Chapter 3  Comments and Coordination

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

3.1 Notice of Initiation of Studies

On November 16, 2011, a Notice of Initiation of Environmental Process (NOIS) was distributed to agencies and interested parties that may have an interest in the project. The NOIS requested feedback pertaining to potential environmental effects of the project, as well as existing facilities or planned projects that may be impacted by the project. Feedback was received from AT&T, Metrolink, the Orange County Sanitation District, Network Infrastructure Services, and Southern California Gas Company. The feedback was considered during development of the alternatives and analysis of project impacts.

3.2 Interagency Coordination and Consultation

The formulation of project alternatives and mitigation has been carried out through a cooperative dialogue among representatives of the following agencies or organizations:

- Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA)
- City of Santa Ana
- City of Irvine
- City of Tustin
- Native American representatives
- Historical groups
- State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO)
- Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) Transportation Conformity Working Group (TCWG)
- United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)
- United States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps)

The following sections summarize the results of Caltrans efforts to fully identify, address, and resolve project-related issues through early and continuing coordination.

3.2.1 Native American Consultation

Consultation with a number of Native American Tribes (groups and individuals) was conducted between November 2011 and January 2012 in compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52), which amended CEQA to require consultation with Native American Tribes, became effective July 1, 2015. As a result, additional Native American coordination under AB 52 was initiated in July 2015. The consultation with the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and Native American representatives is summarized in Table 3.1. A copy of the NAHC correspondence is included at the end of this chapter. As evaluated in Supplemental Draft IS/EA, Alternative 3M does not extend outside the existing Area of Potential Effect (APE), therefore follow-up
Native American Consultation as part of the Supplemental evaluation process was determined unnecessary.

3.2.2 Historical Consultation

Consultation with agencies and interested parties regarding historical resources is summarized below:

- Orange County Historical Society, letter sent October 8, 2012. No response received.
- City of Santa Ana, letter sent October 8, 2012. No response received.
- City of Irvine, letter sent October 8, 2012. Response received via telephone on November 2, 2012 from Sherman Jones, who stated that the City has no historic resources in the project Area of Potential Effects (APE). A letter from the City dated November 5, 2012 stated the same thing.
- City of Tustin, letter sent October 8, 2012. No response received.
- City of Santa Ana Planning and Building Agency, building permit research (October 2012).
- City of Tustin Community Development Department, Building Permits and Inspections Division (Flor Williams), building permit research (October 2012 and January 2013).
- Historic aerial photographs accessed online at historicaerials.com in May and October 2012.
- United States Geological Survey topographic maps.
### Table 3.1 Summary of Native American Consultation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency and Agency Representative</th>
<th>Date of First Contact (Formal Letter)</th>
<th>Date of Reply</th>
<th>Date of Follow-up Contact (Phone Call)</th>
<th>Consultation Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC)  
Dave Singleton, Program Analyst | November 10, 2011 | November 15, 2011 | Forma letter | November 10, 2011: A letter was sent to the NAHC requesting a search of the Sacred Lands File (SLF) in order to identify areas of religious or cultural significance to Native Americans. The NAHC request letter is included at the end of this chapter.  
November 15, 2011: The NAHC responded on November 15, 2011, to say that the SLF search was negative for the immediate Area of Potential Effects (APE), but recommended that 12 Native American individuals representing the Gabrielino, Gabrieleno Tongva, and Juaneño groups be contacted for possible additional information.  
November 28, 2011: Letters discussing the project and requesting information on Native American heritage resources were sent via certified letter and email to NAHC listed contacts on November 28, 2011. |
| Ti'At Society/Inter-Tribal Council of Pimu  
Cindi M. Alvitre, Chairwoman-Manisar Gabrieleno | November 28, 2011  
July 28, 2015 (AB 52) | None  
Letter returned to sender (Caltrans). | December 12, 2011  
December 20, 2011  
January 23, 2012 | November 28, 2011: A letter that discussed the project and requested information on cultural resources in the area that may be significant was sent via certified mail.  
December 12, 2011: A follow up email was sent to Ms. Alvitre.  
December 20, 2011: A second follow up email was sent to Ms. Alvitre.  
January 23, 2012: The letter was returned as "unclaimed." |
| Gabrieleno/Tongva Indians  
Sam Dunlap, Chairperson | November 28, 2011  
July 28, 2015 (AB 52) | None  
None | December 12, 2011  
December 14, 2011  
December 15, 2011 | November 28, 2011: A letter that discussed the project and requested information on cultural resources in the area that may be significant was sent via certified mail.  
December 12, 2011: A follow up email was sent to Mr. Dunlap.  
December 14, 2011: Mr. Dunlap responded by email to say that in 2007, an intact, deeply buried habitation site (approximately 5 feet below the ground surface) was discovered in the southwest quadrant of the Marine Corps Air Station in Tustin, about 3,500 feet east of the project area in the vicinity of Redhill Avenue and Barranca Parkway.  
December 15, 2011: In a follow up telephone call, Mr. Dunlap stated that due to the presence of this site, he considers the area to be sensitive for buried cultural resources and recommends that archaeological monitoring be part of the mitigation to ensure proper recording of any historic discoveries. He also recommends that if native soils are to be impacted, a Native American monitor |
### Table 3.1 Summary of Native American Consultation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency and Agency Representative</th>
<th>Date of First Contact (Formal Letter)</th>
<th>Date of Reply</th>
<th>Date of Follow-up Contact (Phone Call)</th>
<th>Consultation Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Juaneño Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acjachemen Nation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 28, 2015 (AB 52)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December 12, 2011: A follow up email was sent to Mr. Rivera.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December 19, 2011: A second follow up email was sent to Mr. Rivera.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juaneño Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acjachemen Nation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Rivera, Chairman</td>
<td>November 28, 2011</td>
<td>No response received</td>
<td>December 12, 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 28, 2015 (AB 52)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December 12, 2011: A follow up email was sent to Mr. Rosas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Rosas emailed back to acknowledge that he received the information. No further comment has been received.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 29, 2015: Mr. Rosas, Tribal Administrator, e-mailed Caltrans that he would weigh in within a few days.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 30, 2015: Mr. Rosas requested additional project information that was provided by the project team. No additional response received.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongva Ancestral Territorial Tribal Nation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Tommy Rosas, Tribal Administrator</td>
<td>November 28, 2011 (via email)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>December 12, 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 28, 2015 (AB 52; via email)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December 12, 2011: A follow up email was sent to Mr. Dorame.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December 19, 2011: A voicemail was left for Mr. Dorame.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December 22, 2011: Mr. Dorame stated in a telephone call that he forwarded the information to a Native American from his group in Orange County, and will respond if he finds there are concerns.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabrieleno Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert F. Dorame, Tribal Chair/Cultural Resources</td>
<td>November 28, 2011</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>December 12, 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 28, 2015 (AB 52)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December 12, 2011: A follow up email was sent to Mr. Morales.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December 19, 2011: In a telephone call, Mr. Morales requested that the project proponent be vigilant in identifying and protecting cultural resources. He is aware of buried sites in the vicinity and considers that most modern thoroughfares like SR-55 to mirror prehistoric trails. He recommends archaeological and Native American monitoring using a monitor from his group when construction is in native soil.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabrieleno Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Morales, Chairperson</td>
<td>November 28, 2011</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>December 12, 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 28, 2015 (AB 52)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December 12, 2011: A follow up email was sent to Mr. Cruz.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December 19, 2011: A voicemail was left for Mr. Cruz.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juaneño Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfred Cruz, Cultural Resources Coordinator</td>
<td>November 28, 2011</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>December 12, 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 28, 2015 (AB 52)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December 12, 2011: A follow up email was sent to Mr. Cruz.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December 22, 2011: Mr. Cruz returned the call to say that he is aware of sites in the vicinity and he recommends monitoring by an archaeologist and Native American when construction activities are in intact native soil.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency and Agency Representative</td>
<td>Date of First Contact (Formal Letter)</td>
<td>Date of Reply</td>
<td>Date of Follow-up Contact (Phone Call)</td>
<td>Consultation Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Gabrielino-Tongva Tribe Bernie Acuna  | November 28, 2011  
July 28, 2015 (AB 52) | None  
None | December 12, 2011  
December 20, 2011 | December 12, 2011: A follow up email was sent to Ms. Candelaria.  
December 20, 2011: Mr. Acuna’s voicemail box was full so a second follow up email was sent. |
| Juaneño Band of Mission Indians Acjachemen Nation Joyce Perry, Representing Tribal Chairperson | November 28, 2011  
July 28, 2015 (AB 52) | December 8, 2011  
None | None | December 8, 2011: Ms. Perry stated in a telephone call that her group has no comments or concerns. |
| Gabrielino-Tongva Tribe Linda Candelaria, Chairwoman | November 28, 2011  
July 28, 2015 (AB 52) | None  
None | December 12, 2011  
December 19, 2011 | December 12, 2011: A follow up email was sent to Ms. Candelaria.  
December 19, 2011: Ms. Candelaria stated in a telephone call that her group has no concerns or comment. |
| Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians Andrew Salas | November 28, 2011  
July 28, 2015 (AB 52) | None  
None | December 12, 2011  
December 19, 2011 | December 12, 2011: A follow up email was sent to Mr. Salas.  
December 19, 2011: A second follow up email was sent to Mr. Salas. Mr. Salas replied to say that he will comment shortly. No further comments have been received. |
| Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians Joseph Ontiveros, Director of Cultural Resources (requested consultation with District 12 following the passage of AB 52) | July 28, 2015 (AB 52) | August 27, 2015 | | August 27, 2015: Mr. Ontiveros responded by letter that they would like to consult on this project and asked for a meeting.  
September 2, 2015: Caltrans requested meeting availability.  
September 2, 2015: Soboba responded that a field meeting was not needed at this time as long as the reports and maps can be referenced.  
September 3, 2015: Caltrans requested meeting availability.  
September 14, 2015: Soboba responded with next meeting availability (September 29 or 30, 2015).  
September 14, 2015: Caltrans responded with alternate dates.  
September 15, 2015: Soboba responded that Fridays are not available.  
September 15, 2015: Caltrans requested meeting availability in mid-October.  
September 21, 2015: Soboba responded they have an opening tomorrow and need the results of the CHRIS record search and maps. Caltrans sent the information electronically.  
September 22, 2015: Meeting with Caltrans and Mr. Joseph |
## Table 3.1 Summary of Native American Consultation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency and Agency Representative</th>
<th>Date of First Contact (Formal Letter)</th>
<th>Date of Reply</th>
<th>Date of Follow-up Contact (Phone Call)</th>
<th>Consultation Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ontiveros at the Soboba Administration Office in San Jacinto. Project scope and location were briefly discussed. Results of the record search, consultation, and field survey did not identify any cultural resources within the APE. Soboba inquired about mitigation and Caltrans replied that as proposed, no historic properties would be affected and that, based on the potential for only a few small areas of native soil to be impacted, no mitigation was required. Soboba requested they be retained to monitor construction activities in native soil if any present and requested that Caltrans coordinate with other districts. Caltrans indicated that they would re-examine the cultural studies regarding potential impacts to native soil and discuss negative findings and monitoring requests with other districts and Headquarters. <strong>September 29, 2015:</strong> Caltrans responded via e-mail and letter providing engineering information for native soil to only potentially be disturbed during the construction of bridge bents at a few locations. Since no cultural resources had been identified in the APE, Caltrans notified the Soboba that after discussions with other districts and Headquarters, District 12 had decided that the Soboba may voluntarily monitor construction activities in native soil if present, but it would be unpaid and contingent upon any required liability insurance. The Soboba were informed that construction was slated for 2017 and to let Caltrans know if they were interested or if they have any information that may warrant reconsideration. <strong>October 1, 2015:</strong> The Soboba sent Caltrans a formal letter concluding consultation stating that they have no specific concerns and requesting that appropriate consultation continue to take place between concerned tribes, project proponents, and local agencies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


3.2.3 State Historic Preservation Officer

As assigned by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Caltrans has determined that there are properties evaluated as a result of the project that are not eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places within the project APE. Under Section 106 Programmatic Agreement (PA) Stipulation VIII.C, Caltrans requested SHPO’s concurrence on this determination on October 5, 2015. SHPO concurrence was received on November 12, 2015. The proposed Alternative 3M evaluated in the Supplemental Draft IS/EA does not extend outside the existing Area of Potential Effect (APE), therefore no additional properties were evaluated. The SHPO concurrence determination on November 12, 2015 remains valid.

