

O.6.8 Public Hearing Transcripts Comments

This page intentionally left blank

STATE ROUTE 91
 IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

PUBLIC HEARING ON
 DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

502 SOUTH VICENTIA AVENUE
 CORONA

THURSDAY, JUNE 9, 2011

1 CORONA, CALIFORNIA, THURSDAY, JUNE 9, 2011
 2 3:30 - 7:30 P.M.
 3 -000-
 4
 5
 6 PUBLIC COMMENTS
 7
 8
 9 PUBLIC SPEAKER: Sally, S-a-l-l-y, Cota,
 10 C-o-t-a. 777 Highland View Drive, Corona, 92882.
 11 I'd like to -- first of all, I'm very adamantly
 12 opposing the sound barrier block wall to be built at my
 13 property only. I am in favor of a sound barrier wall
 14 that would be made of Plexiglass content or something
 15 that will not hinder the view that we have from our view
 16 home. It would be very detrimental to our family and my
 17 relatives that come and visit us as they enjoy panoramic
 18 view that we have of the mountains, the city lights. We
 19 enjoy the trains that are down below. And we are just
 20 very upset with the blockage of our home. I just would
 21 like to make a comment that I feel that it's not fair
 22 that we would not be able to get the wall built if one or
 23 two of our neighbors is opposed to it.
 24
 25 PUBLIC SPEAKER: Victor Quintana,

T1-1

T1-1-1

T1-2 T1-2-1



1 Q-u-i-n-t-a-n-a. 307 South Smith Avenue, Space 76,
2 92882.

3 I have several concerns. One of them, I'm
4 already up against the freeway right now with a barrier
5 wall that is maybe 20 feet away from my home, so how many
6 much closer can they get, you know. Plus, we don't own
7 the land that the mobile home is on. We lease it. So I
8 mean, I want to know if it's going to depend on what the
9 owners of the mobile home lot decide, whether we're going
10 to lose our home, what is going to happen? Do they
11 purchase our home? Do they take away our yard, because I
12 have a large corner lot.

13 Another concern is having the freeway right
14 there and all that work going on if they're not taking
15 our land. They say they might just take part of the yard
16 and this project is supposed to go on for four years,
17 noise. I'd like to know once the project is approved,
18 whichever plan they go with, how much time do we have if,
19 say, we were to be asked to leave? Since we don't own
20 the land, how do they appraise our house saying they are
21 going to have to move us or buy it or remove the mobile
22 home or replace it to another park even. I don't know.

T1-2-1
T1-2-2
T1-2-3
T1-3

24 PUBLIC SPEAKER: Mala, M-a-l-a, Shah, S-h-a-h.
25 401 South Lincoln Avenue, Suite K, 92882.

T1-3-1

1 According to two different plan on page 34 and
2 No. 111, Section No. 18270038, improvement project for
3 Lincoln Avenue, taking parking lot away on 401 South
4 Lincoln Avenue, Suite K, between Freeway 91 to South
5 Lincoln Avenue.

6 By taking parking lot away, there will be no
7 parking for customers on 401 South Lincoln Avenue, Suite
8 K. That will cause very financial hardship on our
9 business. There is no parking in back of our business
10 either. So basically it will make us out of business.
11 In this bad economy and high rent, all of our business is
12 not doing well. To all of that, taking away parking lot
13 and construction, our business will hurt more. So please
14 try to design lane adding that our parking lot will not
15 go away. So please consider all these aspects while
16 you're design adding lane on Lincoln Avenue by our
17 property, 401 South Lincoln Avenue, Suite K. We would
18 really appreciate. Thank you.

19 While I was looking at the map at City Hall, I
20 like Alternate 2A, 2C, 2E, and 2G, but I don't like
21 Alternate 2B, 2D, 2F, and 2H.

22 Thank you,
23 Lincoln Smoke Shop
24 Joy Massage
25 Cash & Check

T1-3-1

T1-3-2

1 Signarama
2 Donut Shop
3 The Nail Shop
4 The Doctor/Chiropractor Office
5 Yoshinoya
6 Mexican Restaurant
7 Hair Place
8 Insurance Place
9 The Clinic.
10 All these businesses will be affected by taking
11 over the parking lot.
12
13 PUBLIC SPEAKER: Richard Everhart,
14 E-v-e-r-h-a-r-t. 372 Atwood Drive, Corona, 92879.
15 It's concerning sound walls along the 15 west
16 side between Hidden Valley and the 91 freeway. That
17 these sound walls were supposed to have been in place in
18 1994. Were not built. They were also supposed to be
19 installed when they built the Yuma overpass on- and
20 off-ramp at Yuma. Was not built.
21 At that time Caltrans said they had ran out of
22 money. About six months later, they transferred \$500,000
23 from that project to the Magnolia project. The latest
24 plan they have does not include sound walls for this
25 neighborhood. There's been 121 residents who signed the

T1-3-2

T1-4

T1-4-1

1 petition who have talked to Caltrans, ROTC, the City of
2 Corona, the City of Norco. As of today, the neighborhood
3 next to this one is getting a sound wall and we are not.
4 A sound wall should extend from Hidden Valley along the
5 west side of the 15 to the 91 freeway.
6
7 PUBLIC SPEAKER: Jim Lane, L-a-n-e. 1424 Opal,
8 O-p-a-l, Street, Corona, 92882.
9 From its inception, I've been against this
10 project. I feel this project was designed and thought of
11 at a time when the economy was good. And now that the
12 economy is downturned or major recession, depression-type
13 thing, major projects like this should be put off or
14 completely cancelled. This project does not address the
15 actual problem with the freeway. The problem is the
16 freeway is congestion. There is too many cars not moving
17 them faster is not the solution but getting rid of the
18 cars. A better alternative should be looked at and
19 exercised further, such as increased rail service,
20 mandatory car pooling, or really emphasizing car pooling
21 to a stronger education, or even going to the point of
22 having various counties such as Orange, L.A., and
23 Riverside actively try to bring businesses where people
24 commute a lot back to their county to avoid that. I
25 believe the cost is too much at \$65 million per mile.

