APPENDIX A
NOTICE OF PREPARATION
AND
RESPONSE LETTERS
May 24, 2007  

TO: Interested Agencies and Individuals  
FROM: SANDAG Staff  
SUBJECT: Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report for the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)

SANDAG, as lead agency, will prepare an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the above-referenced project. SANDAG needs to know your views, or the views of your agency, as to the scope and content of the environmental information that will be addressed in the EIR. The project description is contained in the attached material.

Public scoping meetings will be held during the Cities/County Advisory Committee meeting scheduled for Thursday, June 7, 2007, at 9:45 a.m. and the Regional Planning Technical Working Group meeting scheduled for Thursday, June 14, 2007, at 1:15 p.m. Both meetings will be held at SANDAG and copies of the agendas can be found one week prior to the meetings on the SANDAG Web site at www.sandag.org.

Public input will be taken at these meetings. In addition, public input can be provided in writing at the meeting or can be sent via email to stu@sandag.org.

Due to the time limits mandated by state law, your response must be sent at the earliest possible date, but no later than 30 days after receipt of this notice.

Please send your response to Shelby Tucker, Associate Regional Planner, at the address shown above. Please include the name of a contact person in your agency, if appropriate.

ST/cd

Attachments:  
1. Project Description  
2. 2030 Highway Network  
3. 2030 Transit Network
Background and Overview

The San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) is currently preparing a Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) for the San Diego Region and an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The RTP addresses all forms, or modes, of transportation including automobiles, transit, bicycles, pedestrians, and intercity railroads. The RTP contains public policies, strategies, projects, and programs aimed at meeting the diverse mobility needs of the growing San Diego region through the year 2030.

In accordance with state and federal guidelines, the RTP is updated approximately every four years. The last comprehensive EIR on the RTP was conducted in 2003 for the 2030 RTP (MOBILITY 2030). A new EIR for the 2007 RTP is necessary to adequately evaluate potentially significant environmental effects of the plan and to indicate the manner in which such significant effects can be avoided or mitigated. This Notice of Preparation (NOP) is intended to alert regulatory and trustee agencies, interested agencies, and individuals of the preparation of the 2007 RTP EIR. Comments regarding the scope of the EIR received during the 30-day NOP review period will be incorporated, as appropriate, in the environmental document.

Similar to MOBILITY 2030, the 2007 RTP will focus on regional mobility as opposed to addressing each mode of transportation individually. It will address four major components of improving mobility:

1. Land use changes;
2. Systems development;
3. Systems management; and
4. Demand management.

Strategies, projects, and programs in each of these areas will be identified. The 2007 RTP also will identify a Reasonably Expected Revenue Scenario, which will include facilities that can reasonably be implemented through 2030. The Reasonably Expected plan will consist of major highways, regional transit services, and selected regional arterials. This transportation network will serve as the core of the 2007 RTP and will be the highest priority for regional transportation funding. The 2007 RTP also will include actions needed to implement the plan as well as regular monitoring of the plan’s improvements. The baseline land use assumption used for the RTP will rely on existing land use plans adopted (or under consideration) by the local jurisdictions in the San Diego region.

Issues Addressed in the EIR

The EIR will analyze the project’s impacts on the physical environment. The EIR will address how the project impacts the following issue areas:
1. Land Use  
2. Social Environment  
3. Visual Resources  
4. Transportation  
5. Air Quality (including Greenhouse Gas Emissions)  
6. Noise  
7. Energy  
8. Geology/Paleontology  
9. Hydrology/Water Resources  
10. Biological Resources  
11. Cultural Resources

**Alternatives Analyzed in the EIR**

SANDAG will evaluate several alternatives in the EIR. Each alternative will be compared to the proposed project for its potential to achieve the goals of the 2007 RTP while reducing potentially adverse regional environmental impacts. In addition to the project, which will assume a transportation network that is developed from the Reasonably Expected Revenue Scenario, the EIR is proposed to evaluate four alternatives as described below.

1. **No Project Alternative** – The No Project Alternative is required by CEQA. For this EIR, the No Project Alternative is defined as a transportation network that includes those projects that have already received funding, are scheduled for funding, and/or have received environmental clearance.

2. **Revenue Constrained Alternative** – The Revenue Constrained Alternative includes a transportation network that relies on guaranteed revenue sources and does not augment funding assumptions based on more aggressive efforts to bring increased funding levels to the region.

3. **Transit Emphasis Alternative** – The Transit Emphasis Alternative will assume a transit network where transit facilities would be improved and constructed with less emphasis on highways.

4. **Transit Emphasis (Urban Core Focus) Alternative** – This alternative is similar to the Transit Emphasis Alternative; however, the focus is on maximizing transit service in the downtown urban core area (within the orange and green line trolley service areas and extending south to National City).

Although these alternatives have been identified, SANDAG is seeking input on the alternatives in the NOP process which could result in modifications to the number of alternatives analyzed in the EIR, or modifications to the alternatives identified above.
June 12, 2007

Shelby Tucker
San Diego Association of governments (SANDAG)
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101

Re: SCH# 20070511145 CEQA Notice of Preparation (NOP) draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for 2007 Regional Transportation Plan: San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG); San Diego County

Dear Shelby Tucker:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above-referenced document. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that any project that causes a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource, that includes archeological resources, is a ‘significant effect’ requiring the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR per CEQA guidelines § 15064.5(b)(c)). 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. To adequately assess the project-related impacts on historical resources, the Commission recommends the following action:

- Contact the appropriate California Historic Resources Information Center (CHRIS). Contact information for the ‘Information Center’ nearest you is available from the State Office of Historic Preservation in Sacramento (816/653-7278). The record search will determine:
  - If a part of the entire (APE) has been previously surveyed for cultural resources,
  - If any known cultural resources have already been recorded in or adjacent to the APE,
  - If the probability is low, moderate, or high that cultural resources are located in the APE,
  - If a survey is required to determine whether previously unrecorded cultural resources are present.
- If an archaeological inventory survey is required, the final stage is the preparation of a professional report detailing the findings and recommendations of the records search and field survey.
- The final report containing site forms, site significance, and mitigation measures should be submitted immediately to the planning department. All information regarding site locations, Native American human remains, and associated funerary objects should be in a separate confidential addendum, and not be made available for public disclosure.
- The final written report should be submitted within 3 months after work has been completed to the appropriate regional archeological Information Center.
- Contact the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) for:
  - A Sacred Lands File (SLF) search of the project area and information on tribal contacts in the project vicinity who may have information on cultural resources in or near the APE. Please provide us site identification as follows: USGS 7.5-minute quadrangle citation with name, township, range and section. This will assist us with the SLF.
  - Also, we recommend that you contact the Native American contacts on the attached list to get their input on the effect of potential project (e.g. APE) impact.
- Lack of surface evidence of archeological resources does not preclude their subsurface existence.
- Lead agencies should include in their mitigation plan provisions for the identification and evaluation of accidentally discovered archeological resources, per California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) §15064.5(f). In areas of identified archeological sensitivity, a certified archeologist and a culturally affiliated Native American, with knowledge in cultural resources, should monitor all ground-disturbing activities.
- Lead agencies should include in their mitigation plan provisions for the disposal of recovered artifacts, in consultation with culturally affiliated Native Americans.
Lead agencies should include provisions for discovery of Native American human remains or unmarked cemeteries in their mitigation plans.

* CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5(d) requires the lead agency to work with the Native Americans identified by this Commission if the initial Study identifies the presence or likely presence of Native American human remains within the APE. CEQA Guidelines provide for agreements with Native American identified by the NAHC, to assure the appropriate and dignified treatment of Native American human remains and any associated grave liens.

Health and Safety Code §7050.5, Public Resources Code §5097.98 and Sec. §15064.5 (d) of the CEQA Guidelines mandate procedures to be followed in the event of an accidental discovery of any human remains in a location other than a dedicated cemetery.

Lead agencies should consider avoidance, as defined in § 15370 of the CEQA Guidelines, when significant cultural resources are discovered during the course of project planning.

Please feel free to contact me at (916) 653-8251 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Dave Singleton
Program Analyst

Cc: State Clearinghouse

Attachment: List of Native American Contacts
Native American Contacts
San Diego County
June 12, 2007

Barona Group of the Capitan Grande
Rhonda Welch-Scalco, Chairperson
1095 Barona Road, Lakeside, CA 92040
sue@barona-nsn.gov
(619) 443-6912
619-443-0681

San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians
Allen E. Lawson, Chairperson
PO Box 365, Valley Center, CA 92082
(760) 749-3200
(760) 749-3876 Fax

Ewiaapaayp Tribal Office
Harlan Pinto, Sr., Chairperson
PO Box 2250, Alpine, CA 91903-2250
wmnicklin@leaningrock.net
(619) 445-6315 - voice
(619) 445-9126 - fax

Santa Ysabel Band of Diegueno Indians
Johnny Hernandez, Spokesman
PO Box 130, Santa Ysabel, CA 92070
brandietaylor@yahoo.com
(760) 765-0845
(760) 765-0320 Fax

La Posta Band of Mission Indians
Gwendolyn Parada, Chairperson
PO Box 1120, Boulevard, CA 91905
(619) 478-2113
619-478-2125

Sycuan Band of the Kumeyaay Nation
Danny Tucker, Chairperson
5459 Sycuan Road, El Cajon, CA 92021
ssilva@sycuan-nsn.gov
619 445-2613
619 445-1927 Fax

Manzanita Band of Kumeyaay Nation
Leroy J. Elliott, Chairperson
PO Box 1302, Boulevard, CA 91905
(619) 766-4930
(619) 766-4957 Fax

Viejas Band of Mission Indians
Bobby L. Barrett, Chairperson
PO Box 908, Alpine, CA 91903
daguilar@viejas-nsn.gov
(619) 445-3810
(619) 445-5337 Fax

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

Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.05 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code and Section 5097.95 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting local Native American with regard to cultural resources for the proposed SCH#2007051145: CEQA Notice of Preparation (NOP); draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for 2007 Regional Transportation Plan; San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG); San Diego County, California.
Native American Contacts
San Diego County
June 12, 2007

Kumeyaay Cultural Historic Committee  
Ron Christman  
56 Viejas Grade Road  
Alpine, CA 92001  
(619) 445-0385

Mesa Grande Band of Mission Indians  
Mark Romero, Chairperson  
P.O Box 270  
Santa Ysabel, CA 92070  
mesagrandeband@msn.com  
(760) 782-3618  
(760) 782-9092 Fax

Diegueno/Kumeyaay

Campo Kumeyaay Nation  
H. Paul Cuero, Jr., Chairperson  
36190 Church Road, Suite 1  
Campo, CA 91906  
chairgoff@aol.com  
(619) 478-9046  
(619) 478-5818 Fax

Pala Band of Mission Indians  
Robert H. Smith, Chairperson  
12198 Pala Mission Road, PMB 50  
Pala, CA 92059  
Luiseno  
(760) 891-3500  
(760) 742-1411 Fax

Kumeyaay

Jumlul Indian Village  
Leon Acebedo, Chairperson  
P.O. Box 612  
Jamul, CA 91935  
jamulrez@sctdv.net  
(619) 669-4785  
(619) 669-48178 - Fax

Pechanga Band of Mission Indians  
Paul Macarro, Cultural Resource Center  
P.O. Box 1477  
Temecula, CA 92593  
Luiseno  
(951) 308-9295 Ext 8106  
(951) 676-2768  
(951) 506-9491 Fax

Diegueno/Kumeyaay

Los Coyotes Band of Mission Indians  
Katherine Saubel, Spokesperson  
P.O. Box 189  
Warner, CA 92086  
loscohotes@earthlink.net  
(760) 782-0711  
(760) 782-2701 - FAX

Rincon Band of Mission Indians  
Angela Veltrano, Rincon Culture Committee  
P.O. Box 68  
Valley Center, CA 92082  
Luiseno  
council@rincontribe.org  
(760) 749-1051  
(760) 749-8901 Fax

Cahuilla

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

Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.34 of the Public Resources Code and Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting local Native American with regard to cultural resources for the proposed SCH#2007051145; CEQA Notice of Preparation (NOP); draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for 2007 Regional Transportation Plan; San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG); San Diego County, California.
Native American Contacts
San Diego County
June 12, 2007

Kwaaymii Laguna Band of Mission Indians
Carmen Lucas
P.O. Box 775
Pine Valley, CA 91962
(619) 709-4207

San Luis Rey Band of Mission Indians
Russell Romo, Chairman
12064 Old Pomerado Road
Poway, CA 92064
(858) 748-1586

Inaja Band of Mission Indians
Rebecca Osuna, Spokesperson
309 S. Maple Street
Escondido, CA 92025
inha_cosmite@hotmail.com
(760) 737-7628
(619) 747-8568 Fax

La Posta Band of Mission Indians
ATTN: James Hill, EPA Director
PO Box 1120
Boulevard, CA 91905
(619) 478-2113
(619) 478-2125 Fax

Kumeyaay Cultural Repatriation Committee
Steve Banegas, Spokesperson
1095 Barona Road
Lakeside, CA 92040
(619) 443-6612
(619) 443-6881 FAX

Pauma & Yuima
ATTN: EPA Coordinator
P.O. Box 369
Pauma Valley, CA 92061
kymberli_peters@yahoo.com
(760) 742-1289
(760) 742-3422 Fax