3.2.4 Transportation Conformity Working Group

The project-level particulate matter hot-spot analysis was presented to the SCAG TCWG for discussion and review on June 26, 2012. Per Caltrans Headquarters policy, all nonexempt projects need to go through review by the TCWG. The TCWG determined that the proposed project would meet the criteria for a project of air quality concern because it would expand an existing freeway with high existing and future truck volumes. Therefore, a qualitative project-level PM2.5 and PM10 hot-spot analysis was conducted to assess whether the project would cause or contribute to any new localized PM2.5 or PM10 violations, increase the frequency or severity of any existing violations, or delay timely attainment of the PM2.5 and PM10 national ambient air quality standards. On December 3, 2013, the TCWG determined that the qualitative project-level PM2.5 and PM10 hot-spot analysis was acceptable for National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) circulation. Subsequent to the TCWG approval, the forecasted SR-55 traffic volumes were updated. On July 28, 2015, the TCWG determined that the updated SR-55 traffic volumes would not affect the conclusions of the qualitative PM hot-spot analysis and reaffirmed that the analysis was acceptable for NEPA circulation. On August 23, 2016, the TCWG determined Alternative 3M (Preferred Alternative) SR-55 traffic volumes would not affect the conclusions of the qualitative PM hot-spot analysis and again reaffirmed that the analysis was acceptable for NEPA circulation. FHWA issued a project-level conformity determination on August 14, 2017. Copies of the TCWG determinations and FHWA’s project-level conformity determination are included at the end of this chapter. Copies of the 2016 RTP and 2017 FTIP are also attached at the end of this chapter following the TCWG and FHWA project-level conformity determination.

3.2.5 United States Fish and Wildlife Service/National Marine Fisheries Service

Official species lists were obtained from the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) on December 17, 2012, September 1, 2015, January 4, 2017, and June 14, 2017; and the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) on June 14, 2017. The species lists provide information about the threatened, endangered, and proposed species, designated critical habitat, and candidate species that may occur in the vicinity of a proposed project. The USFWS and NMFS species lists are included at the end of this chapter.

3.2.6 United States Army Corps of Engineers

On July 14, 2004, as part of the Alton Avenue Overcrossing Project, a letter was sent to the Corps requesting a Department of the Army determination of Corps jurisdiction over the Orange County Flood Control District channel known as Lane Channel, which is tributary to San Diego Creek, in the City of Santa Ana, Orange County California. The Corps August 20, 2004 response is provided at the end of this chapter.
3.3 Community Outreach and Public Involvement

3.3.1 Project Development Team

The Cities of Tustin, Santa Ana, and Irvine participate in the regular PDT meetings conducted by OCTA and Caltrans for the SR-55 widening project. The PDT meetings cover a wide range of topics related to the proposed project, including development and evaluation of alternatives, engineering considerations, environmental issues, and the environmental document and documentation process.

3.3.2 Orange County Transportation Authority Project Website

The OCTA has a webpage (http://www.octa.net/Projects-and-Programs/All-Projects/Freeway-Projects/Costa-Mesa-Freeway-(SR-55)/SR-55-(I-405-to-I-5)/?frm=3555) that provides information to the public regarding the proposed SR-55 project and the status of the environmental document and the environmental documentation process for the project.

3.3.3 Public Review/Circulation of Draft IS/EA and Supplemental IS/EA

3.3.3.1 Draft IS/EA Public Circulation Review

The public participation methods used for the Draft IS/EA included: mailing lists, newspaper notices/articles, direct mailings, public hearing, and web-based information.

Public circulation of the Draft IS/EA began on November 25, 2015 for a 45-day review period and ended on January 8, 2016. Due to several local stakeholders expressing concern about the public circulation period during the holiday season, the 45-day public review duration was extended an additional 15-days, which officially concluded January 23, 2016.

As required by CEQA Guidelines Section 15072, a public Notice of Intent (NOI) to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration and Availability of Initial Study, Notice of Public Meeting for the proposed SR-55 Improvement Project between Interstate I-405 and I-5 was submitted to the State Clearinghouse and Orange County Clerk on November 24, 2015. The NOI was also mailed to all of the agencies and persons that requested to be notified.

Printed copies of the Draft IS/EA were mailed to responsible agencies and other agencies and were made available for public review at the following locations:

*Caltrans District 12          Orange County Transportation Authority          Santa Ana Public Library
3347 Michelson Drive         550 South Main Street             26 Civic Center Plaza
Suite 100                    Orange, CA 92868                  Santa Ana, CA 92701
Irvine, CA 92612

City of Irvine
1 Civic Center Plaza         Tustin Library
Irvine, CA 92606-5207         345 East Main Street
Tustin, CA 92780

*As of The Department of Transportation District 12 has relocated to the following address:
Department of Transportation District 12
1750 East 4th Street
Santa Ana, CA 92705

The Draft IS/EA was also published on the District 12 website at:
http://www.dot.ca.gov/dist12/DEA/SR55IMPROV/

A public hearing was held during the 45-day public review on December 10, 2015 from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. at the Boy Scouts of America in Santa Ana, CA. The meeting was held in an open house format with no formal presentation. Approximately 45 members of the public
attended the meeting. Comment cards were provided at the meeting for the public to write their comments. A total of 7 comments cards were received during the public hearing. A court reporter was also present and officially recorded 2 verbal comments. Representatives from the Department District 12, the environmental consultant team (LSA Associates. Inc.), the design consultant team (HDR Consulting), and OCTA also attended the public hearing. A total of 40 comment letters consisting of letters, emails, comment cards, officially recorded verbal comments were received during the public review period. Responses to comments received during the Draft IS/EA and Supplemental Draft IS/EA are provided in Appendix H of this Final IS/EA.

3.3.3.2 Supplemental Draft IS/EA Public Circulation Review

Subsequent to public circulation of the Draft IS/EA, an inconsistency regarding traffic volume assumptions was identified. Several OCTA Measure M funded projects were not included in the Traffic Model used to determine future traffic volumes and this resulted in an inaccurate projected future travel demand. An Updated Traffic Volumes Report and Traffic Operations Report were prepared which include the additional Measure M funded projects in the forecasted traffic model. In addition, to improve accommodation of future travel demand along the SR-55 corridor between I-405 and I-5, meet the project purpose and need to increase capacity and improve operations, and to meet requirements under the Fixing America’s Surface Transportation Act (FAST Act), Division A, Title 1, Sec. 1411 related to HOV degradation, Alternative 3M was developed.

The public participation methods used for the Supplemental Draft IS/EA where similar to those Draft IS/EA which also included: mailing lists, newspaper notices/articles, direct mailings, public hearing, and web-based information.

Public circulation of the Supplemental Draft IS/EA began on April 3, 2017 and ended on May 3, 2017. As required by CEQA Guidelines Section 15072, a public Notice of Intent (NOI) to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration and Availability of Initial Study, Notice of Public Meeting for the proposed SR-55 Improvement Project between Interstate I-405 and I-5 was submitted to the with the State Clearinghouse and Orange County Clerk on April 2, 2017. The NOI was also mailed to all of the agencies and persons that requested to be notified.

Printed copies of the Supplemental Draft IS/EA were mailed to responsible agencies and other agencies and were made available for public review at the following locations:

- Caltrans District 12
  1750 E 4th Street
  Suite 100
  Santa Ana, CA 92705

- Orange County Transportation Authority
  550 South Main Street
  Orange, CA 92868

- Santa Ana Public Library
  26 Civic Center Plaza
  Santa Ana, CA 92701

- City of Irvine
  1 Civic Center Plaza
  Irvine, CA 92606-5207

- Katie Wheeler Library
  13109 Old Myford Rd
  Irvine, CA 92602

The Draft IS/EA was also published on the District 12 website at:
http://www.dot.ca.gov/d12/DEA/55/0J340/

A public hearing was held during the 30-day public review on April 20, 2017 from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. at the Delhi Center at 505 East Central Avenue, Santa Ana, CA 92707. Like the previous public meeting, the meeting was held in an open house format with no formal presentation. Approximately 23 members of the public attended the meeting. Comment cards were provided at the meeting for the public, however the only formal comment provided during the public meeting was one verbal comment to the court recorder. A total of
17 comment letters consisting of letters, emails and officially recorded verbal comments were received during the public review period. Responses to comments received during the Draft IS/EA public circulation period and the Supplemental Draft IS/EA are provided in Appendix H of this Final IS/EA.

3.3.4 Noise Barrier Survey Coordination

In accordance with the Caltrans Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol (May 2011), letters were sent by registered mail to all property owners and non-owner occupants of benefited receptors on June 23, 2017 to solicit their position either in favor of or in opposition to the proposed noise abatement. A public meeting specific to noise abatement proposed by the project was held at OCTA on July 17, 2017.

The viewpoints of the benefited receptors were received and evaluated. All (100%) property owners were in favor of the proposed sound barriers either for Nose Barrier No. NB-3 (11.5%) or the combined NB No. NNB-3 Reduced and NB No. NB-4 (88.5%).
Native American Heritage Commission Correspondence
This page intentionally left blank
November 10, 2011

Dave Singleton
Native American Heritage Commission
915 Capitol Mall, Room 364
Sacramento, CA 95814

Subject: Sacred Lands File Search for the State Route 55 (SR-55) Improvement Project between Interstate 405 (I-405) and Interstate 5 (I-5), Orange County, California

Dear Mr. Singleton:

Attached please find a portion of one United States Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5-minute topographic quadrangle map. Plotted on the map is the location of the proposed SR-55 Improvement Project between I-405 and I-5 in Orange County, California. Specifically, the project is situated in Township 5 South, Range 9 West, in an unsectioned portion of the Tustin, California USGS topographic quadrangle map (San Bernardino Baseline and Meridian). A map showing the project area is attached.

There will be ground disturbance associated with this project. Per Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, LSA is requesting a Sacred Lands File search for the project area. Please notify LSA of any Native American cultural resources that may be impacted.

I will anticipate a response within 10 working days from your receipt of this request. If you have any questions or comments, please contact me at (949) 553-0666 or you may e-mail me at terri.fulton@lsa-assoc.com. As always, thank you very much for your assistance with this project.

Best Regards,

LSA ASSOCIATES, INC.

