Appendix A

CEQA Checklist

Appendix A. CEQA Checklist

Supporting documentation of all CEQA checklist determinations is provided in Chapter 2 of this Initial Study. Documentation of "No Impact" determinations is provided at the beginning of Chapter 2. Discussion of all impacts, avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures under the appropriate topic headings in Chapter 2.

CEQA Environmental Checklist

12-ORA-57	**20.1/21.8**	**0C110_**
Dist.-Co.-Rte.	P.M/P.M.	E.A.

This checklist identifies physical, biological, social and economic factors that might be affected by the proposed project. In many cases, background studies performed in connection with the projects indicate no impacts. A NO IMPACT answer in the last column reflects this determination. Where there is a need for clarifying discussion, the discussion is included either following the applicable section of the checklist or is within the body of the environmental document itself. The words "significant" and "significance" used throughout the following checklist are related to CEQA, not NEPA, impacts. The questions in this form are intended to encourage the thoughtful assessment of impacts and do not represent thresholds of significance.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS: Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista	☐	☐	☒	☐
Implementation of the proposed project, both Build Alternatives 7A and 9, would result in modifications to the SR-57/Lambert Road interchange. Overall, proposed conditions would be similar to existing conditions with respect to viewer response and changes in views. Impacts would be less than significant as a result of the proposed project. Refer to Section 2.2.6, Visual/Aesthetics, for further detail.				
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway	☐	☐	☐	☒
The proposed project site does not include any officially designated State scenic highways. SR-57 between Imperial Highway and SR-60 is eligible as a California State Scenic Highway. Existing landscaping would be replaced to maintain the existing character. No impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project. Refer to Section 2.2.6, Visual/Aesthetics, for further detail.				
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	☐	☒	☐	☐
A soundwall will be considered along northbound SR-57 along the outdoor patio for the El Torito Grill Restaurant. A new block soundwall would obstruct views of the surrounding developed area of Brea from the El Torito Grill Restaurant outdoor patio area, as well as change the character of the landscape for these viewers. Implementation of mitigation measure VIS-5 would require a transparent soundwall. Several carport structures and two apartment buildings would be removed and an internal access road would be realigned as part of Build Alternative 7A at the Country Woods Apartment Homes. The residents at Country Woods Apartment Homes would have long-duration views to proposed project				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

improvements and would have a high awareness of the proposed project changes. Implementation of Build Alternative 7A would result in direct views to the proposed northbound SR-57 on- and off-ramps from these residences. Implementation of mitigation measure VIS-3 would require an opaque perimeter wall or appropriate landscaping to screen direct views from the Country Wood Apartment Homes to the proposed project. Impacts would be less than significant with the incorporation of mitigation. Refer to Section 2.2.6, Visual/Aesthetics, for further detail.

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Implementation of the proposed project, both Build Alternatives 7A and 9, would result in modifications to the SR-57/Lambert Road interchange. Overall, proposed conditions would be similar to existing conditions with respect to light or glare. Impacts would be less than significant as a result of the proposed project. Refer to Section 2.2.6, Visual/Aesthetics, for further detail.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES:

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment Project; and the forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	☒

There are no designated farmlands located within or adjacent to the SR-57/Lambert Road interchange. The proposed project would not convert farmland to non-agricultural uses. No impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project. Refer to Section 2.1, *Environmental Issues with No Impacts*, for further detail.

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☒

There are no land uses within or adjacent to the proposed project that are zoned for agricultural uses. There are no properties within or adjacent to the project site that currently have a Williamson Act Contract. No impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project. Refer to Section 2.1, *Environmental Issues with No Impacts*, for further detail.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	☐	☐	☐	☒

There are no designated forest lands or timberlands within or adjacent to the project area. No land uses within or adjacent to the project area are zoned as forest land or timberland. No impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project. Refer to Section 2.1, *Environmental Issues with No Impacts*, for further detail.

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒

There are no designated forest lands is within or adjacent to the project area. The proposed project would not convert forest land to non-forest land. No impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project. Refer to Section 2.1, *Environmental Issues with No Impacts*, for further detail.

e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The proposed project would improve an existing interchange within an urban setting. The proposed project would not result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses nor would it convert forest land to non-forest uses. No impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project. Refer to Section 2.1, *Environmental Issues with No Impacts*, for further detail.

III. AIR QUALITY:

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The proposed project is listed in the 2012 financially constrained Regional Transportation Plan which was found to conform by the State Implementation Plan (SIP) by FHWA and FTA on June 4, 2012 (RTP IDs 2M0724 and ORA000107). The project is also included in the SCAG financially constrained 2013 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) (RTP ORA120320). The SCAG FTIP was determined to conform by FHWA and FTA on December 13, 2012. The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of an applicable air quality plan. No impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project. Refer to Section 2.3.6, *Air Quality*, for further detail.

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Short-term construction particulate matter emissions would be reduced with the implementation of required dust suppression measures outlined within the South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 402 and 403. The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) Standard Specifications for Construction (Section 10 and 18 [Dust Control] and Section 39-3.06 [Asphalt Concrete Plants]) would also be adhered to. Therefore, project construction would not violate state or federal air quality standards or contribute to the existing air quality violations in the South Coast Air Basin.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

A carbon monoxide (CO) hot-spot analysis concluded that implementation of the proposed project would alleviate several peak-hour deficiencies and would reduce congestion and overall travel time.

Therefore the project would have a less than significant impact. Refer to Section 2.3.6, *Air Quality*, for further detail.

c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non- attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The proposed project does not qualify as a POAQC pursuant to the March 10, 2006, final rule. The proposed project is not a new highway project that would have a significant number of, or increase in, diesel vehicles. In addition, the proposed project would not result in significant changes in traffic volume, vehicle mix, or other factors that would cause an increase in emissions compared to the No Build condition. The proposed project would reduce congestion and localized idling levels and thus would not cause or contribute to a violation of NAAQS for PM10.

Project construction would result in temporary emissions of CO, NOX, ROG, PM2.5, and PM10. The proposed project would implement applicable Best Available Control Measures from the SCAQMD Rule 403 and Rule 403.1, and implement avoidance and minimization measures shall be utilized to reduce and otherwise address impacts during construction. The proposed project would comply with any state, federal, and/or local rules and regulations developed as a result of implementing control and mitigation measures proposed as part of their respective SIPs. Therefore, project construction is not anticipated to violate state or federal air quality standards or contribute to the existing air quality violations in the SCAB.

Impacts from the proposed project are less than significant. Refer to Section 2.3.6, *Air Quality*, for further detail.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Sensitive receptors located near the proposed project include residential uses, institutional uses, and parks. These sensitive receptors would have short-term impacts during the construction phase of the proposed project. Impacts would cease subsequent to construction. Impacts are less than significant. Refer to Section 2.3.6, *Air Quality*, for further detail.

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Exhaust emissions and odors from construction equipment and paving equipment would occur temporarily during project construction. However, implementation of applicable Best Available Control Measures from the SCAQMD Rule 403 and Rule 403.1, and implementation of avoidance and minimization measures shall be utilized to reduce and otherwise address impacts during construction. Impacts are less than significant. Refer to Section 2.3.6, *Air Quality*, for further detail.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☒	☐	☐

The Biological Study Area (BSA) does not contain suitable habitat to support any of the special-interest plant species. The BSA supports suitable habitat for a variety of special-status wildlife species. USFWS-designated critical habitat for the California gnatcatcher (CAGN) is located within the northern portion of the proposed project site, within the BSA. No sensitive or special-interest animal species were observed or otherwise detected in the BSA at the time of the field visit. Although no direct take of CAGN is expected due to the low quality of habitat within the BSA, take of designated critical habitat would occur as a result of both Build Alternatives. Implementation of mitigation measure TE-1 would require sage scrub-grassland vegetation replacement at ratios of 2:1 for permanent effects and 1:1 for temporary effects. Additional minimization measures would be incorporated into the proposed project to ensure impacts are less than significant. Refer to item IV.b, below, and to Section 2.4, *Biological Environment*, specifically Sections 2.4.3, *Plant Species*, 2.4.4, *Animal Species*, and 2.4.5, *Threatened and Endangered Species*, for further detail.

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☒	☐	☐

No riparian habitat was identified within the BSA. Drainage Feature H satisfies USACE jurisdictional criteria for waters of the U.S.; therefore, Drainage Feature H is also subject to CDFW jurisdiction pursuant to Section 1602 of the California Fish and Game Code. Drainage Feature H is located in an area identified as a temporary staging area and construction vehicle access. Drainage Feature H is considered an environmentally sensitive area (ESA). ESA fencing would be erected outside the jurisdictional limits of Drainage Feature H to ensure avoidance during construction. Therefore, impacts in this regard are considered less than significant. Refer to Section 2.4.2, *Wetlands and Other Waters*, for further detail.

As stated in item IV.a, above, USFWS-designated critical habitat for the CAGN is located within the northern portion of the proposed project site, within the BSA. Temporary (short-term) impacts would only occur during construction activities to allow for construction and equipment staging. Temporary effects to sage scrub-grassland would be limited to incidental encroachment and areas where existing topography would be restored. Because of the low quality and the small amount of impacts to USFWS-designated CAGN critical habitat, less than 0.5 acre, operational (long-term) impacts are considered less than significant. Implementation of mitigation measure TE-1 would require sage scrub-grassland vegetation replacement at ratios of 2:1 for permanent effects and 1:1 for temporary effects. Additional minimization measures would be incorporated into the proposed project to ensure impacts are less than significant. Refer to Section 2.4, *Biological Environment*, specifically Sections 2.4.3, *Plant Species*, 2.4.4, *Animal Species*, and 2.4.5, *Threatened and Endangered Species*, for further detail.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Eight drainage features are within the BSA. An Arid West Region Wetland Determination Data Form was completed for Drainage H and the drainage feature did not qualify as wetlands based on the lack of sufficient hydrophytic vegetation. Due to the historic connection to a TNW (the Pacific Ocean via Fullerton Creek and the San Gabriel River), it is anticipated that the USACE would assert jurisdiction over this drainage as nonwetland waters of the U.S. Therefore, no wetlands were identified within the project site. No impact would occur in this regard. Refer to Section 2.4.2, *Wetlands and Other Waters*, for further detail.

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The surrounding area west and south of the BSA is highly developed; however, the surrounding area east and north of the BSA is connected to a large, undeveloped area associated with the Puente/Chino Hills. Due to the high level of disturbance and substantial portion of the BSA that is developed, the site does not appear to function as a wildlife movement corridor. Impacts are less than significant. Refer to Section 2.4.1, *Natural Communities*, for further detail.

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The proposed project would be consistent with local policies and ordinances protecting biological resources. The proposed project incorporates best management practices, ESA fencing, and existing landscaping would be replaced to maintain the existing character. Impacts are considered less than significant. Refer to Section 2.4, *Biological Environment*, for further detail.

f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

There are no adopted habitat conservation plans (HCPs) or natural community conservation plans (NCCPs) that cover the proposed project. No impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project. Refer to Section 2.4.1, *Natural Communities*, for further detail.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Archival research identified one historic built-environment resource that extends into the northern portion of the Area of Potential Effects (APE) on SR-57, and the eastern portion of the APE on Lambert Road. This resource, 30-177012, is known as the Brea-Olinda Oil Field. No remnants of the oil field were observed or identified within the proposed project's APE during the field visit. According to the California Department of Conservation Online Mapping System, no oil wells have been recorded within the proposed project's APE. There are no resources within 0.5 mile of the APE that are listed in the

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

National Register, the California Register, California Historical Landmarks, or as a California Point of Historical Interest. If cultural materials are discovered during construction, all earth-moving activity within and around the immediate discovery area would be diverted until a qualified archaeologist can assess the nature and significance of the find. Additional surveys would be required if the proposed project changes to include areas not previously surveyed. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant. Refer to Section 2.2.7, *Cultural Resources*, for further detail.