San Luis Rey Band of Mission Indians
Henry Contreras, Most Likely Descendent
1763 Chapulin Lane
Fallbrook, CA 92028
(760) 728-6722 - Home
(760) 207-3818 - Cell

Barona Group of the Capitan Grande
ATTN: EPA Specialist
1095 Barona Road
Lakeside, CA 92040
sue@barona.org
(619) 443-6612

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

Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.64 of the Public Resources Code and Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting local Native American with regard to cultural resources for the proposed SCH#2007051146; CEQA Notice of Preparation (NOP); draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for 2007 Regional Transportation Plan; San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG); San Diego County, California.
Native American Contacts
San Diego County
June 12, 2007

Rincon Band of Mission Indians
Vernon Wright, Chairperson
P.O. Box 68
Valley Center, CA 92082
luiseno
(760) 749-1051
(760) 749-8901 Fax

eewiapaayp Tribal Office
Will Micklin, Executive Director
PO Box 2250
Alpine, CA 91903-2250
kumeyaay
(619) 445-6315 - voice
(619) 445-9126 - fax

Rincon Band of Mission Indians
Kristie Orosco, Environmental Coordinator
P.O. Box 68
Valley Center, CA 92082
council@rincontribe.org
(760) 749-1051
(760) 749-8901 Fax

eewiapaayp Tribal Office
Michael Garcia, Vice-Chairman/EPA Director
PO Box 2250
Alpine, CA 91903-2250
kumeyaay
michaelg@leaningrock.net
(619) 445-6315 - voice
(619) 445-9126 - fax

Santa Ysabel Band of Diegueno Indians
Devon Reed Lomayesva, Esq, Tribal Attorney
PO Box 701
Santa Ysabel, CA 92070
drlomayesva@verizon.net
(760) 765-0845
(760) 765-0320 Fax

San Luis Rey Band of Mission Indians
Carmen Mojado, Co-Chair
1889 Sunset Drive
Vista, CA 92081
(760) 724-8505

Santa Ysabel Band of Diegueno Indians
Rodney Kephart, Environmental Coordinator
PO Box 130
Santa Ysabel, CA 92070
sylrod@aol.com
(760) 765-0845

San Luis Rey Band of Mission Indians
Mark Mojado, Cultural Resources
1889 Sunset Drive
Vista, CA 92081
(760) 724-8505
(760) 586-4858 (cell)

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

Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of 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 only applicable for contacting local Native American with regard to cultural resources for the proposed SCH#2007051145; CEQA Notice of Preparation (NOP); draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for 2007 Regional Transportation Plan; San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG); San Diego County, California.
Native American Contacts
San Diego County
June 12, 2007

Cupa Cultural Center (Pala Band)
Shasta Gaughen, Assistant Director
35008 Pala-Temecula Rd.FMB Box 445 Luiseno
Pala, CA 92059
cupa@palatrib.com
(760) 742-1590
(760) 742-4543 - FAX

Charles Devers, Chair
Cultural Committee; Pauma & Yuima Reservations
P.O. Box 369 Luiseno
Pauma Valley, CA 92061
(760) 742-1289
(760) 742-4543 FAX

La Jolla Band of Mission Indians
ATTN: Rob Roy, Environmental Director
22000 Highway 76 Luiseno
Pauma Valley, CA 92061
lajolla-sherry@aol.com and
(760) 742-3790
(760) 742-1704 Fax

Clint Linton
P.O. Box 507 Diegueno/Kumeyaay
Santa Ysabel, CA 92070
(760) 803-5694
clinton73@aol.com

Sycuan Band of the Kumeyaay Nation
Sydney Morris, Environmental Coordinator
5459 Sycuan Road Diegueno/Kumeyaay
El Cajon, CA 92021
(619) 445-2613
(619) 445-1927-Fax

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

Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of 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 only applicable for contacting local Native American with regard to cultural resources for the proposed SCH#2007061145; CEQA Notice of Preparation (NOP); draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for 2007 Regional Transportation Plan; San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG); San Diego County, California.
From: diane nygaard [mailto:dandd2@peoplepc.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 14, 2007 11:57 AM
To: Gregor, Carolina; Aguilera, Susanah; Anderson, Bill; Backoff, Jerry; Baldwin, Susan; Barry, Robert; Batchelder, Ed; Bidolli, Brian; Birnbaum, Adam; Blessing, Mike; Brady, Rick; Bragado, Nancy; Bridges, John; Briggs, Bill; Brindle, Jon; Brindley, Karen; Cameron, Jean; Conan Cheung; Chopyk, Bill; Clementson, Coleen; Conley, John; de Cordova, Dave; Dinsmore, Val; Eary, Christine; Friehauf, Dana; Fritz, Niall; Gates, Joshua; Griffin, Jim; Grim, Mike; Grimm, Charlie; Halbert, Gary; Hall, Ryan; Hamilton, Andy; Helmer, John; Higgins, Bill; Hittleman, Jerry; Hix, Mike; Hoffman, Bryan; Holder, Sandy; Holler, Ivan; Janemark, Pete; Jarosz, Beth; Johnson, Linda; Kawada, Kim; Kennedy, Rachel; Kirkman, Amanda; Kirshner, Miriam; Kleeman, Ed; Kluth, Chris; Knight, Gary; Kush, Melanie; Landrum, Pat; Larkins, Robert; Leiter, Bob; Lyon, Kim; Marks, Stephen; McCullough, Bets; McDonald, Brent; McNamara, Keegan; Murphy, Patrick; Niles, Linda; Parker, Vicki; Peterson, Patricia; Post, Roger; Pryor, Gary; Putnam, Robin; Raulston, Brad; Redlitz, Barbara; Rowan, Rosemary; Rundle, Rob; Sandoval, Jim; Sawa, Sandi; Schafer, Ed; Schulte, Lance; Schumacher, Dave; Smith, Kerry; Stephens, Mark; Stowell, Lois; Till, Keith; Tucker, Shelby; Vance, Stephan; Wade, Greg; Weinstein, Kimberly; Werdick, Heather; Whitt, Annette; Wilschetz, Keith; Witt, Dave
Cc: Kim, Sookyung; ann@landconserve.com
Subject: Comments Re Agenda # 9 for June 14th TWG Meeting- Public Scoping on 2007 RTP
Importance: High

Dear Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG) Members –

I am not able to attend the meeting this afternoon but ask that you consider the following comments regarding the public scoping on the 2007 RTP EIR:

- Insufficient public outreach

Who knows about this opportunity to comment except people who are already on two SANDAG committee distribution lists? I received a phone call about this last week - spent an hour on the SANDAG website and could find nothing. Apparently the only place the “public notice” was included was within the agendas of two committee meetings. Please do a reasonable level of public notice- I assure you the public does care about this. If a poor scope moves forward we all lose so please do not shortchange this part of the process.

- insufficient public information

The information included with this agenda bill is much less than is typically included as part of a public information package describing the scope of an EIR and is not sufficient to really make many substantive comments. I urge you to make easily available the entire checklist, explanation of the proposed alternatives and references to the more detailed backup information.

Thank you for considering these comments.

Diane Nygaard
June 18, 2007

Ms. Shelby Tucker
San Diego Association of Governments
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101

Dear Ms. Tucker:

Notice of Preparation (NOP) of a Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) for the San Diego Region; SCH# 2007051145

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), Division of Aeronautics (Division), reviewed the above-referenced document with respect to airport-related noise and safety impacts and regional aviation land use planning issues pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The Division has technical expertise in the areas of airport operations safety and airport land use compatibility. We are a funding agency for airport projects and we have permit authority for public-use and special-use airports and heliports.

According to the NOP, the RTP will address all forms, or modes, of transportation including automobiles, transit, bicycles, pedestrians, and intercity railroads. The RTP contains public policies, strategies, projects, and programs aimed at meeting the diverse mobility needs of the growing San Diego region through the year 2030.

Aviation plays a significant role in California’s transportation system. This role includes the movement of people and goods within and beyond our State’s network of over 250 airports. Aviation contributes nearly 9 percent of both total State employment (1.7 million jobs) and total State output ($110.7 billion) annually. These benefits were identified in a study entitled, “Aviation in California: Benefits to Our Economy and Way of Life,” which is available on-line at http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/planning/aeronaut/. Aviation improves mobility, generates tax revenue, saves lives through emergency response, medical and fire fighting services, annually transports air cargo valued at over $170 billion and generates over $14 billion in tourist dollars, which in turn improves our economy and quality of life.

Aviation should be addressed in RTPs not only because of the above roles, but it is also required under state and federal law. According to Government Code 65080(a), “Each transportation planning agency...shall prepare and adopt a regional transportation plan directed at achieving a coordinated and balanced regional transportation system, including...aviation facilities and services.” Title 23 Part 450, Section 316 of the U.S. Code of Federal Regulations, requires inclusion of access to airports is a factor that “shall be explicitly considered, analyzed as appropriate, and reflected in the planning process products.”

Within San Diego County are numerous airports and heliports. The regional transportation planning process provides the opportunity to discuss the connection between land use and transportation
Ms. Shelby Tucker  
June 18, 2007  
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planning and should address regional aviation issues and needs. Strong and effective local, regional, and state policies minimize adverse impacts arising from the encroachment of incompatible land uses around airports, adverse noise impacts on communities near airports, and congestion and/or delays related to airport ground access. The San Diego Region RTP should recognize aviation as a mode of travel and the County’s public-use airports should be identified on the various maps throughout the RTP.

The protection of airports from incompatible land use encroachment is vital to the safety of airport operations and the well being of the communities around airports. As discussed in the Division’s “Aviation Planning Guidelines for Regional Transportation Plan,” available on-line at http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/planning/aerounit/documents/305rtpguidelines.pdf, the best way to preserve and improve airports and their associated economic and quality-of-life benefits is to take timely proactive measures. Incompatible land uses around airports often result in public pressure to restrict operations (curfews, aircraft size limits, etc.), and impose noise, and growth controls. Failure to protect the airport may result in permanent closure, thereby reducing or eliminating its benefits. For questions concerning these guidelines, please contact the Division’s liaison for San Diego County RTP review, Philip Crimmins at (916) 654-6223.

The California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook (Handbook) is also an excellent resource that should be applied to all public use airports. The Handbook is available on-line at http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/planning/aerounit/htmlfile/landuse.php.

Although the need for compatible and safe land uses near airports in California is both a local and a state issue, it is also a regional issue. Airport staff, airport land use commissions (ALUC) and airport land use compatibility plans are key to protecting an airport and the people residing and working in the vicinity of an airport. Coordinating the RTP with these other agencies should help to relieve future conflicts between airports and their neighbors.

These comments reflect the areas of concern to Division with respect to airport-related noise and safety impacts and regional airport land use planning issues. We advise you to contact our Caltrans District 11 office in San Diego concerning surface transportation issues.

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on this proposal. If you have any questions, please call me at (916) 654-5314.

Sincerely,

SANDY NESNARD  
Aviation Environmental Specialist

c: State Clearinghouse, San Diego County ALUC

"Caltrans improves mobility across California"
June 18, 2007

Mrs. Shelby Tucker
Associate Regional Planner
SANDAG
401 B. Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101-4231

SUBJECT: Southern California Regional Rail Authority (SCRRA) Comments on SANDAG’s Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report for the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)

Dear Mrs. Tucker:

As background information, SCRRA is a five-county Joint Powers Authority (JPA) that operates the regional commuter rail system known as Metrolink on member agency-owned and on private freight railroad rights of way. Additionally, SCRRA provides a range of rail engineering, construction, operations and maintenance services to its five JPA member agencies. The JPA member agencies are the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) – previously referred to as MTA, Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA), San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG), Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC) and Ventura County Transportation Commission (VCTC).

Based on the proximity of the rail line and station to the proposed development, the following recommendations are being conveyed by SCRRA:

- Please take under consideration the connectivity at Oceanside between the 4 rail systems: Metrolink Commuter Rail, Coaster Commuter Rail, Amtrak Intercity service, Escondido to Oceanside Sprinter service, as well as the NCTD bus service

- Capacity at the Oceanside Station may also be an issue to consider.

We request and expect to receive timely notice, in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21092.5 and State CEQA Guideline Section 15088, of the written proposed responses to our comments on this environmental document and the time and place of any scheduled public meetings or public hearings by the agency decision makers at least 10 days prior to such a meeting.

If you have any questions regarding these comments please contact Laurene Lopez, Community Relations Administrator, at (213) 452-0288 or by e-mail at lpezl@scrra.net.
Sincerely,

David Solow, Chief Executive Officer

Cc: Linda Culp, SANDAG
    Patricia Chen, TAC Member (Metro)
    Darrell Johnson, TAC Member (OCTA)
    Sheldon Peterson, TAC Member (RCTC)
    Mike Bair, TAC Member (SANBAG)
    Mary Travis, TAC Member (VCTC)
June 25, 2007

Shelby Tucker
Associate Regional Planner
SANDAG
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101

COMMENTS ON SANDAG’S NOTICE OF PREPARATION OF AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE 2007 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (RTP)

The County of San Diego, Department of Public Works (DPW) has reviewed the Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report for the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) dated May 24, 2007. As a responsible agency under CEQA Section 15381, the County has comments that identify potentially significant environmental issues that may have an effect on the unincorporated lands of San Diego County, and also offers reasonable alternatives and mitigation measures that can be explored.

