

## 5.11 TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

This section describes the existing transportation and circulation conditions in the project area, potential environmental impacts due to implementation of the project, recommended mitigation measures to help reduce or avoid identified impacts, and the level of significance of adverse impacts after mitigation.

This analysis examines transportation and traffic conditions for the following four scenarios:

- Existing Conditions.
- Opening Year (2017) No Construction Conditions.
- Existing plus Construction Conditions.
- Opening Year (2017) plus Construction Conditions.

### 5.11.1 EXISTING CONDITIONS

This section documents the existing traffic conditions within the defined project area, below. Specifically, this section focuses on key, nearby locations that could be affected by construction or operation of the proposed project.

#### 5.11.1.1 Traffic Impact Study Area

The traffic impact study area (study area) is slightly larger than the project area as it includes access points. The study area is generally bounded by La Palma Avenue to the north, State Route 91 (SR-91) to the south, Green River Road to the east, and Gypsum Canyon to the west. The study area includes the study locations where vehicles related to both construction and operation of the proposed project are anticipated to utilize. The study area includes locations where recent traffic data was available through existing sources. These study locations (roadway segments) include:

1. SR-91 Westbound (WB) Off-Ramp to Gypsum Canyon Road.
2. SR-91 Eastbound (EB) Off-Ramp to Gypsum Canyon Road.
3. SR-91 WB Off-Ramp to Green River Road.
4. SR-91 EB Off-Ramp Green River Road.
5. La Palma Avenue between Gypsum Canyon Road and Cam De Bryant.
6. Gypsum Canyon Road between La Palma Avenue and SR-91 WB Off-Ramp.
7. Green River Road between SR-91 WB Off-Ramp and Crestridge Drive.
8. Green River Road west of Crestridge Drive.

These eight study locations were selected based on the anticipated regional and local travel patterns to and from the project area during both construction and operation. The travel patterns represent the most direct routes that provide local and regional access to the project area. It should be noted that there is an exit on the SR-91 (near Coal Canyon Trail) between the Gypsum Canyon and Green River exits that is available for emergency vehicles and construction vehicles only. It is anticipated that some of the construction traffic for the proposed project will utilize this exit from both eastbound and westbound SR-91.

#### 5.11.1.2 Existing Roadway System

Important roadway facilities within the study area are described below. The discussion presented here focuses on roadways that are approaches to the study locations or provide direct access to the project area.

- State Route (SR) 91: The SR-91 (Riverside Freeway) provides the primary east-west regional access to the project area. The facility has five general purpose lanes and two toll lanes in each direction, plus auxiliary lanes between interchanges. The closest access points to the project area include full-access interchanges at Gypsum Canyon Road and Green River Road. As noted previously, a service/emergency only entrance/exit is provided between Gypsum Canyon Road and Green River Road near Coal Canyon Trail.
- Gypsum Canyon Road: Gypsum Canyon Road is a four-lane divided arterial and direct access to the project area just north of the SR-91. It primarily serves residential and commercial uses north of La Palma Avenue. A divided sidewalk is provided on the west side of Gypsum Canyon Road from the SR-91 WB off ramp to La Palma Avenue.
- Green River Road: Green River Road is a two-lane, east-west undivided arterial that provides local access to the project area and provides regional access via an interchange with the SR-91. Within the study area, designated bike lanes are provided on the north and south sides of the street.
- La Palma Avenue: La Palma Avenue is a four-lane, east-west divided arterial that provides local access to the project area and provides regional access via its connection with Gypsum Canyon Road. Within the project area, a sidewalk is provided on the north side of the street.

#### 5.11.1.3 Existing Transit Service

Public transit service in the study area is operated by the Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA). Descriptions of these services within the project area or near the project area are provided below:

OCTA Route 794: This east-west local fixed route provides service along the SR-91, south of the project area. The route does not provide any stops within the project area or study locations.

Overall, the project area has low level of transit service, with no provisions of any major core transit services with high frequency or bus stops immediately adjacent to or providing direct access to the project area.

#### 5.11.1.4 Truck Routes

In the vicinity of the study area, there are two certified truck routes (Imperial Highway and SR-91). The truck routes are intended to designate roadways for use by commercial vehicles exceeding a maximum gross weight of 6,000 pounds and with a maximum length from the kingpin to the rearmost axle not exceeding 38 feet.