T1-5

T1-4-1

T1-5-1

T1-5-2

T1-5-3

1 It's only going to create temporary construction jobs and
2 will not create any long-term jobs, no matter how many
3 lanes they add or how much money they spend or how much
4 they charge for their tolls. Congestion is still going
5 to be around. I feel that the toll roads are basically
6 looked at by public entity as a major source of income in
7 a down economy to replace their shorten funds from tax
8 revenues. These freeways were bought, paid for for many
9 decades by the taxes of the people of the State of
10 California, and that they should not be privatized and
11 profiteered by any entities strictly as a way to create
12 revenues for their agencies to use on other projects.
13 Freeways in California were created to be free and they
14 should stay free.

T1-
5-4

T1-6

15
16 PUBLIC SPEAKER: Greg, G-r-e-g, Tesdahl,
17 T-e-s-d-a-h-l. 2920 Via Millano, Unit 202, 92879. Nancy
18 Radillo, R-a-d-i-l-l-o, for John Rojo. 2910 Via Millano,
19 No. 201, Corona, 92879.

20 Greg: I was not even sent this voting -- I
21 don't know what you call this. I wasn't sent the letter
22 that we can actually vote yes or no on the sound barrier.
23 I just received the notice that this hearing was going
24 on. So I wasn't even able to vote on this. My
25 neighbors, I was told, some got them, some did not, and

T1-
6-1

1 what it looks like on this pamphlet, the letter to vote
2 on the wall, yes or no, it's not accurate as to what
3 we're being told here today. So some people have voted
4 yes in our community that Nancy knows that they voted
5 yes, but they were voting off what was stated in the
6 letter and not what we're being shown today. So it seems
7 that people were being misled, and we need to some
8 someone from the city or freeway project to come out and
9 actually talk to our association directly.

T1-
6-1

10 Nancy: I was sent this letter to vote and we
11 voted yes because -- thinking that the wall was going to
12 be way down at the gutter area, but now they are saying
13 that it's going to be three to six feet away from our
14 home and so that's -- that's telling us false information
15 because now it's one thing on paper that they certified,
16 sent it to us certified letter, and then so now they're
17 showing something different that it's going to be really
18 basically close to our home. So some of my friends voted
19 yes thinking that it was going to be down at the bottom,
20 but now it's going to be three to six feet closer, and
21 now I'm going to have to tell them that it's not really
22 going to be that because that's false information. And
23 some of my friends didn't get this letter, because my
24 neighbor, he didn't get a letter saying that he needed to
25 vote yes or no for the wall. And all he got was, you

T1-
6-2

1 know, that there was a public hearing. So I think we're
2 all being misled.

3 Greg: Yeah. And we're going to have an
4 emergency meeting with our homeowners association
5 regarding this, and like I stated, this needs -- we need
6 a representative from the freeway project to come out and
7 speak with us to our units, to our homeowners association
8 specifically, because communication isn't clear to us.
9 At this point people are signing things that aren't
10 accurate to this hearing.

T1-
6-2

11 Nancy: And board members did have this form
12 saying it was going to be way down to the gutter so they
13 were urging people to vote yes to it, and find out today
14 it's not going to be way down here. It's going to be
15 next to our home. We do have to address the board with
16 this.

T1-7

18 PUBLIC SPEAKER: Gloria Salgado, S-a-l-g-a-d-o.
19 676 Green Gate, Corona, 92879.

20 My property is located where they're going to
21 have the freeway north Victoria Avenue. They're going to
22 have a supposed wall, but I'm concerned because I have
23 two rental properties there and they're the only two that
24 are going to stay on that side of the street. I'm going
25 to have difficulty finding renters that are going to be

T1-
7-1

1 so isolated and become more of a depressed neighborhood.

2 There isn't going to be anyone there. We have a
3 Metrolink across the street and the buses and it's all
4 commercial. And then they have that parking lot also
5 where everybody park. And they don't find room there,
6 they park on the street where we live and you're cutting
7 off even more. And they throw all their litter. They're
8 not very clean when it comes to it's not their property
9 and anything. So you always have this. And I'm just
10 concerned that they're going to take away my livelihood.
11 I'm not going to be able to rent them out, and it's going
12 to cause an economic pressure on our part. That's it.

T1-
7-1

T1-8

14 PUBLIC SPEAKER: Jesus and Esperanza Reyes, 203
15 South Belle, Corona, 92882.

16 To whom it may concern: No, I'm not in favor of
17 a sound barrier near my property. I'm extremely stressed
18 out about the way my home will be affected with this
19 change. I have had several incidents where cars have
20 driven into my fence and parked vehicles. With this new
21 change, the risk of danger to my children is increasing.
22 Once the street is aligned, it will lead cars right into
23 my home. What I want is for the Riverside County of
24 Transportation to purchase my home; after that, you may
25 plan to your best interest. Thank you for your

T1-
8-1

T1-
8-2

T1-
8-3

1 understanding and cooperation.

T1-9

T1-8-3

2
3 PUBLIC SPEAKER: Angela Scherer, S-c-h-e-r-e-r,
4 2920 Via Millano, Unit 201, Corona, 92879.

5 First of all, the certified mail notifications
6 have been mailed to the address to the previous owner.
7 She hasn't been there for at least three years because
8 I've owned the property for three years. So I haven't
9 received anything until I got the postcard in the mail
10 and then I put two and two together she was getting
11 certified mail from the State Route 91 project and I
12 probably should look into this. So I want to make sure
13 that I receive all notifications in the future.

14 The second thing is that there seems to be
15 confusion. Some of my neighbors were here, and when I
16 looked online and I spoke to a couple of people -- I
17 spoke to Cheryl Donahue at Right of Way and Eliza
18 Echevarria regarding -- she was the first person I
19 contacted. This Aaron Burton doesn't answer the phone.
20 He refers it -- his phone refers it to somebody else. So
21 that is kind of misleading that you can contact this
22 person. They said that we are not in the right-of-way
23 but probably the notification was for a sound barrier.
24 And then I looked online, and from what I could tell, it
25 looked like it just came to the bottom of the property.

T1-9-1

1 Now, the sound guy is telling me that now the

2 sound wall is being proposed to be built right on the
3 slope and it would actually be six feet from our unit.
4 So it's confusing. Some of the neighbors have received
5 notifications. Others haven't. And we're -- nobody can
6 tell us exactly what's happening at this point. So we
7 would like somebody to come and speak to the homeowners
8 association about that. My neighbor in the unit next to
9 me, she came to a meeting a year and a half ago and her
10 understanding was that they were going to purchase that
11 strip of condos right there. Now she said it's changed
12 where it's going to be a sound wall. The sound guy says
13 no, it wasn't that way. I don't know what is going on.
14 But before I vote on anything, I want to know what's
15 really happening.

T1-9-1

Sally Cota (T1-1)

T1-1-1

The noise barrier at this location would not have to be constructed as a solid block wall. Refer to Section O.5.3.2, Common Response Related to Noise Barriers, provided on page O-10 in Section O.5, Common Responses, for discussion regarding alternative materials for sound barriers, a summary of the noise barrier survey process, and a description of the noise barrier meetings. It should be noted that 100 percent of the private property owners must agree to have a noise barrier located on their private properties in order for the wall to be constructed.

Victor Quintana (T1-2)

T1-2-1

The existing sound wall will be replaced with a longer and higher sound barrier under Alternatives 1 and 2. The new sound barrier would start west of the mobile home park and continue east to Main Street. The replacement wall is proposed to be 14 ft high. This replacement barrier, P-1, is shown on Figure 3.15-1, Sheets 7 through 9, starting on page 3.15-69 in Section 3.15, Noise, in the EIR/EIS.

T1-2-2

This property will not be a full or partial permanent acquisition under Alternatives 1 and 2. However, TCEs will be needed at this property during construction of Alternatives 1 and 2. After construction in this area is complete, the part of the property used for a TCE will be restored to its original condition and returned to the owner.

Refer to Section O.5.1, Common Response Related to the Property Acquisition Process, provided on page O-6 in Section O.5, Common Responses, for a discussion of the RCTC property acquisition process, including TCEs.

The RCTC will negotiate with the property owner regarding the purchase of any land as well as the mobile home owner for the purchase of the actual mobile home, if that is required for the project. Tenants of rental properties, including mobile homes, may be eligible for relocation benefits. If the property is purchased before it is needed, the tenant may be able to remain on the property (under lease from RCTC) until it is required for construction.

T1-2-3

Section 3.15.3.3, Temporary Impacts, on page 3.15-15 in the EIR/EIS discusses the potential for construction-related noise impacts on the same receivers that could experience freeway noise. That section also indicates that the design/build contractor will be required to comply with local and Department noise control requirements. Those requirements are described in Measures N-2 and N-3 starting on page 3.15-60 in Section 3.15.4.2, Measures for Construction Noise, in the EIR/EIS and will be included in the contract specifications.

Refer also to Section O.5.1, Common Response Related to the Property Acquisition Process, provided on page O-6 in Section O.5, Common Responses, and to Appendix D, Summary of Relocation Benefits, in the EIR/EIS for further explanation of the property acquisition process. Acquisition of property by public agencies must follow strict requirements and must provide for minimum notification periods and appropriate appeals processes.

Mala Shah (T1-3)

T1-3-1

The property cited in this comment, at 401 South Lincoln Avenue, is a shopping center with several businesses. This property would be a full acquisition, and those businesses would be removed under Alternatives 1 and 2. Business owners at this property will be eligible for relocation assistance.

Refer to Section O.5.1, Common Response Related to the Property Acquisition Process on page O-6, and Section O.5.2, Common Response Related to the Loss of Parking and Other Potential Impacts to Businesses, on page O-7 in Section O.5, Common Responses, for discussion regarding property acquisition, including acquisition of parking spaces.

T1-3-2

These comments do not raise an environmental issue within the context of CEQA and/or NEPA, or comment on the adequacy of the technical analyses in the EIR/EIS. Consistent with the requirements of CEQA and NEPA, comments that raised environmental issues under CEQA and NEPA are responded to in this report. In addition, all comments received on the Draft EIR/EIS are included in this report and will be made available to the public and decision-makers prior to any action on the proposed project.

Alternative 2f has been identified as the Preferred Alternative, as described briefly in detail in Section O.5.9, Common Response Related to the Identification of the Preferred Alternative, on page O-38, and in cross references to the sections in Chapter 2 where that process and the results of the evaluation are discussed in detail. Alternative 2f was identified as the Preferred Alternative compared to Alternative 1 and the No Build Alternative because it meets the defined purpose for the project, it provides the best travel times savings, it does not result in substantially different impacts than Alternative 1, and it is consistent with adopted regional transportation plans. Design variation f was identified as the preferred design variation for Alternative 2 because the City of Corona indicated a strong preference for design variation f at the Auto Center Drive/Maple Street, Smith Avenue/Mid-City Access, and Lincoln Avenue interchanges based on the effects of the design variations for those interchanges in the City.

Refer also to Section O.5.1, Common Response Related to the Property Acquisition Process on page O-6, Section O.5.2, Common Response Related to the Loss of Parking and Other Potential Impacts to Businesses on page O-7, and Section O.5.9, Common Response Related to the Identification of the Preferred Alternative, on page O-38 in Section O.5, Common Responses.

Richard Everhart (T1-4)

T1-4-1

This commenter provided the cited petition as part of his written comments. Refer to comment letter C-15-1 starting on page O-562. As discussed in the response to that comment, NB K1-A was modeled along the edge of shoulder I-15 to protect the homes along Newhall Drive from noise impacts associated with traffic on I-15. NB K1-A was found to be feasible and within the reasonable cost allowance as discussed in Section 3.15.3.2, Permanent Impacts, starting on page 3.15-18 in the EIR/EIS. Based on a commitment to build NB K1-A as a part of previous Department projects along I-15, RCTC conducted a noise barrier survey for property owners that may be affected by the construction of NB K1-A. Based on the results of the survey, NB K1-A was approved and will be carried through to construction.

Refer to Section O.5.3, Common Responses Related to Noise, on page O-8 in Section O.5, Common Responses, for additional discussion regarding the process for identifying the need for sound walls and the minimum lifecycle requirement for that type of improvement. Refer also to Section O.5.6, Common Response Related to Noise Barriers on I-15, on page O-29 for additional discussion regarding the 20-year

lifecycle and RCTC's commitment to provide this wall if other planned improvements on I-15 are not constructed within 5 years of completion of the construction of the SR-91 CIP.

Jim Lane (T1-5)

T1-5-1

Refer to responses to comments T1-5-2 to T1-5-4, below.

T1-5-2

As described in Chapter 2, Project Alternatives, starting on page 2-1 in the EIR/EIS, the SR-91 CIP is one component of a wide range of transportation and transit improvements proposed to meet the demand for east-west travel in this region. One of the purposes of the project is to reduce congestion and associated impacts as described in Section 1.2, Purpose of the Project, on page 1-11 in the EIR/EIS. While the SR-91 CIP addresses some components of the demand and mobility needs in this corridor, other transit improvements that are separate and apart from the SR-91 CIP have also been or will also be implemented by the appropriate agency to address, in part, demand in the SR-91 corridor including:

- **Express Bus Service:** To provide connections to employment centers in Anaheim, Costa Mesa, Fullerton, and Irvine. Service on the Galleria at Tyler to South Coast Metro line was implemented in 2006. Four additional Express Bus routes are planned for implementation in 2016. These routes would originate in the Riverside and Temecula areas with destinations to employment centers in Anaheim and Orange in Orange County.
- **North Main Street Corona MetroLink Parking Structure Improvements:** Completed in June 2009, the MetroLink parking structure provides MetroLink riders a convenient place to park, which should help to increase MetroLink ridership, thereby diverting trips from SR-91.
- **MetroLink Short-Term Expansion Plan:** Currently a total of 23 trains per day operate on the IEOC and 91 Lines. The number of trains will increase to a total of 31 daily trains by 2016.
- **MetroLink Long-Term Expansion Plan:** Will increase the total trains on the IEOC and 91 Lines to a total of 40 trains per day by 2020.

Because these are separate transit projects, they are beyond the scope of the EIR/EIS for the SR-91 CIP. In addition, in the future, as demand increases, carpool lanes will be less desirable because they can become just as congested as the general-purpose

lanes and, as a result, would not offer any travel time savings for users. These transit projects are included in the cumulative impacts analysis in Section 3.25, Cumulative Impacts, starting on page 3.25-1 in the EIR/EIS.

The relocation of businesses to move jobs to different areas is not within the purview of RCTC or the Department, and is not consistent with the defined project purpose for the SR-91 CIP and the need for improvements on SR-91.

T1-5-3

No response is necessary because this comment does not raise an environmental issue within the context of CEQA and/or NEPA, or comment on the adequacy of the technical or environmental analyses in the EIR/EIS.

T1-5-4

Riverside County approved sales tax revenues will be used for part of the project construction costs. The inclusion of toll facilities in the project provides an additional funding source as well as providing users a more schedule-reliable option when necessary. Qualified HOVs with three or more persons would be allowed to use the facility. Revenues generated from the tolled express lanes will be used to retire bonds used to fund the construction of the tolled express lanes and long-term maintenance costs for those lanes. The revenues generated by the tolled express lanes are not intended to be used as a source of funds for other public agency operating or capital expenditures.

Greg Tesdahl and Nancy Radillo for John Rojo (T1-6)

T1-6-1

Refer to response to comment C-39-1, on page O-616, which discusses the noise barrier meeting held for NB D1-B in August 2011. Comments in C-39-1 and T1-6-1 are similar and were provided by the same commenter (Mr. Tesdahl). Refer also to Section O.5.3.3, Common Response Related to Noise Barrier Survey Process, on page O-13 in Section O.5, Common Responses, for discussion regarding the noise survey process and the August 2011 meetings. Noise barrier surveys were only sent to property owners adjacent to the freeway. An additional community meeting, described in Section O.5.3.3, was held on November 12, 2011, to discuss the noise barrier options at this location. Based on the results of the meeting, NB D1-B was approved and it will be carried through to construction. Aesthetic treatments and/or refinements to the design of the noise barrier will be determined during final design.

T1-6-2

Refer to response to comment T1-6-1, above.

Gloria Salgado (T1-7)

T1-7-1

The cited properties will not be acquired under Alternatives 1 and 2. The value of the property, including rental income, will not be directly impacted by the project.

Litter removal on State highways is the responsibility of the Department. Litter removal on other public streets and rights-of-way is the responsibility of the City of Corona.

Jesus & Esperanza Reyes (T1-8)

T1-8-1

It is acknowledged that this commenter is opposed to a sound wall in the vicinity of this property. Refer also to Section O.5.3, Common Responses Related to Noise, on page O-8 and Section O.5.1, Common Response Related to the Property Acquisition Process, on page O-6 in Section O.5, Common Responses, for discussion regarding the noise barrier survey process and the property acquisition process for the project.

Issues related to safety and the realignment of Second Street have been addressed through consultation with the City of Corona. The City of Corona has approved the preliminary design of the realignment of Second Street. The design for the realigned Second Street will meet the City's standards for the street width, sidewalk widths, street light locations, fire hydrant spacing, handicapped access ramps, and other street and safety features.

This commenter also provided written comments on a comment card at the public hearing. Refer to comment C-29-1, on page O-591 in this appendix, for the responses to those comments.

T1-8-2

Refer to response to comment T1-8-1, above.

T1-8-3

Refer to response to comment T1-8-1, above.

Angela Scherer (T1-9)

T1-9-1

Refer to comments C-38-1 and C-38-2, on page O-615, which are similar to the verbal comments provided by this commenter (Ms. Scherer). Those comments are regarding the noise barrier survey process. Refer also to Section O.5.3.2, Common Response Related to Noise Barriers, on page O-10 in Section O.5, Common Responses, for a summary of the noise barrier survey process.

1
2
3
4 RIVERSIDE COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
5
6 SR-91 CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENT PROJECT
7
8
9
10
11 Public Scoping Meeting
12
13
14 Thursday, June 9, 2011
15 Corona, California
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 CORONA, CALIFORNIA, THURSDAY, JUNE 9, 2011
2 -0-
3 T2-1
4 MR. RIVERA: Martin and Vicki Rivera. Martin,
5 M-a-r-t-i-n, Vicki, Rivera, R-i-v-e-r-a. We're at 641
6 Colonel Drive, Corona, 92882. There's a few issues that
7 we have. First of all, where our property is located
8 right now we tend to get all the rain from the
9 neighborhood in our property and next door neighbors. So
10 we have a tendency to flood out when it's really bad. T2-1-1
11 So right now we're thinking if they put the new
12 wall closer to our property and the freeway, that will
13 block the drainage more and it will flood out our house
14 more and we're going to be constantly flooded out because
15 that's where the drainage is going right now. So we're
16 wondering what they're going to do with that. If they
17 remove that and stop the drainage we will flood out.
18 Every year we do flood out. We have to sand bag
19 everything.
20 We need to now -- we wanted to know how far the
21 new wall is from our property because we have a wall
22 there, but we wanted to know how close the wall is going T2-1-2
23 to be and how far -- how close the freeway is going to be
24 from our property because we're like -- our wall is
25 facing the freeway right now. And then we have some T2-1-3

1 health issues. We have an eight year old granddaughter
2 that's with us and she has heart issues. She's had three
3 heart surgeries already and our concern is about -- our
4 main concern is the quality of the air -- environmental
5 air quality and we're concerned it's going to be a heart
6 issue for her health. If we have to move or do
7 something. So we need to know about that. That's our
8 main concern mainly. That's it. T2-2

9 MS. RAMIREZ: Cheryl Ramirez. 101 North
10 Vicentia Avenue. So the addition or construction of
11 Valero Place from Buena Vista to the Grand Boulevard
12 would eliminate driveways along our property. The second
13 one is acquisition of a portion of our property will
14 eliminate one of two required driveways by the Corona
15 Fire Department because they can't get in -- the traffic
16 on one of the other driveways. It's too steep.