The following comments are provided by the Department of Public Works (DPW):

1. The EIR should assess the effects of build-out of each jurisdiction’s general plan. Areas in which build-out is not assumed by the year 2030 should be identified.

2. The EIR should specify the percentage of the unincorporated area that is currently at build-out, and the estimated number of housing units that could be accommodated by the year 2030, under the County’s adopted and proposed General Plan for land use.

3. The EIR should specify the percentage of the unincorporated area’s non-residential lands that are projected to be fully developed by the year 2030.

4. The EIR should identify the areas of residential and commercial/industrial uses that are assumed to be vacant and has the potential for development by the year 2030.

5. The land use assumptions used for the traffic modeling analysis for the RTP alternatives should be specified.
6. The County of San Diego is in the process of updating its General Plan. The EIR should explain the land use assumptions that were used for the County area in all RTP alternatives. The 2030 highway network assumptions within the unincorporated area should consider the County’s Board-endorsed General Plan 2020 roadway network.

7. The EIR should identify what land use and transportation network assumptions were used for the sphere of influence areas. The EIR should state whether the 2030 assumptions will be based on the County’s and/or the City’s plans for the sphere of influence areas. SANDAG should consider using a range of densities for the sphere of influence area in which the City’s land use plan is denser than the County’s land use plan.

8. The EIR should clarify if the proposed project assumes a balanced funding allocation approach for highway and transit projects.

9. In addition to the Transit Emphasis alternatives, the EIR should also assess a job/housing balance emphasis alternative. The transit emphasis alternatives only address congestion issues in the highly urbanized areas. A job housing balance throughout the region has the potential to shorten commuter trips in large portions of the region, especially trips from outside the County.

10. The EIR should assess the impact of the proposed RTP alternatives to commute times, vehicle miles traveled (VMT), and Levels of Service (LOS) operations from the unincorporated communities to the employment centers located in the San Diego urban region like downtown San Diego and Kearny Mesa.

11. In addition to commute time, VMT, and LOS operations, the EIR should assess the impacts of the RTP alternatives to traffic safety operations for the major freeways and highways that serve the unincorporated communities such as SR-67 and SR-76.

12. The EIR should discuss/identify the Year 2030 land use and roadway network assumptions for the County’s East Otay Mesa region. The majority of the lands in the East Otay Mesa region are designated for Industrial and Technology Business Park uses which are currently vacant and developable. SANDAG and the County should coordinate to develop the Year 2030 land use and roadway network assumptions for the County’s East Otay Mesa region which will be critical for identifying the future border infrastructure needs.

13. The EIR should assess the future transportation needs of the Otay Mesa region and their importance to regional border economies.

14. The EIR should provide a detailed list of the projects and programs that would need to be implemented under the proposed RTP alternatives. The proposed projects and programs should be listed by the individual jurisdictions.

15. The EIR should highlight the proposed 2030 RTP policies, programs, and projects that are not consistent with the County’s General Plan and/or current County policies.
16. The EIR should identify the land use and trip generation assumptions for the local Indian reservations, especially the reservations with gaming facilities.

17. The EIR should explain the assumptions used for the areas outside the San Diego region such as Orange and Riverside counties and Mexico.

18. The EIR should assess the impacts of the RTP alternatives to the I-15 corridor and surrounding regional arterials in the North County communities due to commuters living in Riverside County and working in the San Diego region.

19. As a program-level document, the EIR should clarify to what extent mitigation measures are needed to address the project’s potential impacts.

The County of San Diego appreciates the opportunity to participate in the environmental review process for this project. We look forward to reviewing and providing any additional assistance you might need with this project. If you have any questions regarding these comments, please contact Nick Ortiz at (858) 874-4203.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL H. ROBINSON, Acting Deputy Director
Department of Public Works

MHR:rc

cc: Vince Nicoletti, CAO Staff Officer, DCAO, MS A-6
    Robert Goralka, County Traffic Engineer, Department of Public Works, MS O334
    Nick Ortiz, Project Manager, Department of Public Works, MS O334
    Jennifer Campos, Land Use Environmental Planner, DPLU, MS 0650
    Priscilla Jaszkowiak, Administrative Secretary, DPLU, MS 0650
June 27, 2007

By Telecopy and E-mail

Shelby Tucker
San Diego Association of Governments
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101

RE: Comments on the Notice of Preparation for Draft Environmental Impact Report For the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan (SCH Number 2007051145)

Dear Ms. Tucker:

The Attorney General submits these comments to the San Diego Association of Governments ("SANDAG") on the Notice of Preparation for the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan ("Transportation Plan"). The Notice indicates that SANDAG will prepare a draft Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") for the Transportation Plan and is seeking comments regarding environmental issues to address in the EIR.

Under the California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code § 21000, et seq. ("CEQA"), SANDAG has an obligation to consider global warming impacts in the draft EIR. The projects authorized in the Transportation Plan will result in significant increases in emissions of greenhouse gases ("GHG") that cause global warming, and any increase in such emissions will make it more difficult for the state to meet the greenhouse gas reduction requirements of Assembly Bill 32. Accordingly, the draft EIR should evaluate the global warming impacts of the projects and priorities adopted in the Transportation Plan and discuss feasible alternatives and mitigation measures to avoid or reduce those impacts.

We commend SANDAG for the efforts it has already undertaken to reduce GHG emissions by adopting the Regional Energy Strategy (2003), which is currently being updated, and the Regional Comprehensive Plan for the San Diego Area (July 2004). We encourage SANDAG to continue those efforts in the proposed Transportation Plan and EIR.

**Global Warming in California**

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change of the United Nations recently published its finding that overwhelming evidence establishes that global warming is occurring and is caused
by human activity.\textsuperscript{2} With respect to impacts in the state, the California Climate Change Center reports that temperatures are expected to rise 4.7 to 10.5°F by the end of the century.\textsuperscript{2} These increases would have serious consequences, including substantial loss of snowpack, an increase of as much as 55% in the risk of large wildfires, reductions in the quality and quantity of agricultural products, exacerbation of California's air quality problems, and adverse impacts on human health from increased heat stress and heat related deaths, and increases in asthma, respiratory and other health problems.\textsuperscript{2} According to NASA's James Hansen, proceeding at the greenhouse gas emissions rate of the past decade will result in "disastrous effects, including increasingly rapid sea level rise, increased frequency of droughts and floods, and increased stress on wildlife and plants due to rapidly shifting climate zones."\textsuperscript{2} And, the experts tell us, we have less than a decade to take decisive action.\textsuperscript{2} If we continue our business-as-usual emissions trajectory, dangerous climate change will become unavoidable.

In 2002, 493 million metric tons of carbon dioxide-equivalent greenhouse gases were emitted in California.\textsuperscript{2} Of those emissions, 82% were emissions of carbon dioxide from fossil fuel combustion.\textsuperscript{2} Fossil fuel consumption in the transportation sector was the single largest source of California's GHG emissions in 2002. According to a California Energy Commission report, transportation accounted for 41.2% of GHG emissions in the state.\textsuperscript{2}

---


2. Amy Lynd Luers, Daniel R. Cayan et. al, Our Changing Climate: Assessing the Risks to California (July 2006) at p. 2. The report was prepared by the Climate Change Center at the direction of CalEPA pursuant to its authority under Executive Order S-3-5.

3. Id. at pp. 2, 10; Executive Order S-3-05.


5. Id. For further discussion of dangerous climate change, see IPCC 4\textsuperscript{th}, WG III, Ch. 1 at pp. 6-7 http://www.mnp.nl/ipcc/pages_media/FAR4docs/chapters/CH1_Introduction.pdf


8. Id. at pp. 6-7.
California's Actions to Address Global Warming

On June 1, 2005, Governor Schwarzenegger issued Executive Order S-3-05, which recognized California's vulnerability to global warming and the need for implementation of mitigation measures to limit the impacts to the state. To counteract the warming trend, the Governor set GHG emission reduction targets for California: by 2010, reduce GHG emissions to 2000 levels; by 2020, reduce emissions to 1990 levels; by 2050, reduce emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels.

Assembly Bill 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, codified at Health and Safety Code Section 38500, et seq. ("AB 32"), was signed into law by the Governor on September 27, 2006. The bill demonstrates that the Legislature recognizes the serious threats that global warming poses to California. To combat these threats, AB 32 requires reduction of the state’s GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. This emissions cap is equal to a 25% reduction from current levels. The bill directs that by June 30, 2007, the California Air Resources Board ("CARB") shall publish a list of discrete early action GHG emission reduction measures that will be implemented by 2010. CARB must then adopt comprehensive regulations that will go into effect in 2012 to require the actions necessary to achieve the GHG emissions cap by 2020. The legislation also encourages entities to voluntarily reduce GHG emissions prior to 2012 by offering credits for early voluntary reductions.

California Environmental Quality Act

CEQA and its implementing regulations require that an EIR address the cumulative environmental impacts of a project when its incremental effect is cumulatively considerable. “‘Cumulatively considerable’ means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.” Global warming is a

quintessentially cumulative impact, caused by the added effects of countless individual projects at the local, regional, state, national and international level.

As the Court of Appeal concluded in *Kings County Farm Bureau v. City of Hanford* (1990) 221 Cal.App.3d 692, 720 [internal quotation omitted]:

"[o]ne of the most important environmental lessons evident from past experience is that environmental damage often occurs incrementally from a variety of small sources. These sources appear insignificant, assuming threatening dimensions only when considered in light of the other sources with which they interact. Perhaps the best example is air pollution, where thousands of relatively small sources of pollution cause a serious environmental health problem. CEQA has responded to this problem of incremental environmental degradation by requiring analysis of cumulative impacts."

As part of the analysis carried out in an EIR, the agency must identify mitigation measures and examine alternatives to the proposed project that would reduce its cumulative environmental impact. 16 CEQA mandates that agencies should not approve projects with significant environmental effects if there are feasible alternatives or mitigation measures that can substantially lessen or avoid those effects. 17 CEQA requires that “[e]ach public agency shall mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment of projects that it carries out or approves whenever it is feasible to do so.” 18

**The Transportation Plan**

The Transportation Plan will include policies and goals to guide transportation decisions and will include a list of transportation projects intended to meet travel demand through the year 2030. Transportation projects must be contained in, or consistent with, the Transportation Plan to qualify for federal or state funding. It is estimated that SANDAG’s Transportation Plan will authorize $40 billion worth of transportation projects.

The Transportation Plan is required to provide for consideration of projects and strategies that will, among other things: “protect and enhance the environment”; “promote energy conservation”; and “improve the quality of life. ....” (23 U.S.C.A. § 134(h)). The Transportation Plan also “shall include a discussion of types of potential environmental mitigation activities and potential areas to carry out these activities, including activities that may have the greatest potential to restore and maintain the environmental functions affected by the plan.” (23 U.S.C.A.


§ 134(i)(2)(B)(i)). Based on these provisions and the facts about causes and impacts of global warming discussed above, the Transportation Plan should include projects to reduce global warming impacts on the environment, and also discuss mitigation activities to avoid or reduce global warming impacts of the projects and priorities identified in the Transportation Plan.

The Draft EIR Should Consider Global Warming Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Alternatives

The Governor's Executive Order and AB 32 inform agencies' obligations under CEQA. The existence of global warming is indisputable; it is causing significant environmental impacts in California and will cause future catastrophic impacts if emissions levels are not substantially reduced; and many incrementally small but cumulatively significant sources of emissions are being approved and permitted every day. The global warming impact of $40 billion worth of transportation projects that will be authorized in the SANDAG's Transportation Plan must be considered significant, even just based on the GHG emissions from the huge magnitude of construction (from use of off-road construction vehicles and building materials such as asphalt and concrete). In addition, the road improvement and construction projects authorized in the Transportation Plan will result in a significant increase in the capacity of roads in the area to accommodate vehicle travel, and this additional vehicle travel will result in a large increase in GHG emissions. The draft EIR should use the best available data and modeling tools to estimate the GHG emissions of the projects included in the Transportation Plan.\(^{19}\)

Although the comprehensive regulations implementing AB 32 will not be in place until 2012, the projects included in the Transportation Plan will contribute cumulatively to the GHG load. Once permitted, these projects will continue to have environmental implications far beyond 2012. Accordingly, SANDAG has a current obligation under CEQA to analyze potential global warming impacts and evaluate alternatives and mitigation measures that would avoid or reduce any unavoidable adverse global warming impacts from the actions included in the Transportation Plan. These measures will help California meet its statutory requirements for GHG reductions.

We are pleased to see the “Energy White Paper For the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan”, posted on SANDAG's website, that indicates that SANDAG intends to address “GHG emission impacts” and “reductions from various travel choices and from smart growth efforts” in the EIR for the Transportation Plan. The White Paper also recommends that the EIR “identify an action plan and possible funding sources to further address climate change effects of transportation activities.” We encourage SANDAG to include such an action plan as part of its obligation under CEQA to evaluate, and where feasible adopt, mitigation measures and alternatives to reduce GHG emissions. SANDAG should also evaluate measures that can be implemented to mitigate for the GHG emissions that cannot be avoided, such as contributing funds for an urban

\(^{19}\). A chart of available modeling tools prepared by the California Air Resources Board is attached.
The Climate Action Team Report to Governor Schwarzenegger and the Legislature (CalEPA March 2006) has identified strategies for reducing transportation-related GHG emissions. The Report recommends two broad strategies relevant to regional transportation planning that could achieve significant GHG emission reductions -- Measures to Improve Transportation Energy Efficiency and Smart Land Use and Intelligent Transportation. (Report at p.57.) Measures to Improve Transportation Energy Efficiency includes: “Incorporating energy efficiency and climate change emissions reduction measures into the policy framework governing land use and transportation, including framework for developing energy element in state transportation and regional planning documents.” (Id. at p.58.) Smart land use strategies generally “encourage jobs/housing proximity, promote transit oriented development, and encourage high-density residential/commercial development along transit corridors.” (Ibid.) Intelligent Transportation Systems is “the application of advanced technology systems and management strategies to improve operational efficiency of transportation systems and movement of people, goods and services.” (Ibid.) These strategies for reducing GHG emissions should be addressed in the draft EIR and, where appropriate, included in the Transportation Plan.