#### 5.11.1.5 Existing Freight and Commuter Rail

The Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) Railroad provides rail freight spur line service just north of the project area. All crossings with streets in that study area are grade-separated. The crossing at Green River Road just north of the Green River Golf Clubhouse is at-grade. Amtrak and Metrolink operate commuter rail along the railroad as well.

#### 5.11.1.6 Existing Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities

Existing bikeway routes in the City of Yorba Linda, City of Corona, and Orange County are classified in

three types of facilities. A Class I Bikeway is designated as off-road and paved. A Class II bicycle lane is a facility featuring a striped lane on the paved area of a road for preferential use by bicycles. A Class III bicycle route is a facility typically identified by green and white “Bike Route” guide signage only. Within the project area, a Class I Bikeway exists on the west side of Gypsum Canyon Road between the SR-91 and La Palma Avenue and along the southern bank of the river adjacent to the SR-91. A Class II bike lane exists on the north and south sides of Green River Road south west of Crestridge Drive.

Pedestrian facilities in the City of Yorba Linda are served by sidewalks and crosswalks, both of which are provided throughout the project area.

#### 5.11.1.7 Existing Project Area Levels of Service

##### Study Roadway Segments

Existing count data at the study locations was available through various sources. Existing Average Daily Traffic (ADT) counts were collected at each of the study area roadway segments from the following sources:

- City of Yorba Linda *Average Daily Traffic Volumes* (2008).<sup>1</sup>
- OCTA *Traffic Flow Map* (2013).
- City of Corona *Existing Traffic Control With Average Daily Traffic Volumes* (2014a,b).
- California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) *Traffic Data Branch Ramp Volumes* (2012a,b).

Table 5.11-1 summarizes the existing Level of Service (LOS) for the project area road segments based on the volume to capacity (V/C) ratio standards. The cities of Yorba Linda and Corona have established LOS D or better (LOS A, B, C and D) as the acceptable LOS for road segments within the City limits. LOS E and LOS F are considered to be deficient. As shown in Table 5.11-1, all project area road segments are currently operating at LOS C or better.

**TABLE 5.11-1  
ROADWAY LOS – EXISTING CONDITIONS**

<b>ROAD SEGMENT</b>	<b>SECTION LIMITS</b>	<b>LANE CONFIGURATION</b>	<b>DAILY VOLUME</b>	<b>CAPACITY</b>	<b>V/C</b>	<b>LOS</b>
SR-91 WB Off Ramp	To Gypsum Canyon	2 Lanes	2,240	12,500	0.179	A
SR-91 EB Off-Ramp	To Gypsum Canyon	2 Lanes	2,295	12,500	0.184	A
SR-91 WB Off-Ramp	To Green River	2 Lanes	3,584	12,500	0.287	A
SR-91 EB Off-Ramp	To Green River	3 Lanes	14,236	18,750	0.759	C
La Palma Avenue	From Gypsum Canyon to Cam De Bryant	4 Lanes	11,200	37,500	0.299	A
Gypsum Canyon	From La Palma to SR-91 WB Off-Ramp	4 Lanes	13,600	37,500	0.363	A

<sup>1</sup> Growth rates reported on the count sheets were used to reflect existing (2014) volumes.

**TABLE 5.11-1  
ROADWAY LOS – EXISTING CONDITIONS**

<b>ROAD SEGMENT</b>	<b>SECTION LIMITS</b>	<b>LANE CONFIGURATION</b>	<b>DAILY VOLUME</b>	<b>CAPACITY</b>	<b>V/C</b>	<b>LOS</b>
Green River	Between SR-91 WB Off-Ramp and Crestridge	4 Lanes	11,700	35,900	0.326	A
Green River	West of Crestridge	2 Lanes	2,800	13,000	0.215	A

Source: AECOM (2014).

5.11.1.8 Future Opening Year (2017) Conditions

Opening Year (2017) Conditions

This section provides a summary of the future (opening year 2017) no construction traffic conditions at the project area roadway segments. The year 2017 was defined as the Interim Analysis point for the proposed project based on the anticipated start of construction provided in the Notice of Preparation (NOP).

The traffic volumes analyzed for this scenario include the project area traffic growth based on an ambient growth rate that reflects anticipated regional growth. The analyzed volumes do not include trips generated by the proposed project/related projects located within and near the project area.