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	☐	☐	☒	☐

No prehistoric archaeological resources were identified within 0.5 mile of the APE during the archival research, Native American consultation, and field survey. Two historic archaeological sites were identified within a 0.5-mile radius of the APE, 30-001624 and 30-001625. These are both included in the boundaries of the Brea-Olinda Oil Field and are likely associated with historic oil development in the area. No surface evidence of the oil field was observed during the field survey. If cultural materials are discovered during construction, all earth-moving activity within and around the immediate discovery area would be diverted until a qualified archaeologist can assess the nature and significance of the find. Additional surveys would be required if the proposed project changes to include areas not previously surveyed. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant. Refer to Section 2.2.7, *Cultural Resources*, for further detail.

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☒	☐	☐

The Natural Museum of Los Angeles County (LACM) has no records of vertebrate fossil localities within the Area of Project Disturbance (APD). No paleontological resources were observed during the field survey in December 2011. No paleontological localities are known to exist within the boundaries of the APD; however, all units that the proposed project crosses have the potential to contain significant paleontological remains. Since the Alluvial Fan Deposits, the La Habra Formation, and the Fernando Formation all have the potential to contain paleontological resources and have a high paleontological sensitivity rating with potential for significant resources. With implementation of mitigation measure PALEO-1, effects to paleontological resources are less than significant. Refer to Section 2.2.7, *Cultural Resources*, for further detail.

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☐	☐	☒	☐

No known cemeteries are located within the proposed project APE. If human remains are discovered, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that further disturbances and activities shall cease in any area or nearby area suspected to overlie remains, and the County Coroner contacted. Pursuant to CA Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 5097.98, if the remains are thought to be Native American, the coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) who will then notify the Most Likely Descendent (MLD). At this time, the person who discovered the remains would contact the City of Brea and Caltrans District 12 Environmental Branch so that they may work with the MLD on the respectful treatment and disposition of the remains. Further provisions of PRC 5097.98 are to be followed as applicable. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant. Refer to Section 2.2.7, *Cultural Resources*, for further detail.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS: Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The proposed project is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone. The potential earthquake hazards are prevalent throughout California and is not unique to the study area. Conformance with the California Building Code (CBC), as well as adherence to standard engineering practices would result in less than significant impacts in this regard. Refer to Section 2.3.3, *Geology/Soils/Seismic/Topography*, for further detail.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The Whittier-Elsinore fault is located to the north of the proposed project site. The Puente Hills (Coyote Hills) fault is located to the south of the proposed project site. Geologic and seismic hazards are prevalent throughout California and are not unique to the study area. Conformance with the California Building Code (CBC), as well as adherence to standard engineering practices would reduce the effects of seismic ground shaking. Impacts are less than significant. Refer to Section 2.3.3, *Geology/Soils/Seismic/Topography*, for further detail.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The proposed project is not located within a liquefaction hazard area. No unusual water extractions or other practices would occur that are typically associated with subsidence/liquefaction effects. In addition, the minor amounts of surface material, which would be removed, and the soils being disrupted/displaced would be compacted during proposed project construction. Adherence to the CBC and standard Caltrans design criteria would continue to be required. Impacts are less than significant. Refer to Section 2.3.3, *Geology/Soils/Seismic/Topography*, for further detail.

iv) Landslides?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The proposed project is not located within, or near, a landslide hazard area. The proposed project area consists of gently sloping topography and surrounding areas are gently sloping with no unusual geographic features. Impacts associated with landslides or mudslides are not anticipated. Measures such as soil compaction requirements set forth within the Geotechnical Investigation prepared for this proposed project, as well as standard Department and City design parameters, would reduce any potential impacts associated with slope stability. In addition, Caltrans' and City's standard design practices would be applied to retaining walls included in the Build Alternatives. Impacts are less than significant. Refer to Section 2.3.3, *Geology/Soils/Seismic/Topography*, for further detail.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Construction activities, such as grading and trenching, would displace soils and temporarily increase the potential for soils to be subject to wind and water erosion. The impact of the construction activities would be short-term. The City and Caltrans would be required to comply with standard engineering practices for erosion control and a qualified soils engineer would monitor soil compaction during construction. Implementation of the required Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) would

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

minimize potential soil erosion impacts. In addition, implementation of erosion control measures and adherence to all requirements set forth in the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit required for construction activities would reduce construction-related erosion and siltation impacts (refer to Section 2.3.2, *Water Quality and Storm Water Runoff*). . Impacts are less than significant. Refer to Section 2.3.3, *Geology/Soils/Seismic/Topography*, for further detail.

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Refer to item VI.a, above. The proposed project is not located within, or near, a landslide hazard area. The proposed project is not located within a liquefaction hazard area. There are soils within the proposed project area, specifically the Myford Soil series that are known for their shrink-swell potential. As with seismic ground shaking, conformance with the CBC as well as adherence to standard engineering practices would reduce the potential effects of expansive soils. Impacts are less than significant. Refer to Section 2.3.3, *Geology/Soils/Seismic/Topography*, for further detail.

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Refer to item VI.c, above. There are soils within the proposed project area, specifically the Myford Soil series that are known for their shrink-swell potential. As with seismic ground shaking, conformance with the CBC as well as adherence to standard engineering practices would reduce the potential effects of expansive soils. Impacts are less than significant. Refer to Section 2.3.3, *Geology/Soils/Seismic/Topography*, for further detail.

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The proposed project would construct improvements to the SR-57/Lambert Road interchange. No septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems would be constructed as a result of this project. Therefore, no impact would occur in this regard.

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS: Would the project:

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	An assessment of the greenhouse gas emissions and climate change is included in the body of environmental document. While

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	Caltrans has included this good faith effort in order to provide the public and decision-makers as much information as possible about the project, it is Caltrans determination that in the absence of further regulatory or scientific information related to GHG emissions and CEQA significance, it is too speculative to make a significance determination regarding the project's direct and indirect impact with respect to climate change. Caltrans does remain firmly committed to implementing measures to help reduce the potential effects of the project. These measures are outlined in the body of the environmental document.			
VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS: Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☐	☒	☐

SR-57 and Lambert Road are located within the project site. Current routes for transporting hazardous materials include SR-57 for regional transport and Lambert Road for local transport. The Build Alternatives would continue existing exposure to transport of hazardous materials and hazardous waste associated with vehicles use of SR-57 and Lambert Road. No new permanent hazardous materials or hazardous waste impacts (direct or indirect) are anticipated beyond existing conditions. Impacts are less than significant. Refer to Section 2.3.5, *Hazardous Waste/Materials*, for further detail.