17 The existing water and gas lines are located
18 there in the area that is to be required by Caltrans. So
19 I don't know how they're going to do that. It's worrying
20 me. We can't get our RV out of that other driveway. So
21 we need another one. I don't know how they're going to
22 put another one with the electrical pole that's there and
23 storm drain that's there. I know they know what they're
24 doing, but I'm stressed over it. It looks pretty on the
25 maps, but it's not for me.

T2-1-3

T2-2-1

T2-2-2

T2-2-3

1 MS. URRUTIA: My name is Brenda Urrutia, T2-3
2 U-r-r-u-t-i-a. 401 South Lincoln. And then our property
3 is our parking -- like they want to take the whole
4 parking lot and right now we don't even have parking.
5 Like we have customers that complain because there's no
6 parking. So once they take that out, you know, where are
7 the customers going to park. And then if they park on
8 the other side or opposite side, they're not going to
9 want to come to the business because it's going to be a
10 waste of time for them. If they go somewhere else where
11 there's parking, they're going to go there. T2-4

12 MS. NGUYEN: T-r-u-y-e-n, N-g-u-y-e-n. 401
13 South Lincoln, Corona, California 92882. The business is
14 Gala Nails. My comment is I heard the parking lot will
15 be took away in front of my business and my business is
16 facing the street. So we have a lot of customer and we
17 do business with that. So when the parking lot took
18 away, we lost business. Number two, construction
19 about -- I don't know how many years, but with the
20 construction that we might be really, really bad. We
21 cannot make any income about that. So that is what we
22 worry about. What are we going to do and with damage
23 like that. So do we get anything to repay or help us to
24 get out of that. So this is my comment. We still in
25 lease so we have to stick with the business. So what are

T2-3-1

T2-4-1

T2-4-2

1 we going to do during the construction. So my business
2 will be affected with that with no income coming and we
3 don't know how to deal with that. If someone can help us
4 to survive with the construction like that. So we want
5 to know someone will help us about that.

T2-4-2

6 MS. TANTEH: First name is Canthauy, T2-5
7 C-a-n-t-h-a-u-y, T-a-n-t-e-h. 401 South Lincoln Avenue.
8 Same question as the parking lot front and back for the
9 business. If no parking, there's no business because
10 rent very high. That's why.

T2-5-1

T2-6

11 MS. HARAKA: Judy Haraka, H-a-r-a-k-a. My
12 address is 1721 Merrywood Lane. That's
13 M-e-r-r-y-w-o-o-d, one word, and the zip is 92882. My
14 comment is I can't understand why they can't fix it to be
15 like when you go to San Diego. When -- before you get to
16 San Diego, they open up a couple more lanes to get to San
17 Diego when there's a lot of traffic and then they
18 close -- you know, they add lanes so -- and then when
19 there's less traffic, you know, they reverse it.

T2-6-1

20 And coming home -- when people are coming home
21 from work, they open more -- two lanes when there's more
22 crowd and shut the other two lanes down. What I can't
23 understand is why don't they do it that way instead of
24 thinking about a toll lane right away. People have to
25 pay for it and they're getting to work. Another thing is

1 when they have all these connectors like the I-15, 215,
2 or whatever is right here and you're coming from Elsinore
3 to get on the 91, you're coming from Riverside, you're on
4 the 91, you're coming from Hesperia to get on the 91,
5 you're going like this. It's all connected together.

T2-6-1

6 You're trying to watch the traffic that's coming
7 from every direction to get on the 91 and they got these
8 stupid gigantic billboards. They're all bright at night
9 and you're trying to watch the traffic. Why do they put
10 them all there where all the congestion is? I don't
11 know. Whoever designed that in the first place, the
12 connector that connects onto the freeway in the first
13 place, they did not plan for the future at that time.

T2-6-2

14 They probably get money to design this because
15 it's just one congested mess right there to get onto the
16 91 from the 15 here from all directions and then it goes
17 to Elsinore. You're coming off the freeway and trying to
18 get on the 91 and it's all a bottleneck there. So,
19 hopefully, they plan better for the future and don't make
20 a mess.

T2-7

21 MR. BOWKER: It's Don Bowker, B-o-w-k-e-r.
22 3201 Cutting Horse Road in Norco, California 92860. So
23 in discussing with them about the toll road option they
24 said just like in Orange -- the Orange County section at
25 the peak period you could be paying another \$10 to go to

T2-7-1

1 the Riverside area and I'm not in favor of doubling my
2 tolls at the cost of this project. That's ridiculous.
3 We pay enough every day. We can't afford another five
4 bucks to go another five miles or whatever.

T2-7-1

T2-8

5 MR. CHAUDHRI: Yatish Chaudhri, Y-a-t-i-s-h,
6 C-h-a-u-d-h-r-i. My address is 8367 E. Chadwick Pkwy.,
7 Orange, 92867. I'm affected like -- I'm the community.
8 I'm the local resident. I'm the local business but what
9 happens we hear these 1.3 billion, 20 billion going to
10 big businesses, big contractors. These are public money
11 going to big federal government back the corporation that
12 they are supposed to subcontract to small businesses and
13 local communities, but it never happens.

14 It goes back to the big corporations and they're
15 affiliated with small firms, which they control and own
16 whether it's through SPA or anything. I've seen that
17 many, many, many times. So what is the guarantee this
18 time this money -- public money is being put in there it
19 goes back to the small businesses, local business, and
20 real small businesses not like AT&T and Boeing and IBM.
21 These big corporations buy small companies, majority
22 stakes, and they're the ones that subcontract, but it
23 goes to small businesses. But they are like -- AT&T, IBM
24 is qualified as small business. So it's just a wash.

T2-8-1

25 California unemployment is 25 percent. I have

1 three degrees and I'm unemployed. I'm educated, have a
2 law degree, real estate license, accounting degree, and
3 I'm not counted as unemployed because I was never on
4 unemployment roll. So this is a fake system of reporting
5 unemployment data. Local community, local businesses in
6 California is hurting. Unemployment rate 12.3 percent,
7 you can just double it easily. All the realtors are kind
8 of unemployed in this housing market. They don't count.

9 All the small businesses who don't have
10 corporation don't own corporation, they don't have W-2
11 form from the corporation, they're self-employed, if they
12 lose the job or business, they don't count in
13 unemployment because they had W-2. They never paid
14 unemployment insurance, they don't count. I don't count.
15 I was never counted, but I'm affected with this economy,
16 this government policy, public money. Billions come and
17 go. It goes to the just 5 percent to 20 percent of top
18 big corporations who control federal government, state
19 government, local government and all the things. My name
20 is public. I am the public. I am 80 percent. We need
21 to answer. If the jobs are not going to be here, we
22 don't need these billion dollars of tax payers money.
23 Thank you.

T2-8-1

T2-9

24 MR. TESDAHL: Greg, G-r-e-g, T-e-s-d-a-h-l. My
25 address is 2920 Via Milani, Unit 202, Corona, 92879. My

T2-9-1

1 main issue is the sound. As is my -- I own my condo and
2 I'm on the freeway. I would be west -- I guess just west
3 of Pierce. So the expansion is going to fully creep the
4 freeway closer to my unit. As is, the sound is terrible.
5 Like I said, I'm afraid that it's going to get worse. I
6 talked to the gentleman about the sound and he said
7 they're proposing to put a sound wall just a couple feet
8 away from my unit, which would now block light, and I
9 just think it would be an eye sore. So I'm just -- and I
10 actually think it's going to bring my property value down
11 as well. So I'm just greatly concerned with the whole
12 project. T2-10
13 MR. WEBB: Charlie, C-h-a-r-l-i-e, Webb,
14 W-e-b-b. Address is 2000 West Frontage Road, Corona,
15 92882. My property will be affected by the new freeway
16 and it would be affected in two ways. First of all, my
17 property is shown as being full acquisition, but I don't
18 want to do that. I just want a partial acquisition
19 because there would be enough property for me to work and
20 we've been there for 17 years. We intend to pass our
21 business over to our family. So it's very important for
22 us to stay where we are. I also just noticed today that
23 they show a sound wall in front of my property. I spoke
24 to the gentleman here and he showed me a form -- a sound
25 wall form and I did not receive one. They told me to be

T2-9-1

T2-10-1

T2-10-2

1 sure to make that statement official. We would be
2 damaged by a sound wall or a total acquisition, either
3 one. That's the two things that we don't want. T2-10-2
4
5 (End of comment period.)
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Martin & Vicki Rivera (T2-1)

T2-1-1

Refer to the response to comment C-31-1, on page O-597 for discussion regarding the noted drainage issues and the sound wall location. Comment C-31 was provided by the same commenters (the Riveras) and raised the same issues as in comment T2-1-1.

T2-1-2

The project will result in the freeway and noise barrier moving closer to the cited property. Proposed noise barrier NB K-1 will be approximately 20 ft from the east end of the cited property and 64 ft from the west end of the cited property.

T2-1-3

The air quality analysis in Section 3.14, Air Quality, starting on page 3.14-1 in the EIR/EIS determined that implementation of SCAQMD Rule 403 and other control measures will minimize construction emissions, resulting in less than significant localized construction impacts. This analysis is also discussed in Section 4.2.2.2, Air Quality. In addition, it was determined that the project would reduce criteria air pollutant and MSAT emissions locally and regionally, as discussed in the subsection titled "MSAT Analysis Results" on page 3.14-35 in Section 3.14.3.2, Permanent Impacts, in the EIR/EIS. Therefore, the project would not result in any air toxic impacts.

Cheryl Ramirez (T2-2)

T2-2-1

Refer to the responses to comments C-28-1 through C-28-3, on page O-589 for discussion regarding property access and other issues. Comment card C-28 was provided by the same commenter (Ms. Ramirez) and raised the same issues as comments T2-2-1 through T2-2-3.

Refer also to Section O.5.1, Common Response Related to the Property Acquisition Process, on page O-6 in Section O.5, Common Responses, for a discussion regarding the RCTC property acquisition process for the project.

T2-2-2

Existing utilities that cannot be preserved in their present locations will be relocated within existing or new local road rights-of-way. Refer also to response to comment T2-2-1, above.

T2-2-3

Refer to response to comment T2-2-1, above.

Brenda Urrutia (T2-3)

T2-3-1

The property cited in this comment, at 401 South Lincoln Avenue, is a shopping center with several businesses. This property would be a full acquisition, and those businesses would be removed under Alternatives 1 and 2. Business owners at this property will be eligible for relocation assistance.

Refer to Section O.5.1, Common Response Related to the Property Acquisition Process, on page O-6, and Section O.5.2, Common Response Related to the Loss of Parking and Other Potential Impacts to Businesses, on page O-7 in Section O.5, Common Responses, for discussion of the property acquisition process, including the acquisition of parking spaces.

Truyen Nguyen – Gala Nails (T2-4)

T2-4-1

The property cited in this comment, at 401 South Lincoln Avenue, is a shopping center with several businesses. This property would be a full acquisition, and those businesses would be removed under Alternatives 1 and 2. Business owners at this property will be eligible for relocation assistance.

Refer to Section O.5.1, Common Response Related to the Property Acquisition Process, on page O-6, and Section O.5.2, Common Response Related to the Loss of Parking and Other Potential Impacts to Businesses, on page O-7 in Section O.5, Common Responses, for a discussion of the RCTC property acquisition process.

T2-4-2

It is planned that Lincoln Street will remain open throughout the project construction, except for minor periods of less than 24 hours when traffic may be switched from one side of the street to another. Freeway ramps are also planned to be open during construction except for some closures affecting each ramp for not more than two weekends. The actual timing of any closures will be determined during construction and will involve coordination among the contractor, the Department, and the Construction Liaison, who will work with business owners to minimize inconveniences. Refer also to response to comment T2-4-1, above.

Canthauy Tanteh (T2-5)

T2-5-1

The property cited in this comment, at 401 South Lincoln Avenue, is a shopping center with several businesses. This property would be a full acquisition, and those businesses would be removed under Alternatives 1 and 2. Business owners at this property will be eligible for relocation assistance.

Refer to Section O.5.1, Common Response Related to the Property Acquisition Process, on page O-6 and Section O.5.2, Common Response Related to the Loss of Parking and Other Potential Impacts to Businesses, on page O-7 in Section O.5, Common Responses, for discussion of the property acquisition process, including the acquisition of parking spaces.

Judy Haraka (T2-6)

T2-6-1

Refer to Table 2.39 on page 2-143 in the EIR/EIS for a discussion of reversible managed lanes and why that type of alternative would not effectively meet the travel demand needs on SR-91, which does not have a sufficiently large directional split in demand for reversible lanes to be effective.

T2-6-2

The project as proposed will not impact the existing outdoor advertising/billboard in the area cited in this comment and, therefore, will not result in changes in the current situation. The EIR/EIS identifies, analyzes, and mitigates the impacts of the proposed project but not the existing environmental or safety issues outside the right-of-way for the existing and proposed SR-91 facilities. The cited billboards are outside the right-of-way for the proposed project and, therefore, are outside the scope of the project improvements and the EIR/EIS. If this commenter believes there are safety concerns related to the existing billboards, the commenter should contact District 8 of the Department's Traffic Operations Branch and/or the local jurisdiction in which the billboards are located. Refer also to Section O.5.8, Common Response Related to Billboard Relocation, on page O-35 for additional discussion regarding project effects on and relocation of billboards, including the identification of billboards that would be relocated by the project and those that would not be relocated by the project.

Don Bowker (T2-7)

T2-7-1

On June 7, 2012, the RCTC formally adopted the "RCTC 91 Express Lanes Toll Policy." That policy is the same as the policy for the existing 91 Express Lanes. The

toll policy for the existing 91 Express Lanes and the future SR-91 CIP Express Lanes is based on the concept of congestion management pricing. The policy is designed to optimize traffic flow in the express lanes at free-flow speeds. To accomplish this, tolls are adjusted when traffic volumes consistently reach a trigger point where traffic flow can become unstable. These are known as “super peak” hours. Given the capacity constraints during these hours, pricing is used to manage demand. Once an hourly toll is adjusted, it is frozen for 6 months. Other (non-super peak) toll prices are adjusted annually by inflation. The toll policy also allows vehicles with three or more persons to travel the 91 Express Lanes for free during most hours, except when eastbound Monday through Friday between the hours of 4:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. At those times, carpools of three or more can still save money by earning a 50 percent discount on the posted toll.

Yatish Chaudhri (T2-8)

T2-8-1

This comment does not raise an environmental issue within the context of CEQA and/or NEPA, or ask any questions related to the technical analysis in the EIR/EIS. Consistent with the requirements of CEQA and NEPA, comments that raised environmental issues under CEQA and NEPA are responded to in this report. In addition, all comments received on the Draft EIR/EIS are included in this report and will be made available to the public and decision-makers prior to any action on the proposed project.

Greg Tesdahl (T2-9)

T2-9-1

Refer to responses to comments C-39-1 through C-39-3, starting on page O-618, which were submitted by the same commenter (Mr. Tesdahl) and which are the same as comment T2-9-1.

Charlie Webb (T2-10)

T2-10-1

Refer to Section O.5.1, Common Response Related to the Property Acquisition Process, on page O-6 in Section O.5, Common Responses, for discussion of RCTC’s property acquisition process for the project.

T2-10-2

Refer to response to comment C-40-1, on page O-621. Comment C-40-1 was submitted by the same commenter (Mr. Webb) and asks the same questions regarding the noise barrier survey process. As noted in response to comment C-40-1, this

property was not identified as a residence that would benefit from a sound wall and, therefore, this commenter did not receive the noise barrier survey package.

This page intentionally left blank