The “Climate Action Program at Caltrans” also includes many of the same strategies. It also identifies the need to “[m]ainstream energy efficiency and GHG emissions reductions measures into land use and transportation decisions.”

There undoubtedly are numerous specific alternatives and mitigation measures to reduce GHG emissions that SANDAG could identify and evaluate in the draft EIR and include in the Transportation Plan. It is beyond the scope of this letter to attempt to identify fully the relevant mitigation measures and alternatives, but they may include the following: infrastructure for the “California Hydrogen Highway Network” such as private vehicle and fleet hydrogen refueling stations; construction of electric vehicle charging facilities; electrification at truck stops; measures to reduce idling time; transit vouchers; parking fees; education regarding trip linking; projects to facilitate and increase use of carpooling, vanpooling, and ridesharing; measures to increase use of public transit; increased public transit routes and times of operation; other transportation demand management measures; a requirement that off-road diesel-powered vehicles and equipment (unless it is new) use retrofit emission control devices, such as diesel

---


22. Id., p. 6, Table 1.
oxidation catalysts and diesel particulate filters; a requirement to use the most energy-efficient building materials and lighting technology, including alternative formulations of cement and asphalt that have substantially lower GHG emissions, if they are available; planting trees to mitigate GHG emissions; increased funding for purchase of alternative fuel buses; safe streets to school projects; bike path construction/improvement and bike storage facilities; and adoption of funding priorities that target spending toward population and employment centers and withhold infrastructure funding from greenfield development at the urban edge. A more comprehensive list of transportation emission reduction strategies identified by the Federal Highway Administration is attached to this letter. SANDAG’s draft EIR should evaluate these strategies as potential measures to reduce transportation-related GHG emissions.

Global warming presents California with one of its greatest challenges. SANDAG has the opportunity to continue addressing global warming in a constructive manner while educating the public and decision-makers. We urge SANDAG to meet the challenge with this Transportation Plan and environmental impact report.

Thank you for considering these comments.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

SANDRA GOLDBERG
Deputy Attorney General

For EDMUND G. BROWN JR.
Attorney General

23. See, www.arb.ca.gov/diesel/verdev/verdev.htm and www.epa.gov/ispd/pdf/emission_0307.pdf This requirement was applied to construction at LAX and O’Hare International Airports. See, www.oharemodernization.org (Sustainable Design Manual, §8.5) and www.laxmasterplan.org/cb_CBA_Exhibits.cfm. (Section X. F.) These devices also reduce public exposure to a known carcinogen and toxic air contaminant, diesel particulate exhaust. See “Digging Up Trouble: Health Risks of Construction Pollution in California” (Union of Concerned Scientists, November 2006).


### Climate Action

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(CARROT) (EMFAC) (PLACE)</th>
<th>On-line Tool</th>
<th>Registry Reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emissions Factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO2 and Methane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power plants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate and Weather</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public domain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Download</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sustainable Communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool</th>
<th>Model (SCM)</th>
<th>(CACP) Software</th>
<th>Climate Protection</th>
<th>Clean Air and Climate Mitigation Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data Output</td>
<td>Requirements</td>
<td>Data Input</td>
<td>Trans/Building Scope</td>
<td>Local/Regional Scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMT (tons per year)</td>
<td>CO2 (tons per year)</td>
<td>Energy Use</td>
<td>Transportation Use</td>
<td>Transportation Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTR = Vehicle miles traveled</td>
<td>CO2 = Carbon dioxide emissions</td>
<td>PM = Particulate matter</td>
<td>CO = Carbon monoxide</td>
<td>RPS = Renewable portfolio standard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** This is not meant to be a definitive list of modeling tools to estimate climate change emissions impacts. Other tools may be available.
Viable alternatives to traditional engines and fuels, such as electric and hybrid vehicles, offer significant reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and air pollution. However, transitioning to these technologies requires robust infrastructure and policies to support their adoption. The Urban Emissions Model (URBEMS) is a tool designed to help cities and metropolitan areas plan and evaluate the impact of various transportation and land use policies on greenhouse gas emissions and air quality.

URBEMS uses detailed input data, such as population, vehicle ownership, and transportation patterns, to simulate the emissions and impacts of different scenarios. It can be used to assess the effectiveness of policies like renewable energy incentives, improved public transportation options, and the adoption of electric and hybrid vehicles. The model also allows for the exploration of co-benefits, such as reduced air pollution and improved public health.

Descriptions of Modeling Tools

URBEMS is currently being used extensively during the COEA process by local air districts and consultants to determine achievable reductions in emissions and to identify cost-effective strategies for air quality improvement. The tool provides a comprehensive analysis of transportation impacts and can help guide decision-making processes at all levels, from local to regional.
Multi-Pollutant Emissions Benefits of Transportation Strategies

Appendix A: List of Transportation Strategies

This appendix includes a list of transportation emission reduction strategies that is intended to be comprehensive of the full range of strategies that would be examined by transportation agencies as part of transportation conformity analyses or other emissions analyses. Although this list is intended to be comprehensive, it is not exhaustive of all potential strategies. Two primary criteria were applied for inclusion of strategies:

1. The strategy can be implemented by policy makers at a state or local level (i.e., it does not require a change in federal law or federal action) - Many strategies in the list below can be funded or implemented directly by transportation agencies (e.g., transit programs, traffic flow improvements). However, we did not limit the list only to those that would be implemented directly by transportation agencies. Some strategies are typically funded by state air agencies (e.g., inspection and maintenance programs, vehicle buy-back programs) or require implementation by local governments (e.g., land use policies, parking policies).

2. The strategy is generally considered at least marginally useful as an emission reduction strategy - Some strategies have limited documentation of effectiveness, and may not generate significant emission reductions on their own; however, all strategies included are generally considered to be supportive of other strategies and contributing to emissions reductions.

The strategies are grouped into four broad categories:

1. Transportation demand management (TDM) strategies - these strategies generally focus on reducing the amount of vehicle travel;
2. Transportation system management (TSM) / driver behavior-oriented strategies - these strategies generally focus on improving the operating characteristics of vehicles, affecting speeds, traffic flow, idling, etc.;
3. Vehicle, fuels, and technology strategies - these strategies generally focus on reducing vehicle emission rates; and
4. Non-road transportation strategies - these strategies address railroads, marine vessels, airport ground support equipment, and other non-road engines.

Some individual strategies fall into more than one of these categories (e.g., high-occupancy vehicle lanes can be considered both a TDM and TSM strategy since they encourage ridesharing, and also may help to improve traffic flow) but are only listed once in order to avoid duplication. Within these four broad categories, the strategies have been sub-categorized so that those with similar goals or targets are grouped together (e.g., transit strategies are grouped together, as are bicycle and pedestrian strategies). Often, strategies within a sub-category are implemented together and are analyzed as a package. In total, this memo identifies 137 different strategies in 29 sub-categories. For many of the strategies, examples of specific implementation approaches are provided. Although each of these examples is sometimes listed as a separate strategy in other resource documents, the examples for a given strategy generally serve the same purpose and would typically use the same general methodology for emissions analysis.

Each of the strategies focuses on policy or programmatic approaches that could be implemented by the public sector. Following the strategies, a table identifies specific technologies that can be applied as emission reduction measures.

Transportation Demand Management Strategies

Transportation demand management (TDM) strategies focus on changing travel behavior - trip rates, trip length, travel mode, time-of-day, etc. Most TDM projects/programs reduce emissions by reducing trips and/or vehicle miles traveled (VMT) by personal motor vehicles, or by shifting trips from peak periods to less congested periods. These strategies are listed below.

1. Shared Ride Programs/Projects

### 1. Transportation Programs/Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park-and-Ride facilities</td>
<td>- New park-and-ride facility&lt;br&gt;- Add parking to existing facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes</td>
<td>- Separate roadway for exclusive HOV use&lt;br&gt;- Barrier separated lanes within freeway right-of-way&lt;br&gt;- Concurrent flow lane&lt;br&gt;- Contra-flow lane&lt;br&gt;- HOV on arterial streets&lt;br&gt;- Bypass lanes for HOVs at metered freeway entrance ramps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional rideshare outreach/matching</td>
<td>- Implement regional rideshare matching programs&lt;br&gt;- Upgrade ridematching software (for full regional address recognition, corridor searching, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional rideshare incentives</td>
<td>- Carpool incentives (e.g., free gas card, drawings)&lt;br&gt;- Vanpool incentives (e.g., subsidized vanpools)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic rideshare programs</td>
<td>- Real-time rideshare matching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage shared ride taxis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional vanpool network</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-distance vanpools</td>
<td>- Vanshare program providing access from transit to workplaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2. Bicycle and Pedestrian Programs/Projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New bicycle paths, lanes, routes, or safety enhancements</td>
<td>- Bicycle paths/lanes&lt;br&gt;- On-street bicycle routes&lt;br&gt;- Multi-use trails&lt;br&gt;- Rails-to-trails conversions&lt;br&gt;- Bicycle safety enhancements (lighting, grades, markings, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle parking</td>
<td>- Bicycle racks&lt;br&gt;- Bicycle lockers&lt;br&gt;- Attended bicycle parking&lt;br&gt;- Ordinances requiring bicycle parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bikes on transit programs</td>
<td>- Bicycles on buses&lt;br&gt;- Bicycles on rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle information</td>
<td>- Informational signage (e.g., Share the Road signs, designated bicycle routes)&lt;br&gt;- Bicycle maps/plans&lt;br&gt;- Bicycle educational information, including bicycle safety information&lt;br&gt;- Bicycle coordinators&lt;br&gt;- Bicycle awareness/safety events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle share programs</td>
<td>- Public use bicycles&lt;br&gt;- Bike stations providing maintenance facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial incentives to own bicycles</td>
<td>- Free bikes program&lt;br&gt;- Cash rebates for bicycle purchases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian connections/sidewalks</td>
<td>- New sidewalks&lt;br&gt;- Sidewalk improvements (curb ramps, sidewalk gap closure, etc.)&lt;br&gt;- Pedestrian bridges/tunnels</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Enhancing the pedestrian environment

- Mid-block pedestrian connections
- Wider sidewalks
- Tree plantings
- Crosswalk light fixtures
- Street lights
- Sidewalk furniture (benches, etc.)
- Pedestrian safety modifications (count down pedestrian signals)

### 3. Transit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New transit routes/services</td>
<td>New bus routes&lt;br&gt;New rail lines&lt;br&gt;Demand response shuttle&lt;br&gt;Circulator buses&lt;br&gt;Express bus service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More frequent service</td>
<td>Additional buses in service on existing routes (to reduce headways)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longer service hours</td>
<td>Expansion beyond peak periods&lt;br&gt;late night hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More capacity on services</td>
<td>Larger buses&lt;br&gt;Additional railcars on trains&lt;br&gt;Redesign of seating/standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faster travel times/improved system performance</td>
<td>Busways/bus rapid transit (BRT)&lt;br&gt;Improved bus/rail integration&lt;br&gt;Transit signal prioritization&lt;br&gt;Improved connections/reduced transfer times&lt;br&gt;Transit centers&lt;br&gt;Change routing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger amenities</td>
<td>Bus shelters&lt;br&gt;Benches/seating at bus stops&lt;br&gt;Improved maintenance of buses/trains and stops/stations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved transit access</td>
<td>Increased parking at transit stations&lt;br&gt;Shuttle and feeder bus services&lt;br&gt;Improved pedestrian/bicycle access and bicycle parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit information</td>
<td>Signage/maps/schedules at bus/train stops&lt;br&gt;Signage/maps/schedules at major activity centers (e.g., malls, sports venues, etc.)&lt;br&gt;Terminal displays/kiosks with real-time passenger information&lt;br&gt;Transit information kiosks (e.g., in suburban employment sites, downtown, tourist sites)&lt;br&gt;Web page with transit planning capabilities&lt;br&gt;Inclusion of transit information in 511 and other travel planning services&lt;br&gt;Real-time text messaging/on-line information on bus schedules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit marketing and promotions</td>
<td>Transit promotional campaign&lt;br&gt;Branding of services / routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced fares/free services</td>
<td>Lower transit fares&lt;br&gt;Fare free zones</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4. Parking Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking pricing / fees</td>
<td>- Increase public parking fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Increase taxes on parking providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Impose or increase fees/surcharges on SOVs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Free or reduced priced parking for carpools/vanpools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking supply limits</td>
<td>- Parking maximums for new development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Regional parking caps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Create parking/traffic-free zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Peak-hour parking bans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Curb-parking restrictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferential parking for carpools/vanpools</td>
<td>- Premium parking spots for carpools/vanpools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Guaranteed parking for carpools/vanpools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking cash out program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5. Pricing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road pricing</td>
<td>- New tolls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Increase tolls on roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Increase bridge tolls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- High Occupancy Toll (HOT) lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cordon pricing</td>
<td>- Charge vehicles for entering high-use area, such as CBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable priced tolls</td>
<td>- Peak period surcharge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Prices vary based on traffic levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable parking fees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay-As-You-Drive Vehicle Insurance</td>
<td>- Incentives for per-mile vehicle insurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMT-based registration fees</td>
<td>- Pilot programs for per-mile vehicle insurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in gas tax</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee tax credits</td>
<td>- Tax credit for using transit, HOV, or bicycling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6. Employer-based TDM Programs