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐

During proposed project construction, there is a possibility of accidental release of hazardous substances. The level of risk associated with an accidental release of hazardous substances is not considered significant because the volume of hazardous materials utilized during construction is small and their concentrations are low. The contractor would be required to use standard construction controls and safety procedures, which would avoid and minimize the potential for accidental release of such substances into the environment. Standard construction practices would be observed such that any materials released are appropriately contained and remediated as required by local, state, and federal law. Avoidance and minimization measures would be implemented (i.e., requiring disposal of construction waste at appropriate, permitted disposal facilities and consultation with appropriate agencies if unknown hazards are encountered). Impacts are less than significant. Refer to Section 2.3.5, *Hazardous Waste/Materials*, for further detail.

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Brea Olinda High School is located near the northeastern boundary of the proposed project. The level of risk associated with an accidental release of hazardous substances is not considered significant because the volume of hazardous materials utilized during construction is small and their concentrations are low. The contractor would be required to use standard construction controls and safety procedures, which would avoid and minimize the potential for accidental release of such substances into the environment. Standard construction practices would be observed such that any materials released are

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

appropriately contained and remediated as required by local, state, and federal law. Avoidance and minimization measures would be implemented (i.e., requiring disposal of construction waste at appropriate, permitted disposal facilities and consultation with appropriate agencies if unknown hazards are encountered). Impacts are less than significant. Refer to Section 2.3.5, *Hazardous Waste/Materials*, for further detail.

d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Build Alternative 9 would not impact a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. No impact would result from Build Alternative 9. Refer to Section 2.3.5, *Hazardous Waste/Materials*, for further detail.

The Brea Car Wash & Detail Center (1700 East Lambert Road) is located within the proposed project boundaries and is listed within the UST and HAZNET databases. Soil samples from seven soil boring locations were obtained from the site. There were no detections of total petroleum hydrocarbons as gasoline (TPHg), benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, and xylene (BTEX), or fuel oxygenates in any of the samples. There was a single detection of TPH as diesel (TPHd) above the laboratory method reporting limits (MRLs) at 20 feet below ground surface; however, the soil sample taken at the same boring location at 25 feet below ground surface did not identify a THPd level above the laboratory MRLs. Therefore, based on the field observations and laboratory results, no hydrocarbon impacts were observed and no additional investigations are considered necessary for the site. Prior to any construction activity at the Brea Car Wash & Detail Center, the underground storage tanks would be removed and properly disposed of at an approved landfill facility under the purview of the appropriate lead agency. Consultation with appropriate regulatory agencies shall be conducted prior to and during UST removal, soil sampling and post-soil sampling. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant as a result of Build Alternative 7A. Refer to Section 2.3.5, *Hazardous Waste/Materials*, for further detail.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The proposed project is not located within the vicinity of a public airport, nor is it within an airport land use plan. The proposed project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. No impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project.

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The proposed project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip and would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. No impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project.

g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐

As a result of the short-term road closures, temporary delays in emergency response times may occur during construction of the proposed project due to temporary lane closures and/or traffic detours. Alternative routes are available for use by public service vehicles during short periods of lane closures. These impacts would be minimized with the implementation of a Traffic Management Plan (TMP), which would reduce the disruption of emergency services. The project would have a less than significant

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

impact on emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans during construction. Refer to Section 2.2.4, *Utilities/Emergency Services*, for further detail.

Emergency response times for fire, police, and ambulance providers are anticipated to improve as a result of the proposed project. These improvements would result in the improved operations at the majority of the study intersection from an unacceptable level of services (LOS) to an acceptable LOS. Refer to Section 2.2.4, *Utilities/Emergency Services*, for further detail.

h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The proposed project would improve the operation of the existing SR-57/Lambert Road interchange. The proposed project would not expose people or structure to a significant risk or loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, beyond existing risks. No new permanent wildland fie risks are anticipated beyond existing conditions. Impacts are less than significant. Refer to Section 2.2.3, *Community Impacts*, Section 2.2.4, *Utilities/Emergency Services*, Section 2.3.5, *Hazardous Waste/Materials*, and Section 2.4, *Biological Environment*, for further detail.

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY: Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	☐	☐	☒	☐

As discussed in Item VI.b, construction activities would involve the use of some hazardous materials, such as diesel fuel, hydraulic oil, grease, solvents, adhesives, paints, and other petroleum based products, although these materials are commonly used during construction activities and would not be disposed of on the project site. Under the Construction General Permit, the proposed project is required to prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and implement erosion and sediment control BMPs detailed in the SWPPP to be implemented during construction. In addition, the proposed project would comply with the requirements of the Clean Water Act, the Santa Ana RWQCB, the Orange County Drainage Area Management Plan (DAMP), and appropriate, Caltrans approved, non-structural and structural treatment control BMPs. Additionally, for the operation of the proposed project, the County of Orange's NPDES Permit requires street, road, highway, or above ground lined drainage facilities to comply with the US EPA guidance "Managing Wet Weather with Green Infrastructure: Green Streets". The objective of the guidance is to reduce the discharge of pollutants and the effects of changes to runoff patterns caused by land use modifications. As prescribed by the NPDES Permit, Low Impact Development (LID) BMPs would be considered first and then traditional structural and non-structural BMPs. Impacts would be less than significant. Refer to Section 2.3.2, *Water Quality*, for further detail.

b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The proposed project would construct improvements to the SR-57/Lambert Road interchange. The proposed project would not result in the depletion of groundwater supplies. The proposed project is not sited in a location used by the Orange County Water District or any other local water district for aquifer recharge. Groundwater beneath the proposed project area is not expected to be encountered within 10 feet below ground surface. The proposed project would not create a systems would be constructed as a

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

result of this project. No impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project. Refer to Section 2.3.1, *Hydrology and Floodplain*, and Section 2.3.2, *Water Quality*, for further detail.