*Traffic Growth*

In order to define regional growth that would affect the future traffic conditions within the project area, an ambient annual growth rate of 1 percent per year for the project area was applied to existing volumes to create future ambient growth for the year 2017 no construction analysis. The growth rate was calculated based on the comparison of historical count data for the project area. The increase in volumes for the project area is therefore based on a general area-wide growth, with no traffic from any specific development projects.

*Opening Year (2017) No Construction LOS*

Project Area Roadway Segments

To analyze future conditions for the year 2017 (no construction traffic), the ambient growth rate of 1 percent per year was applied to existing roadway volumes (i.e., existing year 2014 volumes were incremented by 3 percent to derive opening year 2017 volumes). Table 5.11-2 summarizes the daily LOS operations of the study locations under this scenario.

**TABLE 5.11-2  
ROADWAY LOS – OPENING YEAR (2017) NO CONSTRUCTION TRAFFIC CONDITIONS**

<b>ROAD SEGMENT</b>	<b>SECTION LIMITS</b>	<b>LANE CONFIGURATION</b>	<b>DAILY VOLUME</b>	<b>CAPACITY</b>	<b>V/C</b>	<b>LOS</b>
SR-91 WB Off Ramp	To Gypsum Canyon	2 Lanes	2,307	12,500	0.185	A
SR-91 EB Off-Ramp	To Gypsum Canyon	2 Lanes	2,364	12,500	0.189	A

**TABLE 5.11-2  
ROADWAY LOS – OPENING YEAR (2017) NO CONSTRUCTION TRAFFIC CONDITIONS**

<b>ROAD SEGMENT</b>	<b>SECTION LIMITS</b>	<b>LANE CONFIGURATION</b>	<b>DAILY VOLUME</b>	<b>CAPACITY</b>	<b>V/C</b>	<b>LOS</b>
SR-91 WB Off-Ramp	To Green River	2 Lanes	3,692	12,500	0.295	A
SR-91 EB Off-Ramp	To Green River	3 Lanes	14,663	18,750	0.782	C
La Palma Avenue	From Gypsum Canyon to Cam De Bryant	4 Lanes	11,536	37,500	0.308	A
Gypsum Canyon	From La Palma to SR-91 WB Off-Ramp	4 Lanes	14,008	37,500	0.374	A
Green River	Between SR-91 WB Off-Ramp and Crestridge	4 Lanes	12,051	35,900	0.336	A
Green River	West of Crestridge	2 Lanes	2,884	13,000	0.222	A

Source: AECOM (2014).

As Table 5.11-2 indicates, all study area roadway segments would continue to operate at acceptable LOS values of C or better under opening year (2017) no construction conditions.

#### 5.11.2 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Based upon the thresholds contained in Appendix G of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, implementation of the project would result in a significant impact related to transportation and traffic if it would:

- 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.
- 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.
- Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.

Traffic impacts are identified if the proposed project would result in a significant change in traffic conditions at a roadway segment. A significant impact is normally defined when project-related traffic would cause a LOS to deteriorate to below the minimum acceptable level by a measurable amount. A cumulative impact may also be significant if the location is forecast to fall below a minimum acceptable level due to cumulative traffic and project-related traffic causes a further decline.

The study locations are located under the City of Yorba Linda and City of Corona jurisdictions, where the ramp locations of the SR-91 are under Caltrans jurisdiction. The cities and Caltrans have established LOS D as its criterion for an acceptable LOS, consistent with the County of Orange Growth Management

Plan (GMP), Riverside County General Plan, and Orange County Congestion Management Plan (CMP) guidelines. Impacts are triggered at LOS E and LOS F conditions.

### 5.11.3 METHODOLOGY RELATED TO TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

Key tasks undertaken for this traffic analysis included: 1) trip generation estimates of the project; 2) assignment of project-generated trips to the project area roadway system; and 3) evaluation of the impact of project traffic at the study locations. The following text further describes the methodology utilized for the project traffic impact analysis.

#### 5.11.3.1 Project Trip Generation, Distribution, and Assignment

This section summarizes the trip generation calculations conducted for the construction of the proposed project, based on a three-step process that involves trip generation, trip distribution, and trip assignment. It should be noted that trips associated with operation of the proposed project would be substantially less than during construction. As such, the impact analysis focuses on those that may occur during construction and operation.