Note: A wide range of different employer-based demand management options are available, including: transit passes, vanpool subsidies, rideshare matching, bicycle lockers/showers, telecommuting programs, flexible work hours, compressed work schedules, etc. These programs typically are not promoted individually but as packages of strategies, and would be analyzed as a comprehensive program. As a result, the list below focuses on government policies or programs, not individual TDM program elements. The analysis of these strategies requires an assessment of levels of participation in different types of TDM activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employer marketing and support</td>
<td>• Outreach to employers/information programs to encourage commute options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Recognition/awards programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommuting support/incentives</td>
<td>• Support in establishing telecommuting programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Telecommuting financial incentives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telework centers</td>
<td>• Remote/satellite offices close to residential areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Telework centers in communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-going incentives for employer-based transit/vanpool/carpool programs</td>
<td>• Subsidized transit passes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Subsidized vanpools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Tax credit for employers that offer TDM programs, employer transportation coordinators, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start up incentives for employer-based transit/vanpool/carpool programs</td>
<td>• Short-term (start-up) financial incentives for implementing transit pass program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Short-term (start-up) financial incentives for implementing vanpool/carpool program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement programs at government worksites</td>
<td>• Flexible work hours programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Compressed work scheduled programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Telecommuting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Promote ridesharing, transit, bicycling, walking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory commute trip reduction programs</td>
<td>• Mandatory programs for employers of certain size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mandatory program for employers in certain locations/business districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional guaranteed ride home program</td>
<td>• Guaranteed ride home program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Emergency ride home program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support proximate commuting</td>
<td>• Reassigning employees so they can work at a location closest to home</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Non-employer-based TDM Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School-based programs</td>
<td>• School pools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Safe Routes to Schools programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• &quot;Walking bus&quot; programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus programs</td>
<td>• University parking pricing / TDM programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based programs</td>
<td>• Community association/residential building based TDM programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development-based programs</td>
<td>• Require new developments to meet trip reduction targets, implement TDM programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport-based programs</td>
<td>• Airport parking / TDM programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism promotions</td>
<td>• Hotel partnerships to promote transit use, walking/bicycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Tourism site partnerships to promote transit use,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/conformity/mpe_benefits/appenda.htm
### 8. Outreach/Marketing/Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional TDM program outreach</td>
<td>• Media campaigns/Public service announcements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Voluntary &quot;No Drive.&quot;&quot;Share a Ride&quot; Days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episodic (Spare the Air / Ozone Action Days) programs</td>
<td>• Media campaigns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ozone Action Coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Free/reduced price transit on Ozone Action Days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Special incentives on Spare the Air Days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Voluntary business closures / business practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational curriculum</td>
<td>• Incorporate air quality awareness into public school curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Incorporate information about transit, ridesharing into public school curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation management organizations</td>
<td>• Regional Commute Management Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Local Transportation Management Associations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 9. Integrated Land Use-Transportation Planning

Note: A wide range of different land use policy mechanisms are available, including: zoning requirements, impact fees, developer incentives, regional growth boundaries, etc. These policies typically would not be analyzed individually but as a package of strategies that affects land use patterns, and hence, travel and emissions. As a result, these strategies are not listed individually. Sometimes, strategies are identified based on the focus of the efforts: transit-oriented development, mixed-use activity centers, pedestrian-oriented design, etc. Five strategies are listed below that are organized around different types of programmatic approaches.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transit-oriented development (TOD) programs</td>
<td>• Joint-development programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs/requirements/ incentives to encourage better regional land use/transportation coordination</td>
<td>• Developer incentives (e.g., density bonuses for development near transit/urban core, reduced impact fees in TOD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Impact fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Zoning requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Regional growth boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Concurrency requirements (adequate public facilities ordinances)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Accessibility contracts (e.g., preferred access to road system for land use projects that reduce trips)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs/requirements/ incentives to improve community design</td>
<td>• Design standards (requirements for amenities, layout to street, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Incentives for developers to incorporate public spaces and other amenities into new developments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood schools</td>
<td>• Locate schools in communities, with access via walking and bicycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentives to live near work/transit/downtown</td>
<td>• Location Efficient Mortgage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Energy Efficient Mortgage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. Vehicle Use Restrictions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auto-free zones</td>
<td>• Pedestrian malls&lt;br&gt;• Transit malls&lt;br&gt;• Car bans in CBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limit access to HOVs only</td>
<td>• Require 2+ vehicle occupancy to enter designated congested activity centers/parking facilities during peak periods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Drive Days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Other Options to Reduce Auto Ownership / Avoid Vehicle Trips

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carsharing programs</td>
<td>• Car-sharing programs&lt;br&gt;• Station cars&lt;br&gt;• Incentives for use of carsharing programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using technology to avoid vehicle trips</td>
<td>• E-government initiatives&lt;br&gt;• Use teleconferences/web conferences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transportation System Management / Vehicle Driver Behavior-Oriented Strategies

Transportation system management (TSM) strategies focus on changing the operation of the transportation system, typically with a primary focus on improving traffic flow and reducing traveler delay. TSM programs can reduce emissions by changing vehicle speeds, reducing rapid vehicle accelerations and decelerations, and reducing vehicle idling. Many of these strategies are under the umbrella of Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS). In addition, some strategies focus directly on encouraging changes in driving behavior through educational information, incentives, or restrictions on driving speeds, operating patterns, and idling. These strategies are listed below.

12. Traffic Signal Synchronization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signal retiming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced traffic signal controls</td>
<td>• Adjust traffic control/signals based on traffic levels</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Roadway / Intersection Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-way streets</td>
<td>• Convert two-way streets to one-way to improve operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn restrictions</td>
<td>• Restrict left turns on two-way streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turning lanes</td>
<td>• Separate turning vehicles from through traffic to avoid unnecessary backups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roundabouts</td>
<td>• Implement traffic circles to improve traffic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 14. Incident Management / Operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incident management programs</td>
<td>- Intersection/corridor monitoring and response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Call number to report incidents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Roadside assistance vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Motorist aid call boxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Rerouting traffic at incidents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Active/dynamic traffic management systems (e.g., manage speeds, routes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramp metering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage use of underutilized capacity</td>
<td>- Route marking directing traffic to underutilized capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow use of road shoulders during peak periods/to get around incidents</td>
<td>- Reversible traffic lanes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 15. Traveler Information Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Real-time traveler information systems</td>
<td>- Variable message signs (directing traffic from incidents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Variable message signs and information including comparative travel times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Real-time information services (including integrated, multi-modal information)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Web site with real-time traffic information, speed information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Toll-free phone number (511)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real-time parking information</td>
<td>- Availability updates (to reduce unnecessary searching for parking)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Automated reservations and payment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 16. Speed Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower speed limits</td>
<td>55 mph highways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased speed enforcement</td>
<td>Photo speed enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased police enforcement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17. Access Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access management</td>
<td>• Limit development of access points to arterials/highways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Parallel access roads</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Shifting/Separating Freight Movements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shifting freight movement to off-peak periods</td>
<td>• PierPASS program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck-only lanes/routes</td>
<td>• Truck-only lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Truck-only roads/routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck restrictions</td>
<td>• Road restrictions on trucks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Restrictions during peak hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidated freight/package delivery</td>
<td>• Consolidation at peripheral CBD locations or neighborhood locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail shuttles</td>
<td>• Containers brought to inland distribution center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Container matching services</td>
<td>• Transport of empty containers minimized</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Anti-Idling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anti-idling restrictions</td>
<td>• School bus anti-idling restrictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Truck anti-idling restrictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Personal vehicle anti-idling restrictions (in specific zones, near schools, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-idling information campaigns</td>
<td>• Idling reminder hang-tags for trucks and commercial fleets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Remote idling reminders (On-Star-type service)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Inclusion of information in drivers education and at auto dealerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrictions on drive-through services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight facility improvements</td>
<td>• Expansion/improvement of port terminals, intermodal facilities, etc. to reduce queuing and idling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vehicle, Fuels, and Technology Strategies

Vehicle, fuel, and technology projects and programs are designed to change the emission rates of vehicles either by changing the fuel being used, the type of vehicle or emissions control technology, or a combination of both. Some programs also focus on eliminating gross polluters, or vehicles whose emissions controls have failed, or on controlling specific types of emissions (e.g., road dust). These strategies are listed below.
20. Accelerated Vehicle Retirement/Fleet Renewal/Replacement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle buy-back programs</td>
<td>• Vehicle scrapping program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleet renewal / clean vehicle programs</td>
<td>• School bus replacements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Transit bus purchases/replacements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• New purchases/replacements of heavy-duty trucks for solid waste trucks, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• New purchases/replacements of light-duty vehicles (e.g., government fleets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Repowering / replacing existing older diesel engine with a newer, cleaner engine.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicle Repowering/Retrofits*

Note: There are a range of technologies that can be used to retrofit heavy duty diesel vehicles, including particulate filters, oxidation catalysts, flow through filters, crankcase filters, NOX reducing catalysts, exhaust gas recirculation (EGR), and selective catalytic reduction. Each of these technologies has a different effect on pollutants of concern, and can be examined as an emissions reduction measure independently. Strategies listed below are those that are policy/program options available to state/local governments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory fleet retrofits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government contracting requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary programs with funding</td>
<td>• Carl Moyer, TERP-type programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See section "Samples of Technology Samples/Options" for a more detailed list of technology options

22. Idle Reduction Technologies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Truck stop electrification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase of auxiliary power units</td>
<td>• APUs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Electronically-driven auxiliary systems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. Purchases of Advanced Technology and Alternative Fuel Vehicles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cleaner diesel fuels</td>
<td>• Emulsified diesel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Oxygenated diesel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Biodiesel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fuel borne catalyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchases of alternative fuel vehicles (buses, other heavy-duty vehicles, light-duty vehicles)</td>
<td>• LNG vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• CNG vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ethanol / methanol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• LPG vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Electric vehicles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. Programs to Encourage Purchases of Advanced Technology/Alternative Fuel Vehicles

http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/conformity/mpe_benefits/appenda.htm
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| General tax / financial incentives        | • Tax credits for purchase of low emissions vehicles  
• Tax credits for purchase of alternative fuel vehicle  
• Feebates  
• Vehicle emissions fees                  |
| Specific target market programs with funding | • CNG taxicab program                                                   |
| HOV lane use allowed for advanced technology/alternative fuel vehicles |                                                                 |
| Preferential/free parking for advanced technology/alternative fuel vehicles |                                                                 |
| Government contracting requirements      | • Contracts requiring alternative fuel/low emissions vehicles           |

25. Inspection and Maintenance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic I&amp;M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced I&amp;M and on-board diagnostics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remote Sensing</td>
<td>• Roadside pullovers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoking vehicle programs</td>
<td>• Toll-free number for reporting high polluting vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy-duty vehicle inspections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. Road Dust Reduction Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Mitigation for unpaved roads                  | • Apply water  
• Apply wet gravel  
• Apply chemical/organic dust suppressant  
• Use vegetative matter to reduce blowing dust |
| Road paving                                   | • Pave previously unpaved roads  
• Pave road shoulders                          |
| Street sweeping                               | • Regular street sweeping on paved roads  
• Sweeping to remove sand and other de-icing/de-skid materials on paved roads |
| Transportation construction site mitigation efforts | • Require water or chemical stabilizers to be applied  
• Require wind barriers                        |

Non-Road Strategies

Non-road vehicles and equipment include railroads, marine vessels, airport ground support equipment, lawn and garden equipment, construction and agricultural equipment, and other mobile equipment. There are a wide range of technologies and operational strategies available to address these sources. The list of strategies below focuses on policies and programs. Following this strategy list is an appendix that includes more detail on the specific types of modifications that can be made to equipment.

http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/conformity/mpe_benefits/appenda.htm
27. Encourage Replacement/Repowering/Retrofits*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory fleet retrofits</td>
<td>● Only CA requirements can be adopted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scappage programs</td>
<td>● Equipment buy-back programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Replacement of gasoline lawnmowers with electric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Replace older yard tractors with newer, lower emission ones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government contracting requirements regarding vehicle/equipment technologies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary repower / retrofit programs, with funding*</td>
<td>● Carl Moyer, TERP-type programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See section "Samples of Technology Samples/Options" for a more detailed list of technology options

28. Encourage / Implement Use of Alternative Fuels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encourage use of on-road fuels by non-road diesel vehicles</td>
<td>● Use of ultra low-sulfur on-road diesel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase alternative fuel vehicles / equipment</td>
<td>● Purchase CNG street sweepers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentives for purchase of alternative fuel vehicles / equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail electrification</td>
<td>● Commuter rail electrification</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29. Encourage / Implement Operational Improvements and Anti-Idling Technologies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rail infrastructure improvements</td>
<td>● Track geometry improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Use of concrete ties/heavier rails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail operational strategies/practices</td>
<td>● Switcher yard locomotives (anti-idling)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Idle reductions using APUbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Idle reductions using automatic shut-down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine vessel equipment modifications</td>
<td>● Hull design/larger vessels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Increased atomization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Reduction of dead volume/Reduced sack volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine vessel fleet operational strategies/practices</td>
<td>● Speed reductions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Vessel route modifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Programmable logic controllers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Hull cleaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Cold ironing (anti-idling technologies while in port)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Shoreside power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport operational strategies</td>
<td>● Idling reduction policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Full electrification of gates / ground electrification / HVAC systems at gates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Improved airport configuration and expanded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Samples of Technology Approaches/Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Heavy-duty diesel engine retrofits (trucks, locomotives, marine vessels, other)** | - Particulate filters  
- Flow through filters  
- Diesel oxidation catalysts  
- Crank case filters  
- NOX reducing catalysts  
- Exhaust gas recirculation (EGR)  
- Selective catalytic reduction |
| **Locomotive engine modifications**                   | - Low heat rejection  
- Bottoming cycles  
- Improved engine lubricants  
- Use of hybrid switcher locomotives  
- Scrappage/fleet renewal |
| **Railroad equipment modifications**                  | - Tare weight reduction, higher capacity cars  
- Use of low-friction bearings  
- Use of improved suspensions  
- Use of hopper car covers  
- Use of steerable rail car trucks  
- Energy-minimizing train control  
- Improved drive-train lubricants |
| **Railroad alternative fuels**                        | - Use of natural gas  
- Use of cellulosic ethanol |
| **Marine vessel engine modifications**                | - Cooled exhaust gas recirculation  
- Charge air cooling  
- Turbocharging  
- Electric propulsion  
- Padded propulsion  
- Pre-injection  
- Modified valve timing  
- Lower compression ratio  
- Detail design of combustion space  
- Water injection in cylinder  
- Variable exhaust back pressure  
- More uniform injection  
- Insulating combustion space  
- Shutting off cylinder at low load  
- Delay injector timing; injector upgrade  
- Exhaust gas recirculation system or engine cycle modification  
- Install an inlet air humidification system  
- Modify cylinder heads for direct water injection |
| **Marine vessel alternative fuels**                   | - Fuel homogenization  
- Fuel/water emulsion  
- Humid air motor technology  
- Use of off-road diesel instead of residual fuel  
- Use of ULSD  
- Uses of LNG  
- Use of Fischer-Tropsch diesel  
- Use of Biodiesel  
- Use of ethanol-blended diesel  
- Use of low sulfur marine diesel fuel (SECA) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Airport ground support equipment engine modifications/ alternative fuels</th>
<th>Control fuel oil quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Replace GSE with LPG/CNG equipment</td>
<td>• Control fuel oil quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Replace 2-stroke engines with 4-stroke gasoline equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use of hybrid or electric ground support vehicles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Replace mobile GSE with fixed, electrically hardwired “at gate” equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use of alternative fuels in ground support vehicles (e.g., ultra low sulfur diesel)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Shelby Tucker
San Diego Association of Governments
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101

Subject: Comments on the Notice of Preparation for the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan draft Environmental Impact Report.

Dear Shelby Tucker,

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) and the California Department of Fish and Game (Department), hereafter collectively referred to as the Wildlife Agencies, have reviewed the above-referenced Notice of Preparation (NOP) regarding the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan draft Environmental Impact Report dated May 29, 2007. The Wildlife Agencies have identified potential effects of this project on wildlife and sensitive habitats. The comments provided herein are based on the information provided in the NOP, our knowledge of sensitive and declining vegetation communities, and our participation in regional conservation planning efforts.

The primary concern and mandate of the Service is the protection of public fish and wildlife resources and their habitats. The Service has legal responsibility for the welfare of migratory birds, anadromous fish, and endangered animals and plants occurring in the United States. The Service is also responsible for administering the Federal Endangered Species Act (Act) of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.). The Department is a Trustee Agency and a Responsible Agency pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA; Sections 15386 and 15381) and is responsible for ensuring appropriate conservation of the state’s biological resources, including rare, threatened, and endangered plant and animal species, pursuant to the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) and other sections of the Fish and Game Code. The Department also administers the Natural Community Conservation Planning (NCCP) Program.

The project proposes to update the 2003 Regional Transit Plan (RTP). The RTP addresses all forms, or modes, of transportation including automobiles, transit, bicycles, pedestrians, and intercity railroads. The RTP contains public policies, strategies, projects, and programs aimed at meeting the diverse mobility needs of the growing San Diego region through the year 2030.

The RTP will focus on regional mobility as opposed to addressing each mode of transportation individually. It will address four major components of improving mobility: 1) Land use changes; 2) Systems development; 3) Systems management; and 4) Demand management.

The 2007 RTP will encompass approximately 275 square miles (SANDAG, 2007). Projects generated from this plan will significantly affect biological resources within its reach.
The Wildlife Agencies recognize the programmatic nature of the RTP and, consequently, that it will be difficult to quantify biological impacts in the draft EIR before the actual implementation of the RTP. Therefore, our comments are of a general and regional nature. Subsequent specific project plans will require biological analysis at a more refined level for CEQA purposes. In addition, we will be commenting on the draft 2007 RTP that we received June 26, 2007.

The draft EIR for the 2007 RTP should address how implementation of the EMP will be consistent with existing Federal, State and local conservation lands, i.e., existing and/or planned Habitat Conservation Plans /Natural Community Conservation Plans. In particular, the DEIR should address:

1) Mitigation should demonstrate a concerted effort to contribute to build-out of the Natural Community Conservation Plan regional reserve system.

2) Biological analysis should address impacts on protected and covered areas of approved (and proposed) NCCPs with specific attention to protecting wildlife movement corridors and reducing fragmentation or isolation of aquatic and terrestrial wildlife and plants at local and regional scales. Available information may need to be augmented with additional studies such as Before and After Impact-Control analysis.

3) The DEIR should address indirect and cumulative effects (CEQA Guidelines, Sect.15130) from the proposed RTP and other programmed development, as well as potential impacts to area-wide resource management plans (wetlands, water quality). The scale of analysis for cumulative effects should be based on these area-wide plans, or the specific resource sphere of influence (i.e., watershed).

In order to facilitate the evaluation of the proposed project from the standpoint of fish and wildlife protection, we request that the draft EIR contain the following information to the extent possible, given the programmatic nature of the RTP.

1) A complete discussion of the need and purpose for the project, including each of the project alternatives.

2) A complete description of the proposed project, including all practical alternatives that have been considered to reduce project impacts to wetland areas, other sensitive habitat types, and fish and wildlife resources. Alternatives should include development proposals with reduced footprints that would further minimize and avoid impacts to sensitive species and habitat types on-site.

3) Specific coverage and descriptions of the types of wetland, coastal sage scrub, and other sensitive habitats that may be affected by implementation of the RTP. Maps and tables should be included to summarize such information. The maps/figures should provide overlays of existing habitat conservation plans e.g. Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), Multiple Habitat Conservation Program (MHCP) and their respective preserve areas. Sensitive habitats include the rare communities listed in the Attachment 2. The Wildlife Agencies consider these communities as threatened habitats having
both regional and local significance.

4) Conservation measures for potential adverse project-related effects on sensitive plants, animals and habitats should emphasize avoidance and where avoidance is infeasible, minimization of project effects. For unavoidable effects, off-site conservation through acquisition and preservation in perpetuity of the affected habitats should be addressed.

5) A thorough analysis of noise and light impacts on wildlife, including avian species and measures to be taken to mitigate any adverse impacts resulting from increased noise and light levels during and after construction.

6) An analysis of the RTP's potential effects on hydrology of any and all riparian and wetland communities within its sphere of influence, including all lagoons and tidal estuarine systems. Of particular importance is an analysis of the adequacy of proposed means to convey flood, runoff (from storm events) and tidal flows without affecting the physical integrity of or adding pollutants to habitat on and off site, including restoration projects.

The Wildlife Agencies appreciate the opportunity to comment on this NOP. We are hopeful that further consultation between you and us will ensure protection for the biological resources that would be affected by this project. If you have questions or comments regarding this letter, please contact Susan Wynn of the Service (760) 431-9440 ex 216 or L. Brock McAlexander of the Department at (858) 467-4229.

Sincerely,

Therese O'Rourke
Assistant Field Supervisor
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Michael J. Mulligan
Deputy Regional Manager
California Department of Fish and Game

Enclosure(s) 2

- Attachment 1: Guidelines for Assessing the Effects of Proposed Projects on Rare, Threatened, and Endangered Plants and Natural Communities
- Attachment 2: Sensitivity of Top Priority Rare Natural Communities in Southern California

cc: State Clearinghouse

References Cited:
SANDAG 2030 Highway Network Map, June 2007
www.sandag.org
Guidelines for Assessing the Effects of Proposed Projects on Rare, Threatened, and Endangered Plants and Natural Communities

State of California
THE RESOURCES AGENCY
Department of Fish and Game
December 9, 1983
Revised May 8, 2000

The following recommendations are intended to help those who prepare and review environmental documents determine when a botanical survey is needed, who should be considered qualified to conduct such surveys, how field surveys should be conducted, and what information should be contained in the survey report. The Department may recommend that lead agencies not accept the results of surveys that are not conducted according to these guidelines.

1. Botanical surveys are conducted in order to determine the environmental effects of proposed projects on all rare, threatened, and endangered plants and plant communities. Rare, threatened, and endangered plants are not necessarily limited to those species which have been "listed" by state and federal agencies but should include any species that, based on all available data, can be shown to be rare, threatened, and/or endangered under the following definitions:

A species, subspecies, or variety of plant is "endangered" when the prospects of its survival and reproduction are in immediate jeopardy from one or more causes, including loss of habitat, change in habitat, over-exploitation, predation, competition, or disease. A plant is "threatened" when it is likely to become endangered in the foreseeable future in the absence of protection measures. A plant is "rare" when, although not presently threatened with extinction, the species, subspecies, or variety is found in such small numbers throughout its range that it may be endangered if its environment worsens.

Rare natural communities are those communities that are of highly limited distribution. These communities may or may not contain rare, threatened, or endangered species. The most current version of the California Natural Diversity Database's List of California Terrestrial Natural Communities may be used as a guide to the names and status of communities.

2. It is appropriate to conduct a botanical field survey to determine if, or to the extent that, rare, threatened, or endangered plants will be affected by a proposed project when:

a. Natural vegetation occurs on the site, it is unknown if rare, threatened, or endangered plants or habitats occur on the site, and the project has the potential for direct or indirect effects on vegetation; or
b. Rare plants have historically been identified on the project site, but adequate information for impact assessment is lacking.

3. Botanical consultants should possess the following qualifications:

a. Experience conducting floristic field surveys;
b. Knowledge of plant taxonomy and plant community ecology;
c. Familiarity with the plants of the area, including rare, threatened, and endangered species;
d. Familiarity with the appropriate state and federal statutes related to plants and plant collecting; and,
e. Experience with analyzing impacts of development on native plant species and communities.

4. Field surveys should be conducted in a manner that will locate any rare, threatened, or endangered species that may be present. Specifically, rare, threatened, or endangered plant surveys should be:

a. Conducted in the field at the proper time of year when rare, threatened, or endangered species are both evident and identifiable. Usually, this is when the plants are flowering.

When rare, threatened, or endangered plants are known to occur in the type(s) of habitat present in the project.
area, nearby accessible occurrences of the plants (reference sites) should be observed to determine that the species are identifiable at the time of the survey.

b. Floristic in nature. A floristic survey requires that every plant observed be identified to the extent necessary to determine its rarity and listing status. In addition, a sufficient number of visits spread throughout the growing season are necessary to accurately determine what plants exist on the site. In order to properly characterize the site and document the completeness of the survey, a complete list of plants observed on the site should be included in every botanical survey report.

c. Conducted in a manner that is consistent with conservation ethics. Collections (voucher specimens) of rare, threatened, or endangered species, or suspected rare, threatened, or endangered species should be made only when such actions would not jeopardize the continued existence of the population and in accordance with applicable state and federal permit requirements. A collecting permit from the Habitat Conservation Planning Branch of DFG is required for collection of state-listed plant species. Voucher specimens should be deposited at recognized public herbaria for future reference. Photography should be used to document plant identification and habitat whenever possible, but especially when the population cannot withstand collection of voucher specimens.

d. Conducted using systematic field techniques in all habitats of the site to ensure a thorough coverage of potential impact areas.

e. Well documented. When a rare, threatened, or endangered plant (or rare plant community) is located, a California Native Species (or Community) Field Survey Form or equivalent written form, accompanied by a copy of the appropriate portion of a 7.5 minute topographic map with the occurrence mapped, should be completed and submitted to the Natural Diversity Database. Locations may be best documented using global positioning systems (GPS) and presented in map and digital forms as these tools become more accessible.

5. Reports of botanical field surveys should be included in or with environmental assessments, negative declarations and mitigated negative declarations, Timber Harvesting Plans (THPs), EIR’s, and EIS’s, and should contain the following information:

a. Project description, including a detailed map of the project location and study area.

b. A written description of biological setting referencing the community nomenclature used and a vegetation map.

c. Detailed description of survey methodology.

d. Dates of field surveys and total person-hours spent on field surveys.

e. Results of field survey including detailed maps and specific location data for each plant population found. Investigators are encouraged to provide GPS data and maps documenting population boundaries.

f. An assessment of potential impacts. This should include a map showing the distribution of plants in relation to proposed activities.

g. Discussion of the significance of rare, threatened, or endangered plant populations in the project area considering nearby populations and total species distribution.

h. Recommended measures to avoid impacts.

i. A list of all plants observed on the project area. Plants should be identified to the taxonomic level necessary to determine whether or not they are rare, threatened or endangered.

j. Description of reference site(s) visited and phenological development of rare, threatened, or endangered plant(s).

k. Copies of all California Native Species Field Survey Forms or Natural Community Field Survey Forms.

l. Name of field investigator(s).

m. References cited, persons contacted, herbaria visited, and the location of voucher specimens.
Sensitivity of Top Priority Rare Natural Communities in Southern California

Sensitivity rankings are determined by the Department of Fish and Game, California Natural Diversity Data Base and based on either number of known occurrences (locations) and/or amount of habitat remaining (acresage). The three rankings used for these top priority rare natural communities are as follows:

S1. # Fewer than 6 known locations and/or on fewer than 2,000 acres of habitat remaining.
S2. # Occurs in 6-20 known locations and/or 2,000-10,000 acres of habitat remaining.
S3. # Occurs in 21-100 known locations and/or 10,000-50,000 acres of habitat remaining.

The number to the right of the decimal point after the ranking refers to the degree of threat posed to that natural community regardless of the ranking. For example:

S1.1 = very threatened
S2.2 = threatened
S3.3 = no current threats known

Sensitivity Rankings (February 1992)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Community Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1.1</td>
<td>Mojave Riparian Forest                Sonoran Cottonwood Willow Riparian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mesquite Bosque                           Elephant Tree Woodland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crucifixion Thorn Woodland               Alkali Woodland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arizonaan Woodland                       Southern California Walnut Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mainland Cherry Forest                   Southern Bishop Pine Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Torrey Pine Forest                       Desert Mountain White Fir Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southern Dune Scrub                      Southern Coastal Bluff Scrub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maritime Succulent Scrub                 Riversideway Alluvial Fan Sage Scrub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southern Maritime Chaparral              Valley Needlegrass Grassland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Great Basin Grassland                    Mojave Desert Grassland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pebble Plains                            Cismontane Alkali Marsh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S1.2

Southern Foresdunes
Mono Pumice Flat
Southern Interior Basalt Flow Vernal Pool
S2.1

Ventura Coastal Sage Scrub
Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub
Riverside Upland Coastal Sage Scrub
Riverside Desert Sage Scrub
Sagebrush Steppe
Desert Sink Scrub
Mafic Southern Mixed Chaparral
San Diego Mesa Hardpan Vernal Pool
San Diego Mesa Claypan Vernal Pool
Alkali Meadow
Southern Coastal Salt Marsh
Coastal Brackish Marsh
Transmontane Alkali Marsh
Coastal and Valley Freshwater Marsh
Southern Arroyo Willow Riparian Forest
Southern Willow Scrub
Modoc-Great Basin Cottonwood Willow Riparian
Modoc-Great Basin Riparian Scrub
Mojave Desert Wash Scrub
Engelmann Oak Woodland
Open Engelmann Oak Woodland
Closed Engelmann Oak Woodland
Island Oak Woodland
California Walnut Woodland
Island Ironwood Forest
Island Cherry Forest
Southern Interior Cypress Forest
Bigeone Spruce-Canyon Oak Forest

S2.2

Active Coastal Dunes
Active Desert Dunes
Stabilized and Partially Stabilized Desert Dunes
Stabilized and Partially Stabilized Desert Sandfield
Mojave Mixed Steppe
Transmontane Freshwater Marsh
Coulter Pine Forest
Southern California Fellsfield
White Mountains Fellsfield

S2.3

Bristlecone Pine Forest
Limber Pine Forest
Submitted Via Email to rtp@sandag.org

June 27, 2007

Rachel Kennedy  
Associate Transportation Planner  
401 B Street, Suite 800  
San Diego, CA 92101  

Re: NOP for the San Diego 2007 Regional Transportation Plan

Dear Ms. Kennedy,

I am writing on behalf of the Center for Biological Diversity (“Center”), a non-profit organization with over 35,000 members in California and throughout the United States, including the Sacramento area. The Center is dedicated to protecting imperiled species and their habitats by combining scientific research, public organizing, and administrative and legal advocacy. Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the Notice of Preparation of the Draft Program EIR for the San Diego 2007 Regional Transportation Plan, State Clearinghouse # 2007051145 (“plan”).

The Center’s comments here focus on the need for the plan to consider the direct, indirect, and cumulative environmental impacts of greenhouse gas emissions. It is imperative for the EIR to consider the impacts of greenhouse gas emissions that contribute to global warming and its numerous impacts to air quality, water quality, biological resources, and other resources. Increases in construction, housing, population, and motor vehicle traffic all can significantly increase greenhouse gas emissions, and the California Environmental Quality Act requires the plan to address these impacts and reduce, avoid, and minimize those impacts. At the same time, the plan must take into account how climate change affects the project’s environmental setting and other environmental impacts, such as water supply, soil erosion, and biological resources, and prescribe actions to minimize and mitigate the impacts of global warming on the area.

The environmental impacts of global warming are undeniably significant. Global warming is one of the foremost problems our nation faces today and implicates all aspects of society, including environmental health and biodiversity, public health, the stability of our economy, and national security. Global warming is caused primarily by the combustion of fossil fuels for energy and resulting emissions of greenhouse gases. In the absence of substantial reductions of greenhouse gas emissions, global warming and its impacts will accelerate rapidly in this century. Changing weather patterns, including higher maximum temperatures and more hot days over nearly all land areas, higher minimum temperatures, fewer cold days and frost days over nearly all land areas, more intense precipitation events, and increases in tropical cyclone (hurricane) peak wind intensities and mean and peak precipitation intensities threaten human
health and safety and the environment and cause billions of dollars of damage to property and the economy. The primary way to reduce and mitigate these and other impacts of global warming is to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and to slow the rate of warming.

A. The impacts of Global Warming on California

While the exact severity of statewide environmental impacts will vary depending upon the extent of continued greenhouse gas emissions and use of mitigation strategies, some of the major impacts identified in recent reports include:

- Reduction of Sierra snowpack up to 90 percent during the next 100 years threatens California’s water supply and quality as the Sierra accounts for almost all of the surface water storage in the state.
- Impacts to the health of Californians due to increases in the frequency, duration, and intensity of conditions conducive to air pollution formation, oppressive heat, and wildfires. Increasing temperatures from 8 to 10.4°F, as expected under the higher emission scenarios, will cause a 25 to 35 percent increase in the number of days Californians are exposed to ozone pollution in most urban areas. This will slow progress toward attainment of air quality standards and impede many of the state’s efforts to reduce air pollution. Temperature increases are likely to result in an increase in heat-related deaths. Children, the elderly, and minority and low-income communities are at greatest risk.
- Potential impacts from limited water storage, increasing temperatures, increased carbon dioxide concentrations, pests and weeds threaten agriculture and its economic contribution to the state. Direct threats to the structural integrity of the state’s levee system would also have immense implications for the state’s fresh water supply, food supply, and overall economic prosperity.
- Erosion of our coastlines and sea water intrusion into the state’s delta and levee systems may result from a 4 to 33-inch rise in sea level during the next 100 years. This will further exacerbate flooding in vulnerable regions.
- Increasing temperatures and pest infestations would make the state’s forest resources more vulnerable to fires. Large and intense fires threaten native species, increase pollution, and can cause economic losses.
- Increasing temperatures will boost electricity demand, especially in the hot summer season. By 2025 this would translate to a 1 to 3 percent increase in demand resulting in potentially hundreds of millions of dollars in extra energy expenditures.

CalEPA 2006; Cayan et al. 2006; Chung 2006; Drechsler et al. 2006.

Global warming will also have significant impacts on the California economy, which must be addressed by all levels of government. *Global warming will have detrimental effects on some of California’s largest industries, including agriculture, wine, tourism, skiing, recreational and commercial fishing, and*
forestry. It will also increase the strain on electricity supplies necessary to meet the
demand for summer air-conditioning in the hottest parts of the state.
AB 32 § 38501(b) 2006.

In order to address the threats and impacts of global warming the California Global
Warming Solutions Act requires the state to reduce the levels of greenhouse gas emissions to
1990 levels by the year 2020. AB 32 § 38550.

B. The impacts of Global Warming on Threatened, Endangered, Rare, and Special
Status Species

Climate change is a leading threat to California and the world’s biological diversity.
Species have already been profoundly impacted by the worldwide average temperature increase
of 1° Fahrenheit (.6° Centigrade) since the start of the Industrial Revolution (IPCC 2007). Yet
the warming experienced to date is small compared with the 2.5-10.4° F (1.4-5.8° C) or greater
warming projected for this century. The ways in which climate change threatens species are
varied and sometimes complex. Below we present an overview of impacts observed to date and
projections for the future.

Scientists have predicted three categories of impacts from global warming: (1) earlier
timing of spring events, (2) extension of species’ range poleward or upward in elevation, and (3)
a decline in species adapted to cold temperatures and an increase in species adapted to warm
temperatures (Parmesan and Galbraith 2004). A recent survey of more than 30 studies covering
about 1600 hundred species summarized empirical observations in each of these three categories
and found that approximately one half of the species were already showing significant impacts,
and 85-90% of observed changes were in the direction predicted (Parmesan and Galbraith 2004).
The statistical probability of this pattern occurring by chance, as opposed to being caused by
climate change, is less than one in a billion (Parmesan and Galbraith 2004). Changes in the life
cycles and behaviors of organisms such as plants blooming and birds laying their chicks earlier
in the spring were some of the first phenomena to be observed. These changes may not be
detrimental to all species, but depending on the timing and interactions between species, may be
very harmful.

The Edith’s checkerspot butterfly, which occurs along the west coast of north America,
has been severely impacted by such changes in the lifecycles of organisms. The Edith’s
checkerspot’s host plant, Plantago erecta, now develops earlier in the spring while the timing of
caterpillar hatching has not changed. Caterpillars now hatch on plants that have completed their
lifecycle and dried up, instead of on young healthy plants (Parmesan and Galbraith 2004). The
tiny caterpillars are unable to move far enough to find other food and therefore starve to death
(Parmesan and Galbraith 2004). Because of this, many Edith’s checkerspot butterfly populations
have become extinct. Many more populations have been lost in the southern portion of the
species’ range than in the northern portion, resulting in a net shift of the range of the species
northward and upwards in elevation. All these changes have occurred in response to “only” 1.3°
Fahrenheit regional warming (Parmesan and Galbraith 2004). The southernmost subspecies, the
Quino checkerspot butterfly, already listed as endangered under the Endangered Species Act due to habitat destruction from urban development and other impacts, has disappeared from nearly 80% of otherwise suitable habitat areas due to global warming (Parmesan and Galbraith 2004). The Bay checkerspot and Taylor’s checkerspot butterflies, also listed under the Endangered Species Act, have been similarly impacted (Parmesan and Galbraith 2004). Butterfly species are impacted in other ways as well. The northward expansion of the treeline into alpine meadow butterfly habitat can impede dispersal, fragment habitat, and increase mortality via bitterly collisions with the trees (Krajick 2004; Ross et al. 2005).

Outside of California, two species of Caribbean coral, the elkhorn coral (*Acropora palmata*) and staghorn coral (*Acropora cervicornis*) have been listed as threatened species, in part due to global warming and increased levels of dissolved carbon dioxide in ocean water. 71 Fed. Reg. 26852. Other species such as the polar bear are directly threatened with extinction by global warming but not yet proposed for listing under the Endangered Species Act. The Center for Biological Diversity, NRDC, and Greenpeace have submitted a Petition to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to list polar bears under the Endangered Species Act, initiating the listing process. The polar bear’s sea-ice habitat is melting away due to global warming, and the Arctic may be ice-free in the summer well before the end of this century (Overpeck et al. 2005). Polar bears cannot be expected to survive the near complete loss of their sea-ice habitat.

Thomas et al. (2004) have estimated that up to one third of the species included in a study of 20% of the world’s surface area may be committed to extinction because of global warming by the year 2050. This study was based on minimum, mid-range, and maximum warming IPCC (2007) scenarios (Thomas et al. 2004). Under the minimal climate-warming scenario, about 18% of species would be committed to extinction, while under the mid-range scenario about 24% of species would be committed to extinction, and under the maximum warming scenario about 35% of species would be committed to extinction (Thomas et al. 2004). Reducing greenhouse gas emissions will allow total warming to be kept to the low end of the range, thereby preventing many thousands of species extinctions (Thomas et al. 2004).