[Signature]

Terri Fulton
Archaeologist/Senior Cultural Resources Manager
Native American Consultation Coordinator

Attachments: Portion of one USGS map
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November 10, 2011

Dave Singleton
Native American Heritage Commission
915 Capitol Mall, Room 364
Sacramento, CA 95814

Subject: Sacred Lands File Search for the State Route 55 (SR-55) Improvement Project between Interstate 405 (I-405) and Interstate 5 (I-5), Orange County, California

Dear Mr. Singleton:

Attached please find a portion of one United States Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5-minute topographic quadrangle map. Plotted on the map is the location of the proposed SR-55 Improvement Project between I-405 and I-5 in Orange County, California. Specifically, the project is situated in Township 5 South, Range 9 West, in an unsectioned portion of the Tustin, California USGS topographic quadrangle map (San Bernardino Baseline and Meridian). A map showing the project area is attached.

There will be ground disturbance associated with this project. Per Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, LSA is requesting a Sacred Lands File search for the project area. Please notify LSA of any Native American cultural resources that may be impacted.

I will anticipate a response within 10 working days from your receipt of this request. If you have any questions or comments, please contact me at (949) 553-0666 or you may e-mail me at terri.fulton@lsa-assoc.com. As always, thank you very much for your assistance with this project.

Best Regards,
November 15, 2011

Ms. Teri Fulton, RPA, Senior Cultural Resources Manager

LSA ASSOCIATES, INC.
20 Executive Park, Suite 200
Irvine, CA 92614

Sent by FAX to: 949-553-8076
No. of Pages: 5

Re: Sacred Lands File Search and Native American Contacts list for the
"Proposed State Route 55 (SR 55) Improvement Project, between the I-405 and I-5;"
located in; Orange County, California

Dear Ms. Fulton:

The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) conducted a Sacred Lands
File search of the 'area of potential effect,' (APEs) based on the USGS coordinates
provided and Native American cultural resources were not identified in the project area
of potential effect (e.g. APE) you specified. Also, please note; the NAHC Sacred Lands
Inventory is not exhaustive and does not preclude the discovery of cultural resources
during any project groundbreaking activity.

California Public Resources Code §§5097.94 (a) and 5097.96 authorize the NAHC
to establish a Sacred Land Inventory to record Native American sacred sites and burial
sites. These records are exempt from the provisions of the California Public Records Act
pursuant to California Government Code §6254 (f). The purpose of this code is to protect
such sites from vandalism, theft and destruction.

In the 1985 Appellate Court decision (170 Cal App 3rd 604), the court held that the
NAHC has jurisdiction and special expertise, as a state agency, over affected Native American
resources, impacted by proposed projects including archaeological, places of religious
significance to Native Americans and burial sites

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA – CA Public Resources Code §§
21000-21177, amendments effective 3/18/2010) requires that any project that causes a
substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource, that includes
archaeological resources, is a 'significant effect' requiring the preparation of an Environmental
Impact Report (EIR) per the CEQA Guidelines defines a significant impact on the environment
as 'a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of physical conditions within
an area affected by the proposed project, including ...objects of historic or aesthetic
significance.' In order to comply with this provision, the lead agency is required to assess
whether the project will have an adverse impact on these resources within the 'area of potential
effect (APE), and if so, to mitigate that effect. CA Government Code §65040.12(e) defines
"environmental justice" provisions and is applicable to the environmental review processes.
Early consultation with Native American tribes in your area is the best way to avoid unanticipated discoveries once a project is underway. Local Native Americans may have knowledge of the religious and cultural significance of the historic properties of the proposed project for the area (e.g. APE). Consultation with Native American communities is also a matter of environmental justice as defined by California Government Code §65040.12(e). We urge consultation with those tribes and interested Native Americans on the list the NAHC has attached in order to see if your proposed project might impact Native American cultural resources. Lead agencies should consider avoidance as defined in §15370 of the CEQA Guidelines when significant cultural resources as defined by the CEQA Guidelines §15064.5 (b)(c)(f) may be affected by a proposed project. If so, Section 15382 of the CEQA Guidelines defines a significant impact on the environment as "substantial," and Section 2183.2 which requires documentation, data recovery of cultural resources.

The 1992 Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties were revised so that they could be applied to all historic resource types included in the National Register of Historic Places and including cultural landscapes. Also, federal Executive Orders Nos. 11593 (preservation of cultural environment), 13175 (coordination & consultation) and 13007 (Sacred Sites) are helpful, supportive guides for Section 106 consultation. The aforementioned Secretary of the Interior's Standards include recommendations for all "lead agencies" to consider the historic context of proposed projects and to "research" the cultural landscape that might include the "area of potential effect."

Partnering with local tribes and interested Native American consulting parties, on the NAHC list, should be conducted in compliance with the requirements of federal NEPA (42 U.S.C 4321-4335l) and Section 106 4(f). Section 110 (f)(k) of federal NHPA (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq), 36 CFR Part 800.3 (f) (2) & .5, the President's Council on Environmental Quality (CSQ, 42 U.S.C 4371 et seq. and NAGPRA (25 U.S.C. 3001-3013) as appropriate. The 1992 Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties were revised so that they could be applied to all historic resource types included in the National Register of Historic Places and including cultural landscapes. Also, federal Executive Orders Nos. 11593 (preservation of cultural environment), 13175 (coordination & consultation) and 13007 (Sacred Sites) are helpful, supportive guides for Section 106 consultation. The NAHC remains concerned about the limitations and methods employed for NHPA Section 106 Consultation.

Also, California Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, California Government Code §27491 and Health & Safety Code Section 7050.5 provide for provisions for accidentally discovered archeological resources during construction and mandate the processes to be followed in the event of an accidental discovery of any human remains in a project location other than a 'dedicated cemetery', another important reason to have Native American Monitors on board with the project.

To be effective, consultation on specific projects must be the result of an ongoing relationship between Native American tribes and lead agencies, project proponents and their contractors, in the opinion of the NAHC. An excellent way to reinforce the relationship between a project and local tribes is to employ Native American Monitors in all phases of proposed projects including the planning phases.

Confidentiality of "historic properties of religious and cultural significance" may also be protected under Section 304 of the NHPA or at the Secretary of the Interior discretion if not eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. The Secretary may also be advised by the federal Indian Religious Freedom Act (cf. 42 U.S.C., 1996) in issuing a decision
on whether or not to disclose items of religious and/or cultural significance identified in or near the APE and possibility threatened by proposed project activity.

If you have any questions about this response to your request, please do not hesitate to contact me at (946) 653-6251.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Dave Stappert

Attachment: Native American Contact List
California Native American Contacts
Orange County
November 15, 2011

Tlaat Society/Inter-Tribal Council of Pimu
Cindi M. Alvitre, Chairwoman-Manisas
3098 Mace Avenue, Apt D  Gabriéllino
Costa Mesa, CA 92626
calvitre@yahoo.com
(714) 504-2468 Cell

Gabriéllino Tongva Nation
Sam Dunlap, Chairperson
P.O. Box 85908 Los Angeles, CA 90066
samdunlap@earthlink.net
(909) 262-9351 - cell

Juaneno Band of Mission Indians Acjachemen Nation
David Belardes, Chairperson
32161 Avenue Los Amigos Juaneno
San Juan Capistrano, CA 92675
ciefdavidbelardes@yahoo.com
(949) 493-4933 - home
(949) 293-8522

Juaneno Band of Mission Indians Acjachemen Nation
Anthony Rivera, Chairman
31411-A La Matanza Street Juaneno
San Juan Capistrano, CA 92675-2674
arivora@juaneno.com
(949) 488-3484
(949) 488-3294 - FAX
(530) 354-5876 - cell

Tongva Ancestral Territorial Tribal Nation
John Tommy Rosas, Tribal Admin.
Private Address Gabrieléllino Tongva
tattinlaw@gmail.com
310-670-6567

Gabriéllino Tongva Nation
San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians
Anthony Morales, Chairperson
PO Box 693 San Gabriel, CA 91778
GTTrbalcouncil@aol.com
(626) 286-1632
(626) 286-1758 - Home
(626) 286-1262 - FAX

Gabriéllino Tongva Nation
Juaneno Band of Mission Indians
Alfred Cruz, Cultural Resources Coordinator
P.O. Box 25828 Santa Ana, CA 92799
alfredcruz@sbcglobal.net
714-998-0721
714-998-0721 - FAX
714-321-1944 - cell

This list is current only as of the date of this document.

Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of the statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code and Section 5007.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resources for the proposed State Route 55 Improvement Project, between the I-405 and I-5 in Orange County, California for which a Sacred Lands File search and Native American Contacts list were requested.
Gabrielino-Tongva Tribe
Bernie Acuna
1875 Century Pk East #1500 Gabrielino
Los Angeles , CA 90067
(619) 294-8660-work
(310) 426-5690 - cell
(310) 587-0170 - FAX
bacuna1@gabrielinotribe.org

Juaneño Band of Mission Indians Adjacent Nation
Joyce Perry; Representing Tribal Chairperson
4955 Paseo Segovia Juaneno
Irvine, CA 92612
949-293-8522

Gabrielino-Tongva Tribe
Linda Candelaria, Chairwoman
1875 Century Park East, Suite 1500
Los Angeles, CA 90067 Gabrielino
candelaflat1@gabrielinotribe.org
626-676-1184- cell
(310) 587-0170 - FAX
760-904-6533-home

Gabrielino Band of Mission Indians
Andrew Salas, Chairperson
P.O. Box 393 Covina, CA 91723
(626) 926-4131
gabrielinoindians@yahoo.com

This list is current only as of the date of this document.

Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of the statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code and Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resources for the proposed State Route 56 Improvement Project, between the I-405 and I-5 in Orange County, California for which a Scenic Lands File search and Native American Contacts list were requested.
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State Historic Preservation Officer Concurrence
Chapter 3  Comments and Coordination
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October 2, 2015

Julianne Polanco
State Historic Preservation Officer
Office of Historic Preservation
1725 23rd Street, Suite 100
Sacramento, CA 95816

Re: Historic Property Survey Report (HPSR) for the SR-55 Widening Project, in the cities of Tustin, Santa Ana, and Irvine, in Orange County, California (EA 0J3400; EFIS 1200020328)

Dear Ms. Polanco:

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), is initiating consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) regarding the SR-55 Widening Project from just north of the I-405/SR-55 interchange, to just south of the I-5/SR-55 interchange in the cities of Tustin, Santa Ana, and Irvine, in Orange County, California. This consultation is undertaken in accordance with the January 2014 First Amended Section 106 Programmatic Agreement among the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, the California State Historic Preservation Officer, and the California Department of Transportation (PA). We are consulting with you at the present time under Stipulation VIII.C of the PA, which requires that we seek your concurrence on Caltrans’ determinations of eligibility for potential historic properties.

Enclosed you will find a Historic Property Survey Report (HPSR) for the proposed undertaking. Caltrans, in cooperation with the Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA), proposes the SR-55 Widening Project between Postmiles (PM) 6.4 and 10.3. Four build alternatives (Alternatives 1-4) have been proposed, each of which would add at least one general-purpose lane. Auxiliary lanes would also be added or converted, and Alternative 4 includes high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes. All of the build alternatives include right-of-way acquisition (R/W), temporary construction easements (TCEs), bridge work, approximately one soundwall, retaining walls, drainage improvements, utility relocations, and the relocation/reconfiguration of Lane Channel. The HPSR was put on hold between April 2014 and September 2015 due to management discussions regarding traffic modeling.

