportunity to make recommendations and help accumulate data for evaluation during the environmental process. The cities did not voice any objections to the project. As part of the public review process, both cities provided comments on the Draft Environmental Document. The comments included support of the proposed freeway improvements, concerns regarding traffic operations relative to each alternative, and recommendations for moving Alternative 2 forward as the Locally Preferred Alternative. During the public hearing held on October 25,

Doug Keys, a representative of the city of Orange, attended as a member of the public. Mr. Keys can be contacted for additional information regarding the project.

P-2f. Pam and Roger Pearson. November 7, 2018. Email.

Comment: Noise – None of the alternative Plans allow for additional height to existing sound walls in nearby residential areas adjacent to the Northbound Orangewood off-ramp, e.g. West Beverly Drive. Increased traffic can only mean increased noise pollution.

Response: As discussed in P-2a, a noise analysis was conducted for the project and as part of the analysis, noise measurements were taken within nearby residential areas to evaluate existing and projected noise levels. Based on the analysis, additional heights for existing sound walls were not evaluated because predicted noise levels for receptors located behind the existing sound walls would not approach or exceed the noise abatement criteria and did not substantially exceed the existing noise levels. Therefore, noise impacts would not occur as defined by 23CFR772.5 and Caltrans Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol (policies and procedures). The project does not include development that could result in increased traffic.

P-2g. Pam and Roger Pearson. November 7, 2018. Email.

Comment: As members of the impacted community, the only acceptable plan is Alternative 2. The others are unacceptable due to the anticipated closure of the current Orangewood Northbound on-ramp.

Response: Thank you for your input and recommendation concerning the project alternatives. All public comments are considered in the selection of a Preferred Alternative.

P-2h. Pam and Roger Pearson. November 7, 2018. Email.

Comment: To local residents, these alternatives seem to only favor the City of Anaheim's Angel Stadium and Honda Center.

Response: The proposed project is intended to relieve congestion along the northbound segment of SR 57 between Orangewood and Katella due to a discontinuity in the northbound fifth general purpose lane. This discontinuity creates a bottleneck condition where traffic demand exceeds the carry capacity of the roadway. All the proposed Build Alternatives address this deficiency and therefore meet the Project's purpose and need. The Project's purpose and need is to improve existing conditions to alleviate issues for the community and region at large, and not for the benefit of a single entity.

P-2i. Pam and Roger Pearson. November 7, 2018. Email.

Comment: A fully signalized intersection on Orangewood Avenue constructed to control both Eastbound and Westbound vehicular access to a modified three lane Orangewood Avenue loop on-ramp would mean additional congestion, and, therefore, makes no sense to a resident of the City of Orange.

Response: The signalized intersection at the SR 57 NB ramps and Orangewood Avenue is forecast to operate at an acceptable level of service (LOS D or better) in the Opening (2025) and Design (2045) Years in both the AM and PM peak hours. Design Year (2045) storage on the two on-ramps in Alternative 2 and the single on-ramp in Alternatives 2A and 2B would be insufficient. The EB and WB right turn lanes would be sufficient to store the queued vehicles so

they would have minimal impact on the through lanes. Thus, the project is not anticipated to result in congestion.

P-2j. Pam and Roger Pearson. November 7, 2018. Email.

Comment: Alternative 2 would sufficiently move and widen the Westbound vehicular access to a signaled Northbound on-ramp to 2 lanes. The Eastbound vehicular access to the Northbound Orangewood Avenue loop on-ramp would also be widened to 2 metered lanes.

Response: Yes, Alternative 2 proposes to provide two lanes on the eastbound loop on-ramp and two lanes on the westbound on-ramp at Orangewood Avenue. Likewise, Alternatives 2A and 2B would provide three lanes on the eastbound loop on-ramp. The three lanes would accommodate both the eastbound traffic and the newly redirected westbound traffic. All three Build Alternatives have sufficient capacity to handle northbound SR 57 traffic demand from Orangewood Avenue.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK