RIV090903 Response to Comments Memorandum

To:	Southern California Association of Governments Transportation Conformity Working Group
CC:	Frances Segovia, County of Riverside Azan Junaid, County of Riverside Jan Bulinski, County of Riverside
Prepared By:	Keith Lay ICF Senior Air Quality and Climate Change Specialist
Date:	June 20, 2025
Subject:	**Cajalco Road Widening and Safety Enhancement Project – PM Hot-spot Analysis** **FTIP ID# RIV090903**

Introduction

The Riverside County Transportation Department (County), in cooperation with the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), proposes to widen Cajalco Road, or a combination of Cajalco Road and El Sobrante Road, between Temescal Canyon Road to the west and Interstate 215 (I-215) to the east. Caltrans, as assigned by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), is the lead agency under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The County is the lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The proposed project is located in Riverside County, California, and covers a distance of approximately 15.7 miles. In general, Cajalco Road through the project area is a two-lane undivided roadway with one 12-foot lane in each direction and shoulders of varying widths.

The purpose of this memorandum is to address comments that were raised during the April 22, 2025, Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) Transportation Conformity Working Group (TCWG) meeting.

Response to Comments

The following comments on the Cajalco Road Widening and Safety Enhancement Project were received during the May 27, 2025, TCWG meeting.

Comment #1. Using the updated traffic data, model and compare intersection LOS for intersections with obvious differences. (Michael Dorantes, USEPA)

Response #1. A new Traffic Operations Validation Memorandum with supplemental modeled LOS data has been prepared by Iteris (June 2025). This memorandum used 2025 traffic counts and more recently updated travel-demand models to assess whether the 2021 DEIR/EIS results can still be considered reasonable. Table 1 shows the comparison of intersection LOS results from the 2044 with Alternative 1 scenario in the 2021 DEIR/EIS and the current LOS forecast.

Table 1: 2024 Roadway Segment Volumes and LOS (No-Build v. Alternative 1)

Intersection		Control Type	AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour	
			2044 Alt 1 Delay-LOS	2048 Alt 1 Delay-LOS	2044 Alt 1 Delay-LOS	2048 Alt 1 Delay-LOS
1	La Sierra Ave/Cajalco Rd	Signalized	25.0 – C	33.2 – C	95.0 – F	64.2 – E
2	Lake Mathews Dr/Cajalco Rd	Signalized	18.7 – B	41.6 – D	15.3 – B	6.6 – A
3	El Sobrante Rd/Cajalco Rd	Signalized	9.3 – A	16.0 – B	11.1 – B	17.4 – B
4	Harley John Rd/Cajalco Rd	Signalized	158.5 – F	58.7 – E	186.1 – F	35.1 – D
5	Wood Rd/Cajalco Rd	Signalized	23.4 – C	17.7 – B	26.2 – C	14.9 – B
6	Clark St/Cajalco Rd	Signalized	49.3 – D	46.2 – D	128.7 – F	38.9 – D
7	Harvill Ave/Cajalco Rd	Signalized	26.8 – C	54.8 – D	30.8 – C	46.2 – D

Source: Iteris 2025

This analysis shows that the use of more up-to-date traffic data (2025 traffic counts) and traffic forecast modeling (RIVCOM) methods are not forecast to result in new traffic impacts at intersections along Cajalco Road, as compared to the findings in the 2021 DEIR/EIS. Thus, it can be concluded that the traffic operations findings in the 2021 DEIR/EIS would still be valid.

Comment #2. Address/explain clearly different data/results (primary example shared was Intersection #42 Seaton/Cajalco). (Rodney Tavitas, Caltrans)

Response #2. The vehicle delay and LOS values shown in the tables are correct at intersection #42 (Seaton/Cajalco), which is a two-way stop-controlled intersection. However, the metrics presented are different/not consistent in the AM as compared to the PM peak hour. In the AM peak hour, the vehicle delay presented in the report is the stop-controlled delay, which is the highest delay amongst the stop-controlled movements (Seaton Ave is stop-controlled, Cajalco Rd is free-flowing). In the PM peak hour, the results presented are the average delay for the whole intersection. This low number is because all traffic along Cajalco Road is free-flowing, thus has a delay of essentially 0 seconds. The use of these two metrics is the reason behind the large difference in values between the AM and PM peak hour.

Comment #3. Explain reductions in updated projected socioeconomic data (Nesamani Kalandiyur, CARB). Add-on from Michael Dorantes: I'd like to please request that the project sponsors provide a more detailed explanation for the projected employment figures that arose from the past and updated modeling and how they compare to the respective contemporary RTPs, and if differences in trends are noted between the project and the RTP, why they arose, and what impacts they would have on the projected traffic for the project area.

Response #3. In general, it is widely accepted that growth projections within traffic models developed prior to 2010-11 (roughly) were more aggressive than growth projections within recently developed traffic models. This difference in projections is related to economic conditions (housing boom vs recession conditions, for example). In particular, RIVTAM was based on projections developed in 2006 before the recession in 2008. Furthermore, the socio-economic data (SED) from the two models (RivTAM & RIVCOM) shown in the table that Iteris presented at the TCWG meeting represents data from only a focused area around the west end of Cajalco Road (Corona area). Thus, the values in the table are not representative of overall growth within Riverside County nor the SCAG region. Further analysis would need to be done to assess the changes in growth, in the models, for these two larger areas.