A full project scope description and discussion of the Area of Potential Effects (APE) can be found on page 1 in the enclosed HPSR, with a depiction of the APE listed as Map 3.
Consultation and identification efforts for the SR-55 Widening Project resulted in one historic built environment resource (30-176663/30-176664/BNSF Railway) traversing the APE. This segment of the railway has been evaluated previously as ineligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and was exempted in this study. No archaeological resources were identified within the APE as a result of the archaeological field surveys, archival research, and Native American consultation.

Identification and evaluation efforts for the SR-55 Widening Project (HPSR Attachment C) resulted in 17 historic-period built environmental properties being evaluated within the APE as depicted in Section 5. Properties Identified within the HPSR (pg. 5). These properties were evaluated for the NRHP and Caltrans concluded that they are not eligible. Pursuant to Stipulation VIII.C.6 of the PA, Caltrans is requesting your concurrence with the eligibility determinations as follows:

**Not Eligible for the NRHP**

- 2321 Pullman Street (APE Map Reference Number 1)
- 2311 Pullman Street (APE Map Reference Number 2)
- 2322 Pullman Street (APE Map Reference Number 3)
- 1601 Warner Avenue, 2229 Wright Street, 2253–2259 Ritchey Street, and 2261–2271 Ritchey Street (APE Map Reference Number 4)
- 2231–2241 Ritchey Street and 2245–2251 Ritchey Street (APE Map Reference Number 5)
- 1969–2019 Ritchey Street (APE Map Reference Number 6)
- 17021–17041 Kenyon Drive (APE Map Reference Number 7)
- 17051–17061 Kenyon Drive (APE Map Reference Number 8)
- 17071–17081 Kenyon Drive (APE Map Reference Number 9)
- 17091–17101 Kenyon Drive (APE Map Reference Number 10)
- 15991–16001 Pasadena Avenue (APE Map Reference Number 11)
- 17022 Whitby Circle (APE Map Reference Number 12)
- 17021 Whitby Circle (APE Map Reference Number 13)
- 15641 Pasadena Avenue (APE Map Reference Number 14)
- 17042 Carlann Circle (APE Map Reference Number 15)
- 15591 Boleyn Circle (APE Map Reference Number 16)
- 15581 Boleyn Circle (APE Map Reference Number 17)

All other properties within the APE, met the criteria for the Section 106 PA Attachment 4 (Properties Exempt from Evaluation). The HPSR was reviewed by Caltrans Cultural Studies Office (CSO) Professionally Qualified Staff (PQS).

This consultation is being undertaken in accordance with the January 1, 2014, Federal-Aid Highway Programmatic Agreement (PA). Caltrans is initiating consultation as part of its NEPA assignment of federal responsibilities by the Federal Highway Administration.
(FHWA), effective October 1, 2012, and pursuant to 23 USC 327. Please direct all future correspondence on this project to Caltrans.

We are kindly requesting a response within 30 days of your receipt of this submittal, in accordance with Stipulation VIII.C.6(a) of the PA. This letter also serves as notification that Caltrans’ finding for the undertaking (pursuant to Stipulation IX.A.2) is “No Historic Properties Affected”, due to the absence of identified historic properties within the undertaking’s APE.

If you need any additional information, please do not hesitate to me (phone: 949.724.2252; fax: 949.724.2256; e-mail: Charles.Baker@dot.ca.gov. Finally, thank you for your assistance with this undertaking.

Sincerely,

Charles Baker, Specialist Branch Chief
Environmental Analysis
California Department of Transportation, District 12, Irvine

Attachment: October 2015 Historic Property Survey Report for the SR-55 Widening Project between just north of I-405 to just south of I-5 within the cities of Tustin, Santa Ana, and Irvine, in Orange County (12-ORA-55; PM 6.4/10.3; EA 0J3400)

c: Kelly Hobbs – Caltrans CSO, Section 106 Coordinator
November 12, 2015

Charles Baker, Specialist Branch Chief
Environmental Analysis
Caltrans District 12, Irvine
3347 Michelson Drive, Suite 100
Irvine, CA 92612-1692

Re: Determinations of Eligibility for the Proposed SR-55 Widening Project, in the cities of Tustin, Santa Ana, and Irvine, Orange County, CA

Dear Mr. Baker:

Thank you for consulting with me about the subject undertaking in accordance with the January 1, 2014 First Amended Programmatic Agreement Among the Federal Highway Administration, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, the California State Historic Preservation Officer, and the California Department of Transportation Regarding Compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, as it Pertains to the Administration of the Federal-Aid Highway Program in California (PA).

Caltrans, in cooperation with the Orange County Transportation Authority, proposes the SR-55 Widening Project between Postmiles (PM) 6.4 and 10.3. Four build alternatives have been proposed, each of which would add at least one general-purpose lane. Auxiliary lanes would also be added or converted, and Alternative 4 includes high-occupancy vehicle lanes. All of the build alternatives include right-of-way acquisition, temporary construction easements, bridge work, approximately one soundwall, retaining walls, drainage improvements, utility relocations, and the relocation/reconfiguration of Lane Channel. A full project scope description and discussion of the Area of Potential Effects (APE) can be found on page 1 on the HPSR.

Consultation and identification efforts for the project resulted in the identification of 17 historic-period built environment properties within the APE. Caltrans has determined that the following properties are not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places either individually or as part of a potential historic district (NRHP):

- 2321 Pullman Street
- 2311 Pullman Street
- 2322 Pullman Street
- 1601 Warner Avenue, 2229 Wright Street, 2253-2259 Ritchey Street, and 2261-2271 Ritchey Street
- 2231 Ritchey Street and 2245-2251 Ritchey Street
- 1969-2019 Ritchey Street
- 17021-17041 Kenyon Drive
- 17051-17061 Kenyon Drive
- 17071-17081 Kenyon Drive
- 17091-17101 Kenyon Drive
- 15991-16001 Pasadena Avenue
- 17022 Whitby Circle
- 17021 Whitby Circle
- 15641 Pasadena Avenue
• 17042 Carlann Circle
• 15591 Boleyn Circle
• 15581 Boleyn Circle

All other properties within the APE, met the criteria for the Section 106 PA Attachment 4 (Properties Exempt from Evaluation).

Based on my review of the submitted documentation I concur with the foregoing determinations.

If you have any questions, please contact Natalie Lindquist of my staff at (916) 445-7014.

Sincerely,

Julianne Polanco
State Historic Preservation Officer
Transportation Conformity Working Group Determinations
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TCWG Review of Qualitative Analyses

Qualitative PM Hot Spot Analysis Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>December, 2013</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ORA100511 December 2013 Memo</td>
<td>Reaffirmed to be acceptable for NEPA circulation (FHWA and EPA concurrence received via email after meeting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORA100511 December 2013 Markup</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORA100511 December 2013 Rev</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### TCWG Review of Qualitative Analyses

#### Qualitative PM Hot Spot Analysis Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>July, 2015</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ORA100511 July 2015 Memo</td>
<td>Reaffirmed to be acceptable for NEPA circulation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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TRANSPORTATION CONFORMITY WORKING GROUP  
of the  
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  

August 23, 2016  
Minutes  

THE FOLLOWING MINUTES ARE A SUMMARY OF THE MEETING OF THE TRANSPORTATION CONFORMITY WORKING GROUP. A DIGITAL RECORDING OF THE ACTUAL MEETING IS AVAILABLE FOR LISTENING IN SCAG’S OFFICE.  

The Meeting of the Transportation Conformity Working Group was held at the SCAG office in Los Angeles.  

In Attendance:  
Castro, Fernando  
Caltrans, District 7  
Chiou, Wayne  
Caltrans, District 12  
Huddleston, Lori  
LA Metro  
Sherwood, Arnie  
UC Berkeley  

SCAG:  
Asuncion, John  
Au, Anita  
Luo, Yunsheng  
Tran, Daniel  

Via Teleconference:  
Aurasteh, Reza  
Caltrans, District 12  
Alvarez, Grace  
RCTC  
Behtash, Arman  
Caltrans, District 12  
Brugger, Ron  
LSA Associates  
Cacatian, Ben  
VCAPCD  
Cheng, Jack  
SCAQMD  
Dano, Neil  
Parsons  
Durbin, Martha  
RCTC  
Gallo, Ilene  
Caltrans, District 11  
King, Steven  
OCTA  
Lee, Jeannie  
OCTA  
Liptak, Zach  
Dokken Engineering  
Lombard, Susan  
RCTC  
Marksit, John  
County of Riverside  
Mejia, James  
SANBAG  
Nguyendo, Kevin  
Caltrans Headquarters  
Odufalu Olufemi  
Caltrans, District 8  
Pereira, Melina  
Caltrans, District 11  
Pajar, Camilla  
HDR  
Sheehy, Erin  
OCTA  

3.1-1  
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Minutes

Silverman, Sam Terry A. Hayes Associates
Speirs, David Parsons
Suderland, John Terry A. Hayes Associates
Tax, Wienke EPA, Region 9
Tavitas, Rodney Caltran Headquarters
Vanben, Mary RCTC
Vaughn, Joseph FHWA
Walecka, Carla TCA
Yoon, Andrew Caltrans, District 7

1.0 CALL TO ORDER AND SELF-INTRODUCTION

Lori Huddleston, Acting Chair, called the meeting to order at 10:17 am.

2.0 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

There were no public comments.

3.0 CONSENT CALENDAR

None.

4.0 INFORMATION ITEMS

4.1 Review of PM Hot Spot Interagency Review Forms
   1) ORA131304
      It was determined that this is not a POAQC (EPA concurrence was received via email prior to meeting).
   2) RIV011232
      It was determined that this is not a POAQC (EPA concurrence was received via email prior to meeting).

4.2 Review of PM Hot Spot Qualitative/Quantitative Analysts
   1) 18790
      It was determined that the analysis is acceptable for NEPA circulation (EPA concurrence was received via email prior to meeting).
   2) ORA100511
      It was reaffirmed that the analysis is acceptable for NEPA circulation (EPA concurrence was received via email prior to meeting).
4.3 FTIP Update
John Asuncion, SCAG, reported the following:
• 2017 FTIP public comment period concluded on August 8, 2016. All 14 comments received had been addressed in Proposed Final 2017 FTIP.
• 2017 FTIP would be presented to SCAG’s Regional Council for adoption on September 1, 2016 and due to Caltrans Headquarters by September 30, 2016.
• State and federal approval of 2017 FTIP was anticipated in mid-November and mid-December respectively.

4.4 RTP Update
Daniel Tran, SCAG, reported the following:
• SCAG had decided to move forward with Amendment No. 1 to 2016-2040 RTP/SCS in response to input received from CTCs. RTP Amendment Project List spreadsheets had been distributed to CTCs for update.
• SCAG was also accepting modeling updates to 2017 FTIP through FTIP database until September 14, 2016.

4.5 EPA Update
Wienke Tax, EPA Region 9, reported that Final PM$_{2.5}$ SIP Implementation Rule was signed on July 29, 2016.

4.6 ARB Update
None.

4.7 Air Districts Update
Ben Cacatian, VCAPCD, reported the following:
• VCAPCD was planning to release Draft 2016 Ventura County AQMP for 2008 8-hour Ozone standards in September for a 30-day public review period.
• VCAPCD Board approval was anticipated in November 2016, followed by transmittal to ARB and final SIP submittal to EPA.

Jack Cheng, SCAQMD, reported that Draft 2016 South Coast AQMP public comment period concluded on August 19, 2016 but SCAQMD was still taking comments on a rolling basis.

5.0 INFORMATION SHARING
None.
6.0  ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:50 am.

The next Transportation Conformity Working Group meeting will be held on Tuesday, September 27, 2016 at the SCAG office in downtown Los Angeles.
Federal Highway Administration Air Quality Project-Level Conformity Determination
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Ryan Chamberlain  
Director, California Department of Transportation  
District 12  
1750 E., 4th St., Suite 100  
Santa Ana, CA 92705

Attention: Arman Behtash

SUBJECT: Project Level Conformity Determination for the State Route 55 Improvement Project (FTIP ID ORA100511)

Dear Mr. Chamberlain:

On August 1, 2017, the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) submitted to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) a complete request for a project level conformity determination for the State Route 55 Improvement Project. The project is in an area that is designated Non-Attainment or Maintenance for Nitrogen Dioxide (NO₂), Carbon Monoxide (CO), Ozone and Particulate Matter (PM₁₀, PM₂.₅).

The project level conformity analysis submitted by Caltrans indicates that the project-level transportation conformity requirements of 40 CFR Part 93 have been met. The project is included in the Southern California Association of Governments’ (SCAG) current Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), as amended. The design concept and scope of the preferred alternative have not changed significantly from those assumed in the regional emissions analysis.

As required by 40 CFR 93.116 and 93.123, the localized PM₂.₅ and PM₁₀ analyses are included in the documentation. The analyses demonstrate that the project will not create any new violations of the standards or increase the severity or number of existing violations.

Based on the information provided, FHWA finds that the State Route 55 Improvement Project conforms with the State Implementation Plan (SIP) in accordance with 40 CFR Part 93.
If you have any questions pertaining to this conformity finding, please contact Joseph Vaughn at (916) 498-5346 or by email at Joseph.Vaughn@dot.gov.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

For: Tashia J. Clemons
Director Program Director
Federal Highway Administration
SCAG 2016 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)
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TABLE 1  FTIP Projects - Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>System</th>
<th>FTIP ID</th>
<th>Route #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Project Cost ($1,000's)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ORANGE</td>
<td>STATE HIGHWAY</td>
<td>ORA11801</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>I-5 (ALICIA PARKWAY TO EL TORO ROAD) SEGMENT 3 - THE PROJECT WILL ADD ONE GENERAL PURPOSE LANE ON THE I-5 IN EACH DIRECTION BETWEEN ALICIA PARKWAY AND EL TORO ROAD (APPROXIMATELY 17 MILES), EXTEND THE 2ND HOV LANE IN BOTH DIRECTIONS AND ADD AUXILIARY LANES WHERE NEEDED.</td>
<td>$22,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORANGE</td>
<td>STATE HIGHWAY</td>
<td>ORA31105</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>I-5 / LOS ALIROS - ADD RAMPS AT LOS ALIROS OR EL TORO (UTILIZE TOLL CREDIT MATCH FOR RSTP) PALED.</td>
<td>$57,954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORANGE</td>
<td>STATE HIGHWAY</td>
<td>ORA30302</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>I-5 (I-405 TO SR-55) - IN THE CITIES OF IRVINE AND TUSTIN, ADD 1 MF LANE NB FROM TRUCK BYPASS ON RAMP TO SR-55, ADD 1 MF LANE SB FROM SR-55 TO ALTON AND 1 AUX LANE FROM ALTON TO TRUCK BYPASS. (PALED AND PS&amp;E PHASE) PROJECT WILL UTILIZE $917,600 TOLL CREDIT MATCH</td>
<td>$452,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORANGE</td>
<td>STATE HIGHWAY</td>
<td>ORA11210</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>I-5 FROM SR 55 TO SR 57 - ADD 1 HOV LANE EACH DIRECTION (PPNO 2883A)</td>
<td>$37,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORANGE</td>
<td>STATE HIGHWAY</td>
<td>ORA30060</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>INTERSTATE 5 CONTINUOUS ACCESS HIGH OCCUPANCY VEHICLE LANE STRIPING FROM STATE ROUTE 57 INTERCHANGE TO STATE ROUTE 91/BEACH BOULEVARD INTERCHANGE</td>
<td>$4,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORANGE</td>
<td>STATE HIGHWAY</td>
<td>ORA150401</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>THREE HOV OVERHEAD SIGNS WITHIN THE MEDIAN OF THE I-5 SOUTH OF AVENIDA PICO IN THE CITY OF SAN CLEMENTE. THESE IMPROVEMENTS ARE SUPPLEMENTS TO THE I-5 HOV WIDENING PROJECT AND PROVIDE NORTHBOUND I-5 TRAFFIC ADVANCE NOTIFICATION OF A HOV LANE THAT IS ADDED TO THE GP LANES. (RELATED TO ORA990923)</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORANGE</td>
<td>STATE HIGHWAY</td>
<td>ORA000193</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>HOV CONNECTORS FROM SR-22 TO I-405, BETWEEN SEAL BEACH BLVD. (I-405 PM 222.558) AND VALLEY VIEW ST. (SR-22 PM R000.917), WITH A SECOND HOV LANE IN EACH DIRECTION ON I-405 BETWEEN THE TWO DIRECT CONNECTORS. TOLL CREDIT MATCH FOR CMAQ.</td>
<td>$119,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORANGE</td>
<td>STATE HIGHWAY</td>
<td>ORA31301</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>SR-55 (I-5 TO SR-91) - ADD CAPACITY FROM I-5 TO SR-22 AND IMPROVE OPERATIONS FROM I-5 TO SR-91 (UTILIZE TOLL CREDIT MATCH FOR RSTP) (STUDY ONLY)</td>
<td>$148,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORANGE</td>
<td>STATE HIGHWAY</td>
<td>ORA015</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>BAKER STREET AND SP, N/B &amp; S/B FRONTAGE ROAD IMPROVEMENTS. S/B FREE RIGHT TURN, N/B LEFT TURN-AND 2ND E/B LEFT</td>
<td>$900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORANGE</td>
<td>STATE HIGHWAY</td>
<td>ORA016</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>PAULARINO AVE (SR-55 NB FRONTAGE ROAD @ PAULARINO AVE) IN COSTA MESA INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENT. ADDING A N/B RAMP AND W/B RIGHT-TURN-LANE.</td>
<td>$505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORANGE</td>
<td>STATE HIGHWAY</td>
<td>ORA017</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>PAULARINO AVE IN SR-55 SB FRONTAGE ROAD COSTA MESA. INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENT ADD S/B RIGHT-TURN LANE.</td>
<td>$270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORANGE</td>
<td>STATE HIGHWAY</td>
<td>ORA000591</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>SR-55 WIDENING BETWEEN I-405 AND I-5 - ADD 1MF LANE EACH DIRECTION AND FIX CHOKEPOINT'S FROM I-405 TO I-5; ADD 1 AUX LANE EA DIR BTWN SELECT ON/OFF RAMP AND NON-CAPACITY OPERATIONAL IMPROVEMENTS THROUGH PROJECT LIMITS (PS&amp;S AND PAED). CONSISTENT WITH THE 2012 RSTP TOLL CREDIT FOR RSTP.</td>
<td>$274,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORANGE</td>
<td>STATE HIGHWAY</td>
<td>ORA000146</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>CONSTRUCT NEW INTERCHANGE ON SR 55 @ MEATS AVENUE. CONSTRUCT ON-RAMP/OFF-RAMPS. CONSTRUCTION OF AUXILIARY LANES BETWEEN KATIELLA AVENUE AND LINCOLN AVENUE/NOEL RANCH ROAD BOTH NORTHBOUND AND SOUTHBOUND ON SR-55. WIDEN TAFT AVENUE UNDERCROSSING ON NORTHBOUND SIDE OF SR-55. WIDEN MEATS AVENUE FROM PARK LANE TO BRECKENRIDGE STREET. REALIGN 1820’ OF THE SR 55 MEDIAN BARIER. WIDEN SANTIAGO AVENUE AT MEATS AVENUE FOR TURN LANE.</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORANGE</td>
<td>STATE HIGHWAY</td>
<td>ORA10302</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>IN PLACENTIA AND FULLERTON, N/B SR-57 FROM 0.4 MI N/O SR-91 TO 0.1 MI N/O LAMBERT RD (5.1 MILES). REPLACEMENT PLANTING AS THE RESULT OF THE SR-57 NORTHBOUND WIDENING REPLACEMENT PLANTING RELATED TO ORA081901 AND ORA203323</td>
<td>$2,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORANGE</td>
<td>STATE HIGHWAY</td>
<td>ORA31303</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>SR-57 ORANGEGROVE TO KATIELLA ADD 1 MF LANE NORTHBOUND BETWEEN ORANGEGROVE AND KATIELLA UTILIZE TOLL MATCH FOR RSTP IVE OPENING</td>
<td>$6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORANGE</td>
<td>STATE HIGHWAY</td>
<td>ORA020320</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>SR-57/LAMBERT RD INTERCHANGE IMPROVEMENTS - RECONFIG EXISTING DIAMOND INTERCHANGE TO LOOP RAMP ADD SB LN ON OFRAMP (PPNO 3834)</td>
<td>$59,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORANGE</td>
<td>STATE HIGHWAY</td>
<td>ORA000820</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>SR-57 TRUCK CLIMBING AUX LANE FROM LAMBERT TO LA CO LNE. PPNO 3847A EA 0C1200 (PE ONLY)</td>
<td>$124,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORANGE</td>
<td>STATE HIGHWAY</td>
<td>10254</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>SAN JOAQUIN HILLS TRANSPORTATION CORRIDOR (5.3HTC - SR 73)</td>
<td>$351,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORANGE</td>
<td>STATE HIGHWAY</td>
<td>ORA202808</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>IN ORANGE COUNTY, ON RTE 90 IMPERIAL HIGHWAY, IN THE CITIES OF YORBA LINDA AND ANAHEIM ON ROUTE 90 FROM EAST OF KELLOGG DRIVE UNDERCROSSING TO LA PALMA AVENUE. THE PROJECT IS TO PROVIDE ENHANCEMENT AND MITIGATION PLANTING. PPNO 4434B EA 12-056221</td>
<td>$1,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORANGE</td>
<td>STATE HIGHWAY</td>
<td>ORA000982</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>CONNECT EXISTING AUXILIARY LANE THROUGH INTERCHANGES ON WB SR-91 BETWEEN SR-57 AND I-5 W/ITS ELEMENTS PPNO 4596A EA OC700</td>
<td>$65,677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORANGE</td>
<td>STATE HIGHWAY</td>
<td>ORA30301</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>SR-91 (SR-57 TO SR-55) - ADD 1 MF LANE EASTBOUND; IMPROVE INTERCHANGE AT SR-91/SR-55 AND LAKEVIEW AVE; OPERATIONAL, NO INCREASE IN CAPACITY</td>
<td>$425,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This page intentionally left blank
SCAG 2017 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP)
This page intentionally left blank
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ProjectID</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Air Basin</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>RTP ID</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Begin</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>System</th>
<th>Conformity Category</th>
<th>Amendment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ORA015</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>SCAB</td>
<td>ORA015</td>
<td>NCRH1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>EXEMPT - 93.127</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>BAKER STREET AND SR-55; N/B &amp; S/B FRONTAGE ROAD IMPROVEMENTS. S/B FREE RIGHT TURN, N/B LEFT-TURN AND 2ND E/B LEFT.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY FUNDS</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORA015 Total</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORA016</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>SCAB</td>
<td>ORA016</td>
<td>CARH3</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NON-EXEMPT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PAULARINO AVE (SR-55 NB FRONTAGE ROAD @ PAULARINO AVE) IN COSTA Mesa INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENT. ADDING A N/B RAMP AND W/B RIGHT-TURN-LANE.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY FUNDS</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>275</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORA016 Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>275</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORA100511</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>SCAB</td>
<td>2M0733</td>
<td>CAN89</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>10.32</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>TCM</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SR-55 WIDENING BETWEEN I-405 AND I-5 - ADD 1 MF AND 1 HOV LANE EACH DIRECTION AND FIX CHOKEPOINTS FROM I-405 TO I-5; ADD 1 AUX LANE EA DIR BTWN SELECT ON/OFF RAMP AND NON-CAPACITY OPERATIONAL IMPROVEMENTS THROUGH PROJECT LIMITS (PS&amp;E and PAED). Toll Credit for RSTP.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP LOCAL - REGIONAL</td>
<td>13,800</td>
<td>13,800</td>
<td>13,800</td>
<td>13,800</td>
<td>13,800</td>
<td>13,800</td>
<td>13,800</td>
<td>13,800</td>
<td>13,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORANGE CO: MEASURE M2 - REGIONAL CAPACITY</td>
<td>6,523</td>
<td>6,523</td>
<td>6,523</td>
<td>6,523</td>
<td>6,523</td>
<td>6,523</td>
<td>6,523</td>
<td>6,523</td>
<td>6,523</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOPP - ADVANCE CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORA100511 Total</td>
<td>24,023</td>
<td>24,023</td>
<td>24,023</td>
<td>24,023</td>
<td>24,023</td>
<td>24,023</td>
<td>24,023</td>
<td>24,023</td>
<td>24,023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORA131301</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>SCAB</td>
<td>2121002</td>
<td>PLN40</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>EXEMPT/MODELED</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SR-55 (I-5 to SR-91) – Add 1 MF lane each direction and fix chokepoints from I-5 to SR-22; and other operational improvements throughout project limits (Utilize toll credit match for RSTP) (Study Only)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP LOCAL - REGIONAL</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORA131301 Total</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Consultation Tracking Number: 08ECAR00-2013-SLI-0102  

Project Name: SR-Improvement Project  

Subject: List of threatened and endangered species that may occur in your proposed project location, and/or may be affected by your proposed project.

To Whom It May Concern:

The enclosed species list identifies threatened, endangered, and proposed species, designated critical habitat, and candidate species that may occur within the boundary of your proposed project and/or may be affected by your proposed project. The species list fulfills the requirements of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) under section 7(c) of the Endangered Species Act (Act) of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

New information based on updated surveys, changes in the abundance and distribution of species, changed habitat conditions, or other factors could change this list. Please feel free to contact us if you need more current information or assistance regarding the potential impacts to federally proposed, listed, and candidate species and federally designated and proposed critical habitat. Please note that under 50 CFR 402.12(e) of the regulations implementing section 7 of the Act, the accuracy of this species list should be verified after 90 days. This verification can be completed formally or informally as desired. The Service recommends that verification be completed by visiting the ECOS-IPaC website at regular intervals during project planning and implementation for updates to species lists and information. An updated list may be requested through the ECOS-IPaC system by completing the same process used to receive the enclosed list.

The purpose of the Act is to provide a means whereby threatened and endangered species and the ecosystems upon which they depend may be conserved. Under sections 7(a)(1) and 7(a)(2) of the Act and its implementing regulations (50 CFR 402 et seq.), Federal agencies are required to utilize their authorities to carry out programs for the conservation of threatened and endangered species and to determine whether projects may affect threatened and endangered species and/or designated critical habitat.

A Biological Assessment is required for construction projects (or other undertakings having
similar physical impacts) that are major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment as defined in the National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 4332(2) (c)). For projects other than major construction activities, the Service suggests that a biological evaluation similar to a Biological Assessment be prepared to determine whether the project may affect listed or proposed species and/or designated or proposed critical habitat. Recommended contents of a Biological Assessment are described at 50 CFR 402.12.

If a Federal agency determines, based on the Biological Assessment or biological evaluation, that listed species and/or designated critical habitat may be affected by the proposed project, the agency is required to consult with the Service pursuant to 50 CFR 402. In addition, the Service recommends that candidate species, proposed species and proposed critical habitat be addressed within the consultation. More information on the regulations and procedures for section 7 consultation, including the role of permit or license applicants, can be found in the "Endangered Species Consultation Handbook" at:

http://www.fws.gov/endangered/esa-library/pdf/TOC-GLOS.PDF

Please be aware that bald and golden eagles are protected under the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 668 et seq.), and projects affecting these species may require development of an eagle conservation plan (http://www.fws.gov/windenergy/eagle_guidance.html). Additionally, wind energy projects should follow the wind energy guidelines (http://www.fws.gov/windenergy/) for minimizing impacts to migratory birds and bats.

Guidance for minimizing impacts to migratory birds for projects including communications towers (e.g., cellular, digital television, radio, and emergency broadcast) can be found at: http://www.fws.gov/migratorybirds/CurrentBirdIssues/Hazards/towers/towers.htm; http://www.towerkill.com; and http://www.fws.gov/migratorybirds/CurrentBirdIssues/Hazards/towers/comtw.html.

We appreciate your concern for threatened and endangered species. The Service encourages Federal agencies to include conservation of threatened and endangered species into their project planning to further the purposes of the Act. Please include the Consultation Tracking Number in the header of this letter with any request for consultation or correspondence about your project that you submit to our office.

Attachment
Official Species List

Provided by:
CARLSBAD FISH AND WILDLIFE OFFICE
6010 HIDDEN VALLEY ROAD, SUITE 101
CARLSBAD, CA 92011
(760) 431-9440
http://www.fws.gov/carlsbad/

Consultation Tracking Number: 08ECAR00-2013-SLI-0102

Project Type: Transportation

Project Description: California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), in cooperation with the Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA), proposes to widen State Route 55 (SR-55) in both directions from just north of the Interstate 405 (I-405)/SR-55 interchange to Just South of the Interstate 5 (I-5)/SR-55 interchange in the Cities of Irvine, Santa Ana, and Tustin Orange County California.
Project Location Map:

Project Coordinates: MULTIPOLYGON (((-117.87599352 33.6831251), -117.867398
33.6836176, -117.8766556 33.6836711, -117.8757756 33.6849656, -117.8753679 33.686385,
-117.8764618 33.6869562, -117.8764838 33.6879382, -117.8758707 33.6878581, -117.8743365
33.6880999, -117.8730168 33.6885366, -117.8721049 33.688401, -117.8708279 33.6899826,
-117.8686717 33.6921788, -117.8674379 33.6933839, -117.8665796 33.6939999, -117.8655281
33.6949637, -117.8627387 33.6980614, -117.8626528 33.6985077, -117.8627065 33.6986862,
-117.8630712 33.6993378, -117.8634682 33.6995509, -117.8644445 33.6997841, -117.8649702
33.6998376, -117.864981 33.7001322, -117.8646484 33.7001947, -117.8638437 33.7000608,
-117.8628781 33.6998015, -117.8623309 33.700221, -117.8611722 33.7003629, -117.8603246
33.7005156, -117.8590264 33.7017652, -117.8580394 33.7027827, -117.8551962 33.7058266,
-117.8546273 33.7062996, -117.8545522 33.7066834, -117.8544664 33.7084238, -117.8524494
33.708397, -117.8496277 33.7112708, -117.8508186 33.7111459, -117.8508508 33.7115029,
-117.8504967 33.7115475, -117.8504646 33.7122168, -117.8499818 33.712971, -117.8497672
33.7126898, -117.8493166 33.7130825, -117.8483724 33.7125113, -117.8453791 33.7154743,-
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Project Counties: Orange, CA
Endangered Species Act Species List

Species lists are not entirely based upon the current range of a species but may also take into consideration actions that affect a species that exists in another geographic area. For example, certain fish may appear on the species list because a project could affect downstream species. Please contact the designated FWS office if you have questions.

Big-Leaved crownbeard (*Verbesina dissita*)
Listing Status: Threatened

California Least tern (*Sternula antillarum browni*)
Listing Status: Endangered

Coastal California gnatcatcher (*Polioptila californica californica*)
Listing Status: Threatened

Laguna Beach liveforever (*Dudleya stolonifera*)
Listing Status: Threatened

Least Bell's vireo (*Vireo bellii pusillus*)
Listing Status: Endangered

Light-Footed Clapper rail (*Rallus longirostris levipes*)
Population: U.S.A. only
Listing Status: Endangered

Pacific Pocket mouse (*Perognathus longimembris pacificus*)
Population: Entire
Listing Status: Endangered

Riverside fairy shrimp (*Streptocephalus woottoni*)
Listing Status: Endangered

Salt Marsh bird's-beak (*Cordylanthus maritimus ssp. maritimus*)
Listing Status: Endangered

http://ecos.fws.gov/ipac, 12/17/2012 09:34 AM
San Diego fairy shrimp (Branchinecta sandiegensis)
   Listing Status: Endangered

Southwestern Willow flycatcher (Empidonax traillii extimus)
   Listing Status: Endangered

Thread-Leaved brodiaea (Brodiaea filifolia)
   Listing Status: Threatened

Western Snowy plover (Charadrius alexandrinus nivosus)
   Listing Status: Threatened
Consultation Code: 08ECAR00-2015-SLI-0699
Event Code: 08ECAR00-2015-E-01397
Project Name: SR-55 Improvement Project

Subject: List of threatened and endangered species that may occur in your proposed project location, and/or may be affected by your proposed project

To Whom It May Concern:

The enclosed species list identifies threatened, endangered, and proposed species, designated critical habitat, and candidate species that may occur within the boundary of your proposed project and/or may be affected by your proposed project. The species list fulfills the requirements of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) under section 7(c) of the Endangered Species Act (Act) of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

New information based on updated surveys, changes in the abundance and distribution of species, changed habitat conditions, or other factors could change this list. Please feel free to contact us if you need more current information or assistance regarding the potential impacts to federally proposed, listed, and candidate species and federally designated and proposed critical habitat. Please note that under 50 CFR 402.12(e) of the regulations implementing section 7 of the Act, the accuracy of this species list should be verified after 90 days. This verification can be completed formally or informally as desired. The Service recommends that verification be completed by visiting the ECOS-IPaC website at regular intervals during project planning and implementation for updates to species lists and information. An updated list may be requested through the ECOS-IPaC system by completing the same process used to receive the enclosed list.

The purpose of the Act is to provide a means whereby threatened and endangered species and the ecosystems upon which they depend may be conserved. Under sections 7(a)(1) and 7(a)(2) of the Act and its implementing regulations (50 CFR 402 et seq.), Federal agencies are required to utilize their authorities to carry out programs for the conservation of threatened and endangered species and to determine whether projects may affect threatened and endangered species and/or designated critical habitat.
A Biological Assessment is required for construction projects (or other undertakings having similar physical impacts) that are major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment as defined in the National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(c)). For projects other than major construction activities, the Service suggests that a biological evaluation similar to a Biological Assessment be prepared to determine whether the project may affect listed or proposed species and/or designated or proposed critical habitat. Recommended contents of a Biological Assessment are described at 50 CFR 402.12.

If a Federal agency determines, based on the Biological Assessment or biological evaluation, that listed species and/or designated critical habitat may be affected by the proposed project, the agency is required to consult with the Service pursuant to 50 CFR 402. In addition, the Service recommends that candidate species, proposed species and proposed critical habitat be addressed within the consultation. More information on the regulations and procedures for section 7 consultation, including the role of permit or license applicants, can be found in the "Endangered Species Consultation Handbook" at:

http://www.fws.gov/endangered/esa-library/pdf/TOC-GLOS.PDF

Please be aware that bald and golden eagles are protected under the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 668 et seq.), and projects affecting these species may require development of an eagle conservation plan (http://www.fws.gov/windenergy/eagle_guidance.html). Additionally, wind energy projects should follow the wind energy guidelines (http://www.fws.gov/windenergy/) for minimizing impacts to migratory birds and bats.

Guidance for minimizing impacts to migratory birds for projects including communications towers (e.g., cellular, digital television, radio, and emergency broadcast) can be found at: http://www.fws.gov/migratorybirds/CurrentBirdIssues/Hazards/towers/towers.htm; http://www.towerkill.com; and http://www.fws.gov/migratorybirds/CurrentBirdIssues/Hazards/towers/comtow.html.

We appreciate your concern for threatened and endangered species. The Service encourages Federal agencies to include conservation of threatened and endangered species into their project planning to further the purposes of the Act. Please include the Consultation Tracking Number in the header of this letter with any request for consultation or correspondence about your project that you submit to our office.

Attachment
Official Species List

Provided by:
Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office
2177 SALK AVENUE - SUITE 250
CARLSBAD, CA 92008
(760) 431-9440
http://www.fws.gov/carlsbad/

Consultation Code: 08ECAR00-2015-SLI-0699
Event Code: 08ECAR00-2015-E-01397

Project Type: TRANSPORTATION

Project Name: SR-55 Improvement Project

Project Description: California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), in cooperation with the Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA), proposes to widen State Route (SR) 55 in both directions from Just north of the Interstate 405 (I-405)/SR-55 interchange to just south of Interstate 5 (I-5)/SR-55 interchange in the Cities of Irvine, Santa Ana, and Tustin Orange County California.

Please Note: The FWS office may have modified the Project Name and/or Project Description, so it may be different from what was submitted in your previous request. If the Consultation Code matches, the FWS considers this to be the same project. Contact the office in the 'Provided by' section of your previous Official Species list if you have any questions or concerns.
Project Location Map:

Project Coordinates: The coordinates are too numerous to display here.

Project Counties: Orange, CA
Endangered Species Act Species List

There are a total of 13 threatened or endangered species on your species list. Species on this list should be considered in an effects analysis for your project and could include species that exist in another geographic area. For example, certain fish may appear on the species list because a project could affect downstream species. Critical habitats listed under the Has Critical Habitat column may or may not lie within your project area. See the Critical habitats within your project area section further below for critical habitat that lies within your project. Please contact the designated FWS office if you have questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birds</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Has Critical Habitat</th>
<th>Condition(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California Least tern (<em>Sterna antillarum browni</em>)</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal California gnatcatcher (<em>Poliopitla californica californica</em>)</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td>Final designated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population: Entire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least Bell's vireo (<em>Vireo bellii pusillus</em>)</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>Final designated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population: Entire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light-Footed Clapper rail (<em>Rallus longirostris levipes</em>)</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population: U.S.A. only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwestern Willow flycatcher (<em>Empidonax traillii extimus</em>)</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>Final designated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population: Entire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>western snowy plover (<em>Charadrius nivosus ssp. nivosus</em>)</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td>Final designated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Crustaceans

http://ecos.fws.gov/ipac, 09/01/2015 02:33 PM
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Diego fairy shrimp</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>Final designated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Branchinecta sandiegonensis)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Flowering Plants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flowers</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Big-Leaved crownbeard (Verbesina dissita)</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laguna Beach liveforever (Dudleya stolonifera)</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Marsh bird's-beak (Cordylanthus maritimus ssp. maritimus)</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego button-celery (Eryngium aristulatum var. parishii)</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura Marsh Milk-vetch (Astragalus pycnostachyus var. lanoissimus)</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>Final designated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mammals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mammal</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Pocket mouse (Perognathus longimembris pacificus)</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population: Entire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Critical habitats that lie within your project area

There are no critical habitats within your project area.
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To Whom It May Concern:

The enclosed species list identifies threatened, endangered, and proposed species, designated critical habitat, and candidate species that may occur within the boundary of your proposed project and/or may be affected by your proposed project. The species list fulfills the requirements of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) under section 7(c) of the Endangered Species Act (Act) of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

New information based on updated surveys, changes in the abundance and distribution of species, changed habitat conditions, or other factors could change this list. Please feel free to contact us if you need more current information or assistance regarding the potential impacts to federally proposed, listed, and candidate species and federally designated and proposed critical habitat. Please note that under 50 CFR 402.12(e) of the regulations implementing section 7 of the Act, the accuracy of this species list should be verified after 90 days. This verification can be completed formally or informally as desired. The Service recommends that verification be completed by visiting the ECOS-IPaC website at regular intervals during project planning and implementation for updates to species lists and information. An updated list may be requested through the ECOS-IPaC system by completing the same process used to receive the enclosed list.

The purpose of the Act is to provide a means whereby threatened and endangered species and the ecosystems upon which they depend may be conserved. Under sections 7(a)(1) and 7(a)(2) of the Act and its implementing regulations (50 CFR 402 et seq.), Federal agencies are required to utilize their authorities to carry out programs for the conservation of threatened and endangered species and to determine whether projects may affect threatened and endangered species and/or designated critical habitat.
A Biological Assessment is required for construction projects (or other undertakings having similar physical impacts) that are major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment as defined in the National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 4332(2) (c)). For projects other than major construction activities, the Service suggests that a biological evaluation similar to a Biological Assessment be prepared to determine whether the project may affect listed or proposed species and/or designated or proposed critical habitat. Recommended contents of a Biological Assessment are described at 50 CFR 402.12.

If a Federal agency determines, based on the Biological Assessment or biological evaluation, that listed species and/or designated critical habitat may be affected by the proposed project, the agency is required to consult with the Service pursuant to 50 CFR 402. In addition, the Service recommends that candidate species, proposed species and proposed critical habitat be addressed within the consultation. More information on the regulations and procedures for section 7 consultation, including the role of permit or license applicants, can be found in the "Endangered Species Consultation Handbook" at:

http://www.fws.gov/endangered/esa-library/pdf/TOC-GLOS.PDF

Please be aware that bald and golden eagles are protected under the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 668 et seq.), and projects affecting these species may require development of an eagle conservation plan (http://www.fws.gov/windenergy/eagle_guidance.html). Additionally, wind energy projects should follow the wind energy guidelines (http://www.fws.gov/windenergy/) for minimizing impacts to migratory birds and bats.

Guidance for minimizing impacts to migratory birds for projects including communications towers (e.g., cellular, digital television, radio, and emergency broadcast) can be found at: http://www.fws.gov/migratorybirds/CurrentBirdIssues/Hazards/towers/towers.htm; http://www.towerkill.com; and http://www.fws.gov/migratorybirds/CurrentBirdIssues/Hazards/towers/comtow.html.

We appreciate your concern for threatened and endangered species. The Service encourages Federal agencies to include conservation of threatened and endangered species into their project planning to further the purposes of the Act. Please include the Consultation Tracking Number in the header of this letter with any request for consultation or correspondence about your project that you submit to our office.

Attachment
Official Species List

Provided by:

Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office
2177 SALK AVENUE - SUITE 250
CARLSBAD, CA 92008
(760) 431-9440
http://www.fws.gov/carlsbad/

Consultation Code: 08ECAR00-2015-SLI-0699
Event Code: 08ECAR00-2017-E-00485

Project Type: TRANSPORTATION

Project Name: SR-55 Improvement Project
Project Description: California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), in cooperation with the Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA), proposes to widen State Route (SR) 55 in both directions from Just north of the Interstate 405 (I-405)/SR-55 interchange to just south of Interstate 5 (I-5)/SR-55 interchange in the Cities of Irvine, Santa Ana, and Tustin Orange County California.

Please Note: The FWS office may have modified the Project Name and/or Project Description, so it may be different from what was submitted in your previous request. If the Consultation Code matches, the FWS considers this to be the same project. Contact the office in the 'Provided by' section of your previous Official Species list if you have any questions or concerns.
Project Location Map:

![Map showing the project location.](image)

**Project Coordinates:** The coordinates are too numerous to display here.

**Project Counties:** Orange, CA
Endangered Species Act Species List

There are a total of 13 threatened or endangered species on your species list. Species on this list should be considered in an effects analysis for your project and could include species that exist in another geographic area. For example, certain fish may appear on the species list because a project could affect downstream species. Critical habitats listed under the Has Critical Habitat column may or may not lie within your project area. See the Critical habitats within your project area section further below for critical habitat that lies within your project. Please contact the designated FWS office if you have questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birds</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Has Critical Habitat</th>
<th>Condition(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California Least tern (<em>Sterna antillarum browni</em>)</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population: Wherever found</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal California gnatcatcher</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td>Final designated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(<em>Polioptila californica californica</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population: Wherever found</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least Bell’s vireo (<em>Vireo bellii pusillus</em>)</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>Final designated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population: Wherever found</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light-Footed Clapper rail (<em>Rallus longirostris levipes</em>)</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population: Wherever found</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwestern Willow flycatcher</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>Final designated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(<em>Empidonax traillii extimus</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population: Wherever found</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>western snowy plover (<em>Charadrius nivosus ssp. nivosus</em>)</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td>Final designated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population: Pacific Coast population DPS-U.S.A. (CA, OR, WA), Mexico (within 50 miles of Pacific coast)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Crustaceans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Diego fairy shrimp (<em>Branchinecta sandiegonensis</em>)</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>Final designated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population: Wherever found</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Flowering Plants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Big-Leaved crownbeard (<em>Verbesina dissita</em>)</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population: Wherever found</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laguna Beach liveforever (<em>Dudleya stolonifera</em>)</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population: Wherever found</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Marsh bird's-beak (<em>Cordylanthus maritimus ssp. maritimus</em>)</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population: Wherever found</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego button-celery (<em>Eryngium aristulatum var. parishii</em>)</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population: Wherever found</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura Marsh Milk-vetch (<em>Astragalus pycnostachyus var. lanosissimus</em>)</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>Final designated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population: Wherever found</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Mammals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Pocket mouse (<em>Perognathus longimembris pacificus</em>)</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population: Wherever found</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Critical habitats that lie within your project area

There are no critical habitats within your project area.
In Reply Refer To:
Consultation Code: 08ECAR00-2015-SLI-0699
Event Code: 08ECAR00-2017-E-02128
Project Name: SR-55 Improvement Project

Subject: Updated list of threatened and endangered species that may occur in your proposed project location, and/or may be affected by your proposed project

To Whom It May Concern:

The enclosed species list identifies threatened, endangered, and proposed species, designated critical habitat, and candidate species that may occur within the boundary of your proposed project and/or may be affected by your proposed project. The species list fulfills the requirements of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) under section 7(c) of the Endangered Species Act (Act) of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

New information based on updated surveys, changes in the abundance and distribution of species, changed habitat conditions, or other factors could change this list. Please feel free to contact us if you need more current information or assistance regarding the potential impacts to federally proposed, listed, and candidate species and federally designated and proposed critical habitat. Please note that under 50 CFR 402.12(e) of the regulations implementing section 7 of the Act, the accuracy of this species list should be verified after 90 days. This verification can be completed formally or informally as desired. The Service recommends that verification be completed by visiting the ECOS-IPaC website at regular intervals during project planning and implementation for updates to species lists and information. An updated list may be requested through the ECOS-IPaC system by completing the same process used to receive the enclosed list.