#### Construction Trip Generation

Trip generation calculations were based on peak construction month activities obtained from the *Santa Ana River Parkway Extension Equipment Summary* (see Appendix I of this Draft EIR). Peak construction months were identified to occur between months 3 and 4. Below is a summary of the trip generation during construction:

- 40 Off-Site Daily Truck Trips (80 round truck trips times 2.0 passenger-car equivalent = 160 total daily trips).
- 20-30 Daily Worker Trips (40-60 round trips).

Based on the above, a maximum of approximately 220 daily trips would occur on any given day during the peak construction months. It should be noted that construction-related trips (160 of the 220 daily trips) would occur throughout the day and would not coincide with peak period traffic conditions (7:00 AM to 9:00 AM and 4:00 PM to 6:00 PM). It is important to note that all traffic identified due to construction would be isolated, temporary, short in duration, and coordinated with various agencies. In addition, the selected contractor would employ commonly used traffic control measures as needed.

#### Operation Trip Generation

Trip generation calculations were based on the proposed project provided by the County. Below is a summary of the trip generation during operation:

- 2 Daily Maintenance Worker Trips (4 round trips).
- 24 Patron Trips (48 round trips to and from the Staging Area that may include various amenities and parking area for access to trail).

Based on the above, a maximum of approximately 52 trips would occur on any given time during operation of the proposed project (26 trips to the Staging Area and 26 trips from the Staging Area). Daily trips will vary but the 52 trips would be the worst-case scenario (at one given time) considering that the

Staging Area could only accommodate 26 vehicles a one given time. As stated previously, the number of trips associated with operation would be less than during construction; as such, the impact analysis is based on construction of the proposed project.

### Project Trip Distribution

Trip distribution is the process of assigning the directions from which traffic would travel to and from a project area. Based on information received from the County, the percentage of construction trips to and from the project area are as follows:

- 50 percent from/to Gypsum Canyon interchange with SR-91.
- 20 percent from/to service/emergency vehicle interchange with SR-91.
- 30 percent from/to Green River interchange with SR-91.

### Project Trip Assignment

The final product of the trip assignment process is a full accounting of project trips, by multiplying the trip generation by the trip distribution. With a total of 220 trips during construction, approximately 50 percent (110 trips) were assigned to utilize Gypsum Canyon Road, 20 percent (44 trips) were assigned to utilize the service/emergency entrance/exit, and 30 percent (66 trips) were assigned to Green River Road. As discussed previously, these trips (160 of the 220 daily trips) would occur throughout the day and would not coincide with peak period traffic conditions (7:00 AM to 9:00 AM and 4:00 PM to 6:00 PM).

#### 5.11.3.2 Study Roadway Segment Impact Methodology

### Project Impact Standards

The cities of Yorba Linda and Corona, as well as Caltrans, have established maximum daily road capacities corresponding to different LOS designations based on road classifications, as shown in Table 5.11-3. For this analysis, LOS for project area road segments was calculated by comparing the daily traffic volumes to the LOS E capacity (V/C = 1.0). This comparison yields a V/C ratio from which the LOS is determined. Daily roadway segment analysis was utilized based on both available count data and construction traffic arrival and departure patterns. Since construction traffic would occur throughout the day (with the exception of the peak periods of 7:00 AM to 9:00 AM and 4:00 PM to 6:00 PM), a daily roadway segment capacity analysis is appropriate. A peak hour roadway segment analysis or peak hour intersection analysis would not be necessary as construction traffic would be restricted to off-peak hours.

**TABLE 5.11-3  
MAXIMUM AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC FOR ARTERIAL ROADS**

Road Classification	Lane Configuration	LOS A (V/C=0.6)	LOS B (V/C=0.7)	LOS C (V/C=0.8)	LOS D (V/C=0.9)	LOS E (V/C=1.0)	LOS F (V/C>1.0)
Major Arterial	8 Lanes Divided	33,900	39,400	45,000	50,600	56,300	> 56,300
Primary Arterial	4 Lanes Divided	22,500	26,300	30,000	33,800	37,500	> 37,500
Secondary Arterial	4 Lanes Divided	15,000	17,500	20,000	22,500	25,000	> 25,000

**TABLE 5.11-3  
MAXIMUM AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC FOR ARTERIAL ROADS**

<b>Road Classification</b>	<b>Lane Configuration</b>	<b>LOS A (V/C=0.6)</b>	<b>LOS B (V/C=0.7)</b>	<b>LOS C (V/C=0.8)</b>	<b>LOS D (V/C=0.9)</b>	<b>LOS E (V/C=1.0)</b>	<b>LOS F (V/C&gt;1.0)</b>
Commuter	2 Lanes Divided	7,500	8,800	10,000	11,300	12,500	> 12,500

Source: City of Yorba Linda (1993).