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The proposed project would not change the existing drainage patterns. The primary concentration of flow would remain in the local storm drain, outlet into the Loftus Diversion Channel, and ultimately reach the San Gabriel River via Coyote Creek. The proposed project would not change the sediment at the bottom of the Loftus Diversion Channel, nor would it increase erosion or accretion patterns. As discussed in item VI.b, construction activities would increase sediment exposure due to activities such as reconfiguring roadways, excavation and grading, and constructing the new roadway segments and bridge abutments. The County of Orange's NPDES Permit requires street, road, highway, or above ground lined drainage facilities to comply with the US EPA guidance "Managing Wet Weather with Green Infrastructure: Green Streets". The objective of the guidance is to reduce the discharge of pollutants and the effects of changes to runoff patterns caused by land use modifications. As prescribed by the NPDES Permit, Low Impact Development (LID) BMPs would be considered first and then traditional structural and non-structural BMPs. Impact would be less than significant. Refer to item IX.a, above. Refer to Section 2.3.1, *Hydrology and Floodplain*, and Section 2.3.2, *Water Quality*, for further detail.

d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The proposed project would not change the existing drainage patterns. The primary concentration of run-off would remain in the local storm drain, outlet into the Loftus Diversion Channel, and ultimately reach the San Gabriel River via Coyote Creek. Standard best management practices (BMPs) would be required in order to reduce any runoff during construction activities, thus ensuring no flooding impacts to the site or the surrounding area. The County of Orange's NPDES Permit requires street, road, highway, or above ground lined drainage facilities to comply with the US EPA guidance "Managing Wet Weather with Green Infrastructure: Green Streets". The objective of the guidance is to reduce the discharge of pollutants and the effects of changes to runoff patterns caused by land use modifications. As prescribed by the NPDES Permit, Low Impact Development (LID) BMPs would be considered first and then traditional structural and non-structural BMPs. Impacts are less than significant. Refer to Section 2.3.1, *Hydrology and Floodplain*, and Section 2.3.2, *Water Quality*, for further detail.

e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Refer to items IX.a through IX.d, above. During construction, the NPDES permit and required SWPPP would be implemented. The addition of new impervious area would marginally increase the flow rates and discharge volumes at the individual on-site pipes. Regionally, the Loftus Diversion Channel Hydrology uses a fully developed condition for the state ROW, and therefore already accounts for these improvements in the channel design. Changes to flow depths in the local on-site systems would marginally increase by approximately 0.1 to 0.2 feet; however, this would remain within the pipes or within the provided freeboard of the improved channels. Loftus Diversion Channel depths would not be measurably altered by the proposed project. No seasonal changes would occur as a result of the proposed project. Impacts are less than significant. Refer to Section 2.3.1, *Hydrology and Floodplain*, and Section 2.3.2, *Water Quality*, for further detail.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Refer to items IX.a through IX.e, above. Compliance with the requirements of the Clean Water Act, the Santa Ana RWQCB, the Orange County Drainage Area Management Plan (DAMP), and appropriate, Caltrans approved, non-structural and structural treatment control BMPs to address potential short- (during construction) and long-term (post construction/maintenance) impacts are required for the proposed project. Impacts are less than significant. Refer to Section 2.3.1, *Hydrology and Floodplain*, and Section 2.3.2, *Water Quality*, for further detail.

g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The proposed project is outside the 100-year floodplain. No impacts would occur because the proposed project is outside of the 100-year floodplain. Refer to Section 2.3.1, *Hydrology and Floodplain*, for further detail.

h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The proposed project is outside the 100-year floodplain. Therefore, the proposed project would not introduce structures that would impede or redirect flood flows. No impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project. Refer to Section 2.3.1, *Hydrology and Floodplain*, for further detail.

i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The proposed project is outside the 100-year floodplain; however, the southern portion of the proposed project is located within the Orange County Reservoir inundation pathway, if dam failure occurs. The proposed project would not include habitable structures and would not increase the current vehicle use of the portion of SR-57 located within the inundation pathway. Conformance with the California Building Code (CBC), as well as adherence to standard Caltrans and City engineering practices would reduce any effects resulting from dam failure. Impacts are less than significant. Refer to Section 2.3.1, *Hydrology and Floodplain*, for further detail.

j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow	☐	☐	☐	☒

The proposed project is not located within, or near, an ocean or other large body of water; therefore, the proposed project is not located in a seiche or tsunami hazard area. The proposed project is not located within, or near, a landslide hazard area. The proposed project is not located within a liquefaction hazard area. Therefore, the proposed project is not located in a mudflow hazard area. The proposed project would not contribute to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. No impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project. Refer to Section 2.3.1, *Hydrology and Floodplain*, Section 2.3.2, *Water Quality*, and Section 2.3.3, *Geology/Soils/Seismic/Topography*, for further detail.

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING: Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☒	☐

SR-57 is a multi-lane freeway and Lambert Road is a six-lane arterial road. The project area is, therefore, already divided by SR-57 and Lambert Road. The proposed project would not further divide existing communities in the vicinity of the interchange. Impacts are less than significant. Refer to Section 2.2.3, *Community Impacts*, for further detail.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b)Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The proposed project would be consistent with the surrounding residential, commercial, industrial, and other uses in the surrounding area. Both alternatives would be consistent with the applicable City of Brea General Plan goals and policies. The proposed project is listed in the 2008, RTP, 2012 RTP, and 2011 FTIP; thus the proposed project is consistent with the regional and federal Transportation Plans. Implementation of either Build Alternative 7A or Build Alternative 9 would not result in major changes to existing land use patterns in the vicinity of the SR-57/Lambert Road Interchange, since the interchange is an existing facility and is located in a highly developed area. Impacts are considered less than significant in this regard. Refer to Section 2.2.1.2, *Consistency with State, Regional, and Local Plans and Programs*, for further detail.

c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

There are no adopted habitat conservation plans (HCPs) or natural community conservation plans (NCCPs) that cover the proposed project. No impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project. Refer to Section 2.4.1, *Natural Communities*, for further detail.

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES: Would the project:

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No oil or gas wells are located within the proposed project boundaries. The Olinda Oil Field is located north and east of the proposed project and the nearest wells, which are outside the project limits, have been capped. One historic site, the Brea-Olinda Oil Field, was identified during the record searches; however, no remnants of the oil field were observed or identified within the project site. No known mineral resources are located within the project site. No impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project. Refer to Section 2.2.7, *Cultural Resources*, Section 2.3.4, *Paleontology*, Section 2.3.5, *Hazardous Waste/Materials*, and Section 2.3.8, *Energy*, for further detail.

b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No known mineral resources are located within the project site. There are known oil fields within 10 miles of the proposed project. The proposed project would improve the SR-57/Lambert Road interchange and would not interfere with existing mineral resource production. No impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project. Refer to Section 2.2.7, *Cultural Resources*, Section 2.3.4, *Paleontology*, Section 2.3.5, *Hazardous Waste/Materials*, and Section 2.3.8, *Energy*, for further detail.