The purpose of the Act is to provide a means whereby threatened and endangered species and the ecosystems upon which they depend may be conserved. Under sections 7(a)(1) and 7(a)(2) of the Act and its implementing regulations (50 CFR 402 et seq.), Federal agencies are required to utilize their authorities to carry out programs for the conservation of threatened and endangered species and to determine whether projects may affect threatened and endangered species and/or designated critical habitat.

A Biological Assessment is required for construction projects (or other undertakings having similar physical impacts) that are major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the
human environment as defined in the National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 4332(2) (c)). For projects other than major construction activities, the Service suggests that a biological evaluation similar to a Biological Assessment be prepared to determine whether the project may affect listed or proposed species and/or designated or proposed critical habitat. Recommended contents of a Biological Assessment are described at 50 CFR 402.12.

If a Federal agency determines, based on the Biological Assessment or biological evaluation, that listed species and/or designated critical habitat may be affected by the proposed project, the agency is required to consult with the Service pursuant to 50 CFR 402. In addition, the Service recommends that candidate species, proposed species and proposed critical habitat be addressed within the consultation. More information on the regulations and procedures for section 7 consultation, including the role of permit or license applicants, can be found in the "Endangered Species Consultation Handbook" at:

http://www.fws.gov/endangered/esa-library/pdf/TOC-GLOS.PDF

Please be aware that bald and golden eagles are protected under the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 668 et seq.), and projects affecting these species may require development of an eagle conservation plan (http://www.fws.gov/windenergy/eagle_guidance.html). Additionally, wind energy projects should follow the wind energy guidelines (http://www.fws.gov/windenergy/) for minimizing impacts to migratory birds and bats.

Guidance for minimizing impacts to migratory birds for projects including communications towers (e.g., cellular, digital television, radio, and emergency broadcast) can be found at:
http://www.fws.gov/migratorybirds/CurrentBirdIssues/Hazards/towers/towers.htm;
http://www.towerkill.com; and

We appreciate your concern for threatened and endangered species. The Service encourages Federal agencies to include conservation of threatened and endangered species into their project planning to further the purposes of the Act. Please include the Consultation Tracking Number in the header of this letter with any request for consultation or correspondence about your project that you submit to our office.

Attachment(s):

- Official Species List
Official Species List

This list is provided pursuant to Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, and fulfills the requirement for Federal agencies to "request of the Secretary of the Interior information whether any species which is listed or proposed to be listed may be present in the area of a proposed action".

This species list is provided by:

Carlsbad Fish And Wildlife Office
2177 Salk Avenue - Suite 250
Carlsbad, CA 92008-7385
(760) 431-9440
Project Summary

Consultation Code: 08ECAR00-2015-SLI-0699

Event Code: 08ECAR00-2017-E-02128

Project Name: SR-55 Improvement Project

Project Type: TRANSPORTATION

Project Description: California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), in cooperation with the Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA), proposes to widen State Route (SR) 55 in both directions from Just north of the Interstate 405 (I-405)/SR-55 interchange to just south of Interstate 5 (I-5)/SR-55 interchange in the Cities of Irvine, Santa Ana, and Tustin Orange County California.

Project Location:
Approximate location of the project can be viewed in Google Maps:
https://www.google.com/maps/place/33.71251021197207N117.84782074411405W

Counties: Orange, CA
**Endangered Species Act Species**

There is a total of 13 threatened, endangered, or candidate species on your species list. Species on this list should be considered in an effects analysis for your project and could include species that exist in another geographic area. For example, certain fish may appear on the species list because a project could affect downstream species. See the "Critical habitats" section below for those critical habitats that lie wholly or partially within your project area. Please contact the designated FWS office if you have questions.

**Mammals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Pocket Mouse (<em>Perognathus longimembris pacificus</em>)</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No critical habitat has been designated for this species.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species profile: <a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/8080">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/8080</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Birds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California Least Tern (<em>Sterna antillarum browni</em>)</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal California Gnatcatcher (<em>Polioptila californica californica</em>)</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least Bell's Vireo (<em>Vireo bellii pusillus</em>)</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light-footed Clapper Rail (<em>Rallus longirostris levipes</em>)</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwestern Willow Flycatcher (<em>Empidonax traillii extimus</em>)</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Snowy Plover (<em>Charadrius alexandrinus nivosus</em>)</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### California Least Tern
- No critical habitat has been designated for this species.
- Species profile: [https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/8104](https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/8104)

### Coastal California Gnatcatcher
- There is a final critical habitat designated for this species. Your location is outside the designated critical habitat.
- Species profile: [https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/8178](https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/8178)

### Least Bell's Vireo
- There is a final critical habitat designated for this species. Your location is outside the designated critical habitat.
- Species profile: [https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/5945](https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/5945)

### Light-footed Clapper Rail
- No critical habitat has been designated for this species.
- Species profile: [https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/6035](https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/6035)

### Southwestern Willow Flycatcher
- There is a final critical habitat designated for this species. Your location is outside the designated critical habitat.
- Species profile: [https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/6749](https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/6749)

### Western Snowy Plover
- Population: Pacific Coast population DPS-U.S.A. (CA, OR, WA), Mexico (within 50 miles of Pacific coast)
- There is a final critical habitat designated for this species. Your location is outside the designated critical habitat.
- Species profile: [https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/8035](https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/8035)

## Crustaceans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Fairy Shrimp (<em>Branchinecta sandieggonensis</em>)</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### San Diego Fairy Shrimp
- There is a final critical habitat designated for this species. Your location is outside the designated critical habitat.
- Species profile: [https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/6945](https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/6945)
Flowering Plants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Big-leaved Crownbeard (<em>Verbesina dissita</em>)</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laguna Beach Liveforever (<em>Dudleya stolonifera</em>)</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Marsh Bird's-beak (<em>Cordylanthus maritimus ssp. maritimus</em>)</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Button-celery (<em>Eryngium aristulatum var. parishii</em>)</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura Marsh Milk-vetch (<em>Astragalus pycnostachyus var. lanosissimus</em>)</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Species profiles:
- Big-leaved Crownbeard: [https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/8049](https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/8049)
- Laguna Beach Liveforever: [https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/7919](https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/7919)
- Salt Marsh Bird's-beak: [https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/6447](https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/6447)
- San Diego Button-celery: [https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/5937](https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/5937)
- Ventura Marsh Milk-vetch: [https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/1160](https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/1160)

Critical habitats

There are no critical habitats within your project area.
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National Marine Fisheries Service Species List
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SR-55 Widening (I405 to I-5) 0J340 NMFS
Species list obtained on 06/14/17

Quad Name  **Tustin**  
Quad Number  **33117-F7**

**ESA Anadromous Fish**

- SONCC Coho ESU (T)
- CCC Coho ESU (E)
- CC Chinook Salmon ESU (T)
- CVSR Chinook Salmon ESU (T)
- SRWR Chinook Salmon ESU (E)
- NC Steelhead DPS (T)
- CCC Steelhead DPS (T)
- SCCC Steelhead DPS (T)
- SC Steelhead DPS (E)
- CCV Steelhead DPS (T)
- Eulachon (T)
- sDPS Green Sturgeon (T)

**ESA Anadromous Fish Critical Habitat**

- SONCC Coho Critical Habitat
- CCC Coho Critical Habitat
- CC Chinook Salmon Critical Habitat
- CVSR Chinook Salmon Critical Habitat
- SRWR Chinook Salmon Critical Habitat
- NC Steelhead Critical Habitat
- CCC Steelhead Critical Habitat
- SCCC Steelhead Critical Habitat
- SC Steelhead Critical Habitat
- CCV Steelhead Critical Habitat
- Eulachon Critical Habitat
- sDPS Green Sturgeon Critical Habitat
**ESA Marine Invertebrates**

Range Black Abalone (E) -
Range White Abalone (E) -

**ESA Marine Invertebrates Critical Habitat**

Black Abalone Critical Habitat -

**ESA Sea Turtles**

East Pacific Green Sea Turtle (T) -
Olive Ridley Sea Turtle (T/E) -
Leatherback Sea Turtle (E) -
North Pacific Loggerhead Sea Turtle (E) -

**ESA Whales**

Blue Whale (E) -
Fin Whale (E) -
Humpback Whale (E) -
Southern Resident Killer Whale (E) -
North Pacific Right Whale (E) -
Sei Whale (E) -
Sperm Whale (E) -

**ESA Pinnipeds**

Guadalupe Fur Seal (T) -

**Essential Fish Habitat**

Coho EFH -
Chinook Salmon EFH -
Groundfish EFH -
Coastal Pelagics EFH -
Highly Migratory Species EFH -

**MMPA Species (See list at left)**
ESA and MMPA Cetaceans/Pinnipeds
See list at left and consult Monica DeAngelis
monica.deangelis@noaa.gov
562-980-3232

MMPA Cetaceans -
MMPA Pinnipeds -

According to NMFS West Coast Region, Any item on the list that has an X next to it indicates that species may be present within the quad. Therefore all technical studies are discuss only the species that has X
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United States Army Corps of Engineers Letter on Determination of Corps Jurisdiction
This page intentionally left blank
August 20, 2004

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
LOS ANGELES DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS
P.O. BOX 632711
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90063-2325

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF:
Office of the Chief
Regulatory Branch

David Blondolillo
City of Santa Ana
Public Works Agency M-93
P.O. Box 1988
Santa Ana, California 92702

Dear Mr. Blondolillo:

Reference is made to your letter request (No. 200401677-SJIH) dated July 14, 2004 for a Department of the Army determination of Corps jurisdiction over the Orange County Flood Control Channel (OCFCC), also-known-as “Lane Channel”, which is tributary to San Diego Creek, in the city of Santa Ana, Orange County, California.

Based on the Corps Los Angeles District regulatory staff’s working knowledge of the OCFCC as well as information furnished in your letter, we have determined that your proposed project does discharge dredged or fill material into a water of the United States (U.S.) or an adjacent wetland. Therefore, the project is subject to our jurisdiction under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and a Section 404 permit is required from our office. In addition, since the project has the potential to impact 2.36 acres of waters of the U.S., an “Individual Permit” would be required. Individual Permits are required for projects whose impacts to waters of the U.S. are in excess of 0.50 acre.

If you have any questions, please contact Stephanie J. Hall of my staff at (213) 452-3410.

Sincerely,

Mark Durham
Chief, South Coast Section
Regulatory Branch
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