A project is deemed to have a significant adverse impact if the project results in deterioration of the LOS from acceptable (LOS A through D) to an unacceptable LOS (LOS E or LOS F).

#### 5.11.4 POTENTIAL IMPACTS

##### 5.11.4.1 Conflict with Applicable Plan, Ordinance or Policy Establishing Measures of Effectiveness for the Performance of the Circulation System

#### Existing Plus Construction Impacts

This section provides an analysis of significant impacts of the addition of construction traffic to existing conditions.

#### *Study Roadway Segment Impacts*

Tables 5.11-4 and 5.11-5 provide a comparison of the existing and existing plus project scenarios. As these tables indicate, all eight study roadway segments would continue to operate at an acceptable LOS during construction of the proposed project.

**TABLE 5.11-4  
ROADWAY LOS – EXISTING + CONSTRUCTION TRAFFIC CONDITIONS**

<b>Road Segment</b>	<b>Section Limits</b>	<b>Existing</b>				<b>Existing + Construction</b>		
		<b>Daily Volume</b>	<b>Capacity</b>	<b>V/C</b>	<b>LOS</b>	<b>Daily Volume</b>	<b>V/C</b>	<b>LOS</b>
SR-91 WB Off-Ramp	To Gypsum Canyon	2,240	12,500	0.179	A	2,290	0.183	A
SR-91 EB Off-Ramp	To Gypsum Canyon	2,295	12,500	0.184	A	2,345	0.188	A
SR-91 WB Off-Ramp	To Green River	3,584	12,500	0.287	A	3,614	0.289	A
SR-91 EB Off-Ramp	To Green River	14,236	18,750	0.759	C	14,266	0.761	C
La Palma Avenue	From Gypsum Canyon to Cam De Bryant	11,200	37,500	0.299	A	11,300	0.301	A
Gypsum Canyon	From La Palma to SR-91 WB Off-Ramp	13,600	37,500	0.363	A	13,700	0.365	A
Green River	Between SR-91 WB Off-Ramp and Crestridge	11,700	35,900	0.326	A	11,760	0.328	A
Green River	West of Crestridge	2,800	13,000	0.215	A	2,860	0.220	A

Source: AECOM (2014).



**TABLE 5.11-5  
DETERMINATION OF PROJECT IMPACTS –EXISTING PLUS CONSTRUCTION CONDITIONS**

ID#	ROADWAY	EXISTING CONDITIONS		EXISTING PLUS CONSTRUCTION CONDITIONS		LOS CHANGE?	SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS?
		V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS		
1	State Route 91 (SR-91) Westbound (WB) Off-Ramp to Gypsum Canyon Road	0.179	A	0.183	A	No	No
2	SR-91 Eastbound (EB) Off-Ramp to Gypsum Canyon Road	0.184	A	0.188	A	No	No
3	SR-91 WB Off-Ramp to Green River Road	0.287	A	0.289	A	No	No
4	SR-91 EB Off-Ramp Green River Road	0.759	C	0.761	C	No	No
5	La Palma Avenue between Gypsum Canyon Road and Cam De Bryant	0.299	A	0.301	A	No	No
6	Gypsum Canyon Road between La Palma Avenue and SR-91 WB Off-Ramp	0.363	A	0.365	A	No	No
7	Green River Road between SR-91 WB Off-Ramp and Crestridge Drive	0.326	A	0.328	A	No	No
8	Green River Road west of Crestridge Drive	0.215	A	0.220	A	No	No

Source: AECOM (2014).

Opening Year (2017) Plus Construction Traffic Impacts

This section provides an analysis of significant impacts of the addition of construction traffic to opening year (2017) conditions.

*Study Roadway Segment Impacts*

Tables 5.11-6 and 5.11-7 provide a comparison of the opening year and opening year plus construction scenarios. As these tables indicate, all eight study roadway segments would continue to operate at an acceptable LOS during construction of the project under opening year conditions.