XII. NOISE: Would the project result in:

a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The closest sensitive receptor locations are located within 50 feet from the proposed project construction areas. Therefore, these receptor locations may be subject to short-term noise levels reaching

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

90 dBA L_{max} generated by construction activities within the proposed project area for both Build Alternatives 7A and 9. These impacts are short-term in nature and would cease upon construction completion. Construction noise is regulated by Caltrans' Standard Specifications in Section 14-8.02, "Noise Control". The nighttime noise level from the contractor's operations, between the hours of 9:00 PM and 6:00 AM, shall not exceed 86 dBA at a distance of 50 feet. The contractor should use an alternative warning method instead of a sound signal unless required by safety laws. In addition, the contractor shall equip all internal combustion engines with the manufacturer-recommended mufflers and shall not operate any internal combustion engine on the job site without the appropriate muffler. Construction impacts would be less than significant. Refer to Section 2.3.7, *Noise*, for further detail.

The predicted noise level at the R-65 would decrease by 0.1 dBA. A change of 3 dBA would barely be perceptible to the human ear. Thus, at R-65, the noise level perception would remain the same. The remaining 129 receptors would not result in a noise level change of 3 dBA. Therefore, no significant noise impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project, and no mitigation is required. Refer to Section 2.3.7, *Noise*, for further detail.

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Groundborne vibration or noise levels may occur as a result of construction activities and use of construction equipment. Construction noise is regulated by Caltrans' Standard Specifications in Section 14-8.02, "Noise Control". Noise control shall conform to the provisions in Section 14-8.02. The nighttime noise level from the contractor's operations, between the hours of 9:00 PM and 6:00 AM, shall not exceed 86 dBA at a distance of 50 feet. The proposed project would comply with the construction hours specified in Caltrans' Standard Specifications and would be required to minimize construction noise impacts, including groundborne vibration or noise levels, on sensitive land uses adjacent to the project site. Impacts would less than significant. Refer to Section 2.3.7, *Noise*, for further detail.

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Refer to item XII.a, above. Impacts would be less than significant. Refer to Section 2.3.7, *Noise*, for further detail.

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Refer to item XII.a, above. Construction impacts would be less than significant. Refer to Section 2.3.7, *Noise*, for further detail.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The proposed project is not located within the vicinity of a public airport, nor is it within an airport land use plan. The proposed project would not result in the exposing people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels. No impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The proposed project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip and would not result in the exposing people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels. No impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project.

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING: Would the project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The proposed project would not include habitable structures; therefore the proposed project would not result in direct population growth.

While the proposed project would result in reconstruction of an existing interchange, it would not provide new transportation facilities or create new access points to areas previously not accessible. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in changes in accessibility to the existing transportation system in the area. The proposed project is consistent with the transportation goals and policies of the City of Brea General Plan. Future growth in the City of Brea is expected to occur with or without construction of the proposed project because the interchange project on its own cannot affect variables such as economic opportunities, employment, or housing availability, which directly affect local and regional growth. The proposed project meets the stated purpose and need (refer to Chapter 1, *Proposed Project*) and does not add capacity. The proposed project would help to accommodate existing, approved, and planned growth in the area; however, because the proposed project would only improve the existing interchange and would not increase roadway or freeway capacity, it would not influence the amount, timing, or location of growth in the area. The proposed project would not provide new transportation facilities in an area where such facilities do not currently exist and, therefore, would not influence the amount, timing, or location of growth in the city. Impacts would be less than significant. Refer to Section 2.2.2, *Growth*, for further detail.

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Build Alternative 9 would result in partial acquisitions of 13 nonresidential parcels. None of these acquisitions under Build Alternative 9 would result in the displacement of businesses or residential relocations. Therefore, no residents or employees would be displaced under this alternative. Refer to Section 2.2.3.2, *Relocations and Real Property Acquisition*, for further detail.

Build Alternative 7A would result in the full acquisition of one business (Brea Auto Spa) and 13 partial acquisitions, including two buildings from the Country Woods Apartment Homes. Equivalent business properties, approximately seven, were available for the relocated business (car wash) in the adjacent cities of Anaheim, Placentia, and Fullerton at the time of the property survey. There is a possibility that the car wash business (Brea Auto Spa) could reestablish itself within the study area and keep its current employees. Approximately 17 residential units at the Country Woods Apartment Homes would be displaced. As of January 2012, several apartments for rent are available within the Country Woods apartment complex. Given the Census Tract 218.14 demographic characteristics such as high household income, high education levels, low transit dependency, relatively short residency, and availability of replacement properties, it is expected that residential relocation impacts occurring under Build Alternative 7A would be less than significant. Refer to Section 2.2.3.2, *Relocations and Real Property Acquisition*, for further detail.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☒	☐

As discussed in item XIII.b, above, Build Alternative 9 would not result in the displacement of businesses or residential relocations. . Therefore, no residents or employees would be displaced under this alternative. Refer to Section 2.2.3.2, *Relocations and Real Property Acquisition*, for further detail.

Build Alternative 7A would result in the displacement of approximately 20-49 employees at the Brea Car Wash & Detail Center and approximately 47 residents at the Country Woods apartment complex. There is a possibility that the car wash business (Brea Auto Spa) could reestablish itself within the study area and keep its current employees. Given the Census Tract 218.14 demographic characteristics such as high household income, high education levels, low transit dependency, relatively short residency, and availability of replacement properties, it is expected that residential relocation impacts occurring under Build Alternative 7A would be less than significant. Refer to Section 2.2.3.2, *Relocations and Real Property Acquisition*, for further detail.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES:

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection?	☐	☐	☒	☐

As a result of the short-term road closures, temporary delays in emergency fire response times may occur during construction of the proposed project due to temporary lane closures and/or traffic detours. Alternative routes are available for use by public service vehicles during short periods of lane closures. These impacts would be minimized with the implementation of a Traffic Management Plan (TMP), which would reduce the disruption of emergency fire services. Impacts would be less than significant. Refer to Section 2.2.4, *Utilities/Emergency Services*, for further detail.

Emergency response times for fire, police, and ambulance providers are anticipated to improve as a result of the proposed project. These improvements would result in the improved operations at the majority of the study intersection from an unacceptable level of services (LOS) to an acceptable LOS. Because of the improved LOS at the majority of the study area intersections, fire and police response times would improve over the existing and No Build Alternative conditions. Refer to Section 2.2.4, *Utilities/Emergency Services*, for further detail.

Police protection?	☐	☐	☒	☐

As a result of the short-term road closures, temporary delays in emergency police response times may occur during construction of the proposed project due to temporary lane closures and/or traffic detours. Alternative routes are available for use by public service vehicles during short periods of lane closures. These impacts would be minimized with the implementation of a Traffic Management Plan (TMP), which would reduce the disruption of emergency police services. Impacts would be less than significant. Refer to Section 2.2.4, *Utilities/Emergency Services*, for further detail.

Emergency response times for fire, police, and ambulance providers are anticipated to improve as a result of the proposed project. These improvements would result in the improved operations at the majority of the study intersection from an unacceptable level of services (LOS) to an acceptable LOS. Because of the improved LOS at the majority of the study area intersections, fire and police response

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

times would improve over the existing and No Build Alternative conditions. Refer to Section 2.2.4, *Utilities/Emergency Services*, for further detail.

Schools?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The proposed project would improve the SR-57/Lambert Road interchange. The proposed project would not result in an increase in population such that new schools would be warranted. The proposed project would not result in physical impacts to existing schools, as there are no schools within the project site. The nearest school is the Brea Olinda High School, which is outside of the project boundaries. No impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project.

Parks?	☐	☐	☐	☒

There are no designated parks, trails, or other recreational facilities within the project boundaries. No park facilities would be constructed as a result of the proposed project. The proposed project would not increase the population of the area, therefore the proposed project would not result in the need for new or expanded park facilities. No impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project.

Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The proposed project would impact various underground and overhead utilities, which would require protection in place, removal, replacement, or relocation. Replacement and relocation of utilities would be conducted in cooperation with utility owners. It is expected that all utilities that require relocation would be relocated within the proposed project limits. An updated utility search would be required during the Final Design phase of the proposed project to determine all utility conflicts that require positive location and/or relocation. The proposed project would not increase the need for domestic water services, wastewater facilities, or solid waste disposal, since the proposed project would not result in an increase in land uses that require these services. Utility services would remain similar to existing conditions upon completion of the proposed project, because the proposed project would not result in an increased need for utility services beyond what currently exists. Impacts would be less than significant. Refer to Section 2.2.4, *Utilities/Emergency Services*, for further detail.

XV. RECREATION:

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	☐	☐	☐	☒

There are no designated parks, trails, or other recreational facilities within the project boundaries. The proposed project would not increase the use of existing facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or accelerate. No impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project.

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The proposed project would improve the SR-57/Lambert Road interchange. No recreational facilities would be constructed as a result of the proposed project. The proposed project would not increase the population of the area, therefore the proposed project would not result in the need for new or expanded recreational facilities. No impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC: Would the project:				
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The proposed project is listed in the 2012 financially constrained Regional Transportation Plan which was found to conform by the State Implementation Plan (SIP) by FHWA and FTA on June 4, 2012 (RTP IDs 2M0724 and ORA000107). The project is also included in the SCAG financially constrained 2013 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) (RTP ORA120320). The proposed project would not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. The proposed project would improve LOS at the majority of the study area intersections and would maintain bicycle and pedestrian access through the project site. There are no existing bike lanes designated on Lambert Road within the proposed project limits, therefore, the proposed project would not result in impacts to designated bike lanes. Build Alternatives 7A and 9 would provide standard shoulders to establish a Class III bikeway through the interchange in the future. The proposed project would maintain existing ramp metering system, coordinate intersection signals, provide an auxiliary lane on southbound SR-57, and provide eight-foot, Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)-compliant sidewalks along Lambert Road. Temporary disruptions could occur during construction; however, a TMP would be prepared for the proposed project. Impacts would be less than significant. Refer to Section 2.2.5, *Traffic and Transportation/Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities*, for further detail.

b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The proposed project is listed in the 2012 financially constrained Regional Transportation Plan which was found to conform by the State Implementation Plan (SIP) by FHWA and FTA on June 4, 2012 (RTP IDs 2M0724 and ORA000107). The project is also included in the SCAG financially constrained 2013 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) (RTP ORA120320). Under both Build Alternatives, all ramps would operate at acceptable LOS (V/C less than or equal to 1.0), the ramp intersections would operate with improved LOS. Three intersection locations would continue to operate at an LOS below the acceptable criteria; however, the capacity utilization measures would decrease, resulting in slightly less delay as compared to a No Build Alternative. This is considered a beneficial effect of both Build Alternatives. Therefore, the proposed project would reduce the current congestion and better accommodate anticipated traffic increases, thereby minimizing delays and potential safety hazards. Impacts would be less than significant. Refer to Section 2.2.5, *Traffic and Transportation/Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities*, for further detail.

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The proposed project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or public airport. The proposed project would provide congestion relief to improve the traffic flow within an existing interchange.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns. No impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project.

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The proposed project would improve an existing interchange within an urban setting. The proposed project would be compatible with the surrounding residential, commercial, industrial, and other uses in the surrounding area. The proposed project would be designed to better accommodate anticipated traffic increases, thereby minimizing delays and potential safety hazards. Impacts would be less than significant. Refer to Section 2.2.5, *Traffic and Transportation/Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities*, for further detail.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Access to properties adjacent to the proposed project would remain open during construction. As a result of the short-term road closures, temporary delays in emergency response times may occur during construction of the proposed project due to temporary lane closures and/or traffic detours. Alternative routes are available for use by public service vehicles during short periods of lane closures. These impacts would be minimized with the implementation of a Traffic Management Plan (TMP), which would reduce the disruption of emergency services. Impacts would be less than significant. Refer to items VIII.g and XIV.a, above, as well as Section 2.2.4, *Utilities/Emergency Services*, for further detail.