**TABLE 5.11-6  
ROADWAY LOS – OPENING YEAR (2017) + CONSTRUCTION TRAFFIC CONDITIONS**

Road Segment	Section Limits	Opening Year (2017)				Opening Year + Construction		
		Daily Volume	Capacity	V/C	LOS	Daily Volume	V/C	LOS
SR-91 WB Off Ramp	To Gypsum Canyon	2,307	12,500	0.185	A	2,357	0.189	A
SR-91 EB Off-Ramp	To Gypsum Canyon	2,364	12,500	0.189	A	2,414	0.193	A
SR-91 WB Off-Ramp	To Green River	3,692	12,500	0.295	A	3,722	0.298	A
SR-91 EB Off-Ramp	To Green River	14,663	18,750	0.782	C	14,693	0.784	C

**TABLE 5.11-6  
ROADWAY LOS – OPENING YEAR (2017) + CONSTRUCTION TRAFFIC CONDITIONS**

Road Segment	Section Limits	Opening Year (2017)				Opening Year + Construction		
		Daily Volume	Capacity	V/C	LOS	Daily Volume	V/C	LOS
La Palma Avenue	From Gypsum Canyon to Cam De Bryant	11,536	37,500	0.308	A	11,636	0.310	A
Gypsum Canyon	From La Palma to SR-91 WB Off-Ramp	14,008	37,500	0.374	A	14,108	0.376	A
Green River	Between SR-91 WB Off-Ramp and Crestridge	12,051	35,900	0.336	A	12,111	0.337	A
Green River	West of Crestridge	2,884	13,000	0.222	A	2,944	0.226	A

Source: AECOM (2014).

**TABLE 5.11-7  
DETERMINATION OF PROJECT IMPACTS –EXISTING PLUS CONSTRUCTION CONDITIONS**

ID#	ROADWAY	OPENING YEAR CONDITIONS		OPENING YEAR PLUS CONSTRUCTION CONDITIONS		LOS CHANGE?	SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS?
		V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS		
1	State Route 91 (SR-91) Westbound (WB) Off-Ramp to Gypsum Canyon Road	0.185	A	0.189	A	No	No
2	SR-91 Eastbound (EB) Off-Ramp to Gypsum Canyon Road	0.189	A	0.193	A	No	No
3	SR-91 WB Off-Ramp to Green River Road	0.295	A	0.298	A	No	No
4	SR-91 EB Off-Ramp Green River Road	0.782	C	0.784	C	No	No
5	La Palma Avenue between Gypsum Canyon Road and Cam De Bryant	0.308	A	0.310	A	No	No
6	Gypsum Canyon Road between La Palma Avenue and SR-91 WB Off-Ramp	0.374	A	0.376	A	No	No
7	Green River Road between SR-91 WB Off-Ramp and Crestridge Drive	0.336	A	0.337	A	No	No
8	Green River Road west of Crestridge Drive	0.222	A	0.226	A	No	No

Source: AECOM (2014).

*Bicycle/Pedestrian Impacts*

The designated bikeways other than the proposed project are not anticipated to be disrupted during construction or operation of the project. Existing sidewalks, crosswalks, and other pedestrian facilities would not be affected by construction or operation of the proposed project resulting in no impacts to bicycle and pedestrian facilities in the project area.

5.11.4.2 Conflict with Congestion Management Program Facility

The project area does not include any designated CMP roadways or intersections. As such, no impacts

related to CMP intersections would occur.

#### 5.11.4.3 Conflict with Adopted Policies, Plans, or Programs Regarding Public Transit, Bicycle, or Pedestrian Facilities

The project is not expected to conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities during both construction or operation of the proposed project. Implementation of the proposed project would not affect any existing or proposed OCTA transit routes and stations. For safety purposes, a temporary fence will be installed to secure the construction site and restrict public access while maintaining access to recreational facilities. Public use and access of the SAR Parkway would be maintained during construction. Adjacent pedestrian facilities would remain intact during both construction and operation of the project. Construction-related traffic (160 of the 220 daily trips) would be restricted to off-peak hours and would occur throughout the day. Therefore, impacts related to adopted policies, plans, or programs would be less than significant.

#### 5.11.5 MITIGATION MEASURES

No mitigation measures would be required.

#### 5.11.6 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to transportation and traffic.