Emergency response times for fire, police, and ambulance providers are anticipated to improve as a result of the proposed project. These improvements would result in the improved operations at the majority of the study intersection from an unacceptable level of services (LOS) to an acceptable LOS. Because of the improved LOS at the majority of the study area intersections, fire and police response times would improve over the existing and No Build Alternative conditions. Refer to items VIII.g and XIV.a, above, as well as Section 2.2.4, *Utilities/Emergency Services*, for further detail.

f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Both Build Alternatives 7A and 9 would result in a sliver acquisition from the park-and-ride facility. The parking spaces would be reconfigured with no loss of parking spaces and the access driveway to the park-and-ride lot would be relocated. The impacts to the park-and-ride lot would not affect local and regional travelers beyond what is identified during construction. Access would remain and no parking would be lost as a result of either Build Alternative. There are no existing bike lanes designated on Lambert Road within the proposed project limits, therefore, the proposed project would not result in impacts to designated bike lanes. Build Alternatives 7A and 9 would provide standard shoulders to establish a Class III bikeway through the interchange in the future. The proposed project would maintain existing ramp metering system, coordinate intersection signals, provide an auxiliary lane on southbound SR-57, and provide eight-foot, Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)-compliant sidewalks along Lambert Road. Temporary disruptions could occur during construction; however, a TMP would be prepared for the proposed project. Impacts would be less than significant. Refer to Section 2.2.5, *Traffic and Transportation/Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities*, for further detail.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The proposed project would not increase the need for wastewater facilities and would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements because the proposed project would not result in an increase in land uses that require these services. Services would remain similar to existing conditions upon completion of the proposed project, because the proposed project would not result in an increased need for utility services beyond what currently exists. No impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project. Refer to Section 2.2.4, *Utilities/Emergency Services*, for further detail.

b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The proposed project would not increase the need for domestic water or wastewater facilities because the proposed project would not result in an increase in land uses that require these services. Services would remain similar to existing conditions upon completion of the proposed project, because the proposed project would not result in an increased need for utility services beyond what currently exists. No impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project. Refer to Section 2.2.4, *Utilities/Emergency Services*, for further detail.

c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Surface water/runoff for the proposed project is within the gutters of Lambert Road, which is collected by the City of Brea drainage network and connects to the Loftus Diversion Channel. The proposed project would not change the existing drainage patterns. The primary concentration of flow would remain in the local storm drain, outlet into the Loftus Diversion Channel, and ultimately reach the San Gabriel River via Coyote Creek. There would be a small differential increase in flow rates and discharge volumes when compared to the existing condition. The addition of new impervious area would marginally increase the flow rates and discharge volumes at the individual on-site pipes. Regionally, the Loftus Diversion Channel Hydrology uses a fully developed condition for the state right-of-way (ROW), and therefore already accounts for these improvements in the channel design. The proposed project would not result in the need to construct a new storm water drainage facility, nor would it require the expansion of an existing facility. Impacts would be less than significant. Refer to items IXa through IXf, above, for further detail. Refer to Section 2.3.1, *Hydrology and Floodplain*, and Section 2.2.4, *Utilities/Emergency Services*, for further detail.

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The proposed project would not increase the need for domestic water services because the proposed project would not result in an increase in land uses that require these services. Services would remain similar to existing conditions upon completion of the proposed project, because the proposed project would not result in an increased need for utility services beyond what currently exists. No impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project. Refer to Section 2.2.4, *Utilities/Emergency Services*, for further detail.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The proposed project would not increase the need for wastewater facilities because the proposed project would not result in an increase in land uses that require these services. Services would remain similar to existing conditions upon completion of the proposed project, because the proposed project would not result in an increased need for utility services beyond what currently exists. No impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project. Refer to Section 2.2.4, *Utilities/Emergency Services*, for further detail.

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The construction of the proposed project would general solid waste as the result of the construction of the interchange improvements, which would include replacing pavement and widening bridge structures. Build Alternative 7A would also generate solid waste as a result of the demolition of business and residential structures. Construction activities would not generate solid waste amounts that would exceed the capacity of a landfill. In addition, upon construction completion, the proposed project would not increase the need for solid waste disposal, since the proposed project would not result in an increase in land uses that require these services. Utility services would remain similar to existing conditions upon completion of the proposed project, because the proposed project would not result in an increased need for utility services beyond what currently exists. Impacts would be less than significant. Refer to Section 2.2.4, *Utilities/Emergency Services*, for further detail.

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The proposed project would comply with the federal, state, and local statutes and regulations regarding solid waste. Any construction debris identified to contain hazardous materials would be disposed of properly at the appropriate, permitted disposal facility. Impacts would be less than significant. Refer to Section 2.3.5, *Hazardous Waste/Materials*, for further detail.

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Refer to items IV.a through IV.f regarding biological resources. The BSA does not contain suitable habitat to support any of the special-interest plant species. The BSA supports suitable habitat for special-status wildlife species. USFWS-designated critical habitat for the CAGN is located within the northern portion of the proposed project site. Mitigation Measures would be incorporated into the proposed project to ensure impacts are less than significant. Refer to Section 2.4, *Biological Environment*, specifically Sections 2.4.3, *Plant Species*, 2.4.4, *Animal Species*, and 2.4.5, *Threatened and Endangered Species*, for further detail.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Specific project related impacts are discussed above in items I through XVII. Specific measures to minimize harm are identified in Chapter 2, *Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences, and Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures*, of the Initial Study/Environmental Assessment (IS/EA) for each environmental concern analyzed. These measures address project-specific and cumulative short-term and permanent impacts. The proposed project, in conjunction with the cumulative project, would have a less than significant cumulative impact with the incorporation of project-related mitigation measures. Refer to Section 2.5, *Cumulative Impacts*, for further detail.

c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Specific project related impacts are discussed above in items I through XVII. The proposed project would comply with appropriate laws and regulations. The proposed project would have a less than significant impact on human beings with the incorporation of resource-specific mitigation measures, as discussed above. Refer to Chapter 2, *Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences, and Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures*, for further detail.