While theoretically some species can adapt by shifting their ranges in response to climate change, species in many areas today, in contrast to migration patterns in response to paleoclimatic warming, must move through a landscape that human activity has rendered increasingly fragmented and inhospitable (Walther 2002). When species cannot shift their ranges northward or to increased elevations in response to climate warming, they will become extinct (Parmesan and Galbraith 2004). Therefore, the least mobile species will be the first to disappear.1

C. California Law Requires the Analysis and Reductions of Green House Gases

---

1 Appendix B further documents the impacts of global warming on threatened, endangered, rare, and special status species throughout the world
The State of California recognizes the threats posed by global warming. To address and rectify the State’s increasing contributions to greenhouse gas emissions the State of California has enacted requirements for state and local agencies to address the issue of global warming by analyzing and reversing the emissions of greenhouse gases. Executive Order S-3-05 calls for greenhouse gas emission reductions and analysis of the impacts of climate change. The legislature and the Governor again reaffirmed their commitment to address the issue of climate change by passing the “The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006.” AB 32, 2005-06 Sess., codified at Cal. Health & Safety Code §§ 38550-99.

California is extremely vulnerable to the impacts of global warming and is also responsible for a significant portion of the U.S. and global emissions of greenhouse gases. The significant risks climate change poses to California as well as the considerable benefits the state could realize if it addresses these risks prompted Governor Schwarznegger to issue Executive Order S-3-05 on June 1, 2005. See F.Chung et al. 2006 at Appendix 1.7. The Executive Order called for specific emissions reductions and a periodic update on the state of climate change science and its potential impacts on sensitive sectors, including water supply, public health, coastal areas, agriculture and forestry. The Executive Order established the following greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions targets: by 2010, reduce GHG emissions to 2000 levels; by 2020, reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels; and by 2050, reduce GHG emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels.

In response to Executive Order S-3-05, the California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA) formed a Climate Action Team with members from various state agencies and commissions. The Team has issued a series of reports, including a March 2006 Climate Action Team Report to Governor Schwarznegger and the Legislature. This and other reports issued by CalEPA, the California Energy Commission (CEC), Department of Water Resources and other California agencies are available at http://www.climatechange.ca.gov/documents/index.html and should be used by local jurisdictions in preparing environmental documents under CEQA.

The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB 32), acknowledges the threats of global warming and places a cap on California’s greenhouse gas emissions and thus brings the state closer to meeting these targets. The state of California recognizes the significant threats to the natural environment posed by global warming:

Global warming poses a serious threat to the economic well-being, public health, natural resources, and the environment of California. The potential adverse impacts of global warming include the exacerbation of air quality problems, a reduction in the quality and supply of water to the state from the Sierra snowpack, a rise in sea levels resulting in the displacement of thousands of coastal businesses and residences, damage to marine ecosystems and the natural environment, and an increase in the incidences of infectious diseases, asthma, and other human health-related problems.

AB 32 § 38501(a) 2006.

CEQA requires an EIR analyze any "significant environmental effects" of a proposed project. Pub. Res. Code § 21 100(b)(l); Cal. Code Regs., Title 14, §§ 15126(a), 15126.2(a),
"Significant effect on the environment' means a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in the environment." Pub. Res. Code § 21068. CEQA also provides that the CEQA guidelines "shall" specify certain criteria that require a finding that a project may have a significant effect on the environment:

"(1) A proposed project has the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, curtail the range of the environment, or to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals.

(2) The possible effects of a project are individually limited but cumulatively considerable. As used in this paragraph, "cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.

(3) The environmental effects of a project will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly."


The effects of a project must be fully analyzed and mitigation imposed if any of the above triggers are reached. The CEQA Guidelines provide that, in discussing the environmental effects of a project, an EIR must include “a sufficient degree of analysis to provide decisionmakers with information which enables them to make a decision which intelligently takes account of environmental consequences.” 14 Cal. Code Regs. § 15151. Increases in greenhouse gas emissions will contribute directly and cumulatively to the increase in atmospheric greenhouse gases, and will thus contribute directly and cumulatively to global warming. These would include but not be limited to: (1) the greenhouse gas emissions resulting from the construction of roads and facilities; (2) the greenhouse gas emissions from motor vehicle travel and motorized recreation; (3) Increases in construction, housing, and population. In addition, changes in vegetation and land use can also contribute to global warming. The EIR must calculate the project’s greenhouse gas emissions, and then avoid, minimize, and mitigate them to the maximum extent feasible.

D. Climate Change Mitigation

As of 2002, California’s main source of greenhouse gases was the transportation sector (41.2%) followed by the industrial sector (22.8%), electric power sector (19.6%), agriculture & forestry sector (8.0%), and other sources (8.4%) (CalEPA 2006). Mitigation of the state’s emissions, therefore, will result from addressing each of the sources.

The plan must include avoidance and mitigation measures to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The Governor has recognized, "mitigation efforts will be necessary to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and adaptation efforts will be necessary to prepare Californians for the consequences of global warming." Executive Order S-3-05, June 1, 2005. There are many avoidance and mitigation measures available. Adopting these measures will benefit the environment, take the plan closer to meeting state greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets, and demonstrate responsible development. These measures may also save money.
In summary, the plan should reduce, avoid, and minimize greenhouse gas emissions, and the EIR needs to analyze the environmental impacts of global warming due to greenhouse gas emissions, as well as analyze the implications that global warming can potentially have on the plan. These impacts are unfortunately not restricted to the project area, but have national and worldwide implications.

Thank you very much for your consideration of these comments. Please add the Center to all mailing lists for all notices about this project, by email at bnowicki@biologicaldiversity.org, or mail at Center for Biological Diversity, P.O. Box 710, Tucson, AZ 85702. Please contact me at (520) 623-5252 x311 or at the address on this letterhead if you have any question or concerns.

Sincerely,

Brian Nowicki

Literature Cited


June 28, 2007

Mr. Shelby Tucker
San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG)
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, California 92101

NOTICE OF PREPARATION OF AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (EIR) FOR THE 2007 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (RTP) PROJECT (SCH# 2007051145)

Dear Mr. Tucker:

The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) has received your submitted Notice of Preparation of an EIR for the above-mentioned project. The following project description is stated in your document: “Regional Transportation Plan for the San Diego region, which will describe all transportation facilities and programs needed to meet travel demand through the year 2030.” DTSC provides comments as follows:

1) The EIR should identify the current or historic uses at the project site that may have resulted in a release of hazardous wastes/substances.

2) The EIR should identify the known or potentially contaminated sites within the proposed Project area. For all identified sites, the EIR should evaluate whether conditions at the site may pose a threat to human health or the environment. Following are the databases of some of the regulatory agencies:

   • National Priorities List (NPL): A list maintained by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S.EPA).

   • Envirostor (formerly CalSites): A Database primarily used by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control, accessible through DTSC's website (see below).

   • Resource Conservation and Recovery Information System (RCRIS): A database of RCRA facilities that is maintained by U.S. EPA.

   • Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Information System (CERCLIS): A database of CERCLA sites that is maintained by U.S.EPA.
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- Solid Waste Information System (SWIS): A database provided by the California Integrated Waste Management Board which consists of both open as well as closed and inactive solid waste disposal facilities and transfer stations.

- Leaking Underground Storage Tanks (LUST) / Spills, Leaks, Investigations and Cleanups (SLIC): A list that is maintained by Regional Water Quality Control Boards.

- Local Counties and Cities maintain lists for hazardous substances cleanup sites and leaking underground storage tanks.

- The United States Army Corps of Engineers, 911 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, California, 90017, (213) 452-3908, maintains a list of Formerly Used Defense Sites (FUDS).

3) The EIR should identify the mechanism to initiate any required investigation and/or remediation for any site that may be contaminated, and the government agency to provide appropriate regulatory oversight. If necessary, DTSC would require an oversight agreement in order to review such documents. Please see comment No.17 below for more information.

4) All environmental investigations, sampling and/or remediation for the site should be conducted under a Workplan approved and overseen by a regulatory agency that has jurisdiction to oversee hazardous substance cleanup. The findings of any investigations, including any Phase I or II Environmental Site Assessment investigations should be summarized in the document. All sampling results in which hazardous substances were found should be clearly summarized in a table.

5) Proper investigation, sampling and remedial actions overseen by the respective regulatory agencies, if necessary, should be conducted at the site prior to the new development or any construction. All closure, certification or remediation approval reports by these agencies should be included in the EIR.

6) If any property adjacent to the project site is contaminated with hazardous chemicals, and if the proposed project is within 2,000 feet from a contaminated site, then the proposed development may fall within the “Border Zone of a Contaminated Property.” Appropriate precautions should be taken prior to construction if the proposed project is within a Border Zone Property.

7) If buildings or other structures, asphalt or concrete-paved surface areas are being planned to be demolished, an investigation should be conducted for the presence of other related hazardous chemicals, lead-based paints or products, mercury, and asbestos containing materials (ACMs). If other hazardous chemicals, lead-based
paints or products, mercury or ACMs are identified, proper precautions should be taken during demolition activities. Additionally, the contaminants should be remediated in compliance with California environmental regulations and policies.

8) The project construction may require soil excavation or filling in certain areas. Sampling may be required. If soil is contaminated, it must be properly disposed and not simply placed in another location onsite. Land Disposal Restrictions (LDRs) may be applicable to such soils. Also, if the project proposes to import soil to backfill the areas excavated, sampling should be conducted to ensure that the imported soil is free of contamination.

9) Human health and the environment of sensitive receptors should be protected during the construction or demolition activities. If it is found necessary, a study of the site and a health risk assessment overseen and approved by the appropriate government agency and a qualified health risk assessor should be conducted to determine if there are, have been, or will be, any releases of hazardous materials that may pose a risk to human health or the environment.

10) If it is determined that hazardous wastes are, or will be, generated by the proposed operations, the wastes must be managed in accordance with the California Hazardous Waste Control Law (California Health and Safety Code, Division 20, Chapter 6.5) and the Hazardous Waste Control Regulations (California Code of Regulations, Title 22, Division 4.5).

11) If it is determined that hazardous wastes are or will be generated and the wastes are (a) stored in tanks or containers for more than ninety days, (b) treated onsite, or (c) disposed of onsite, then a permit from DTSC may be required. If so, the facility should contact DTSC at (714) 464-5423 to initiate pre-application discussions and determine the permitting process applicable to the facility.

12) If it is determined that hazardous wastes will be generated, the facility should obtain a United States Environmental Protection Agency Identification Number by contacting (800) 518-6942.

13) Certain hazardous waste treatment processes may require authorization from the local Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA). Information about the requirement for authorization can be obtained by contacting your local CUPA.

14) If the project plans include discharging wastewater to a storm drain, you may be required to obtain an NPDES permit from the overseeing Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB).
15) If during construction/demolition of the project, the soil and/or groundwater contamination is suspected, construction/demolition in the area would cease and appropriate health and safety procedures should be implemented.

16) If a site in the project area was used for agricultural or related activities, onsite soils and groundwater might contain pesticides, agricultural chemical, organic waste or other related residue. Proper investigation, and remedial actions, if necessary, should be conducted under the oversight of and approved by a government agency at the site prior to construction of the project.

17) Envirostor (formerly CalSites) is a database primarily used by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control, and is accessible through DTSC's website. DTSC can provide guidance for cleanup oversight through an Environmental Oversight Agreement (EOA) for government agencies, or a Voluntary Cleanup Agreement (VCA) for private parties. For additional information on the EOA please see www.dtsc.ca.gov/SiteCleanup/Brownfields, or contact Maryam Tasnif-Abbasi, DTSC's Voluntary Cleanup Coordinator, at (714) 484-5489 for the VCA.

If you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact Ms. Teresa Hom, Project Manager, at (714) 484-5477 or email at thom@dtsc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Greg Holmes
Unit Chief
Southern California Cleanup Operations Branch - Cypress Office

cc: Governor's Office of Planning and Research
State Clearinghouse
P.O. Box 3044
Sacramento, California 95812-3044

CEQA Tracking Center
Department of Toxic Substances Control
Office of Environmental Planning and Analysis
1001 I Street, 22nd Floor, M.S. 22-2
Sacramento, California 95814

CEQA#1691
June 28, 2007

Shelby Tucker, Associate Regional Planner
San Diego Association of Governments
401 B Street, Floor 8
San Diego, California 92101

RE: Comments on Scoping for EIR for Regional Transportation Plan, 2007 Update

Attached please find the following documents for your consideration in determining the scope of issues for the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Regional Transportation Plan, 2007 Update:

- Summary of comments by City Heights residents and staff of the City Heights Community Development Corporation (CHCDC) at the Public Scoping Meeting held on June 14, 2007 at the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (Agenda Item #9). This document summarizes environmental concerns related to Interstate and State Route 15 through Mid-City San Diego.

- Memorandum of Agreement between City of San Diego and State of California dated May 14 and May 21, 1985 ("1985 MOA").

- Memorandum of Understanding between City of San Diego and State of California dated August 9, 1993 ("1993 MOU")

The current Mobility 2030 RTP and the draft 2007 document are both in conflict with the rapid transit system lane designation stipulated as mitigation for the I-15 project in the 1993 MOU between the City of San Diego and the State of California (at item #21).

With respect to Goods Movement, an alternative has been suggested to SANDAG and CalTrans to expand the north-south "I-15 corridor" definition to include potential rerouting onto I-805 and SR – 163 around the Mid City I-15 segment, but the current RTP and draft update do not include discussion or evaluation of this alternative.

In fact, they continue to propose that the HOV/ML / "flexible highway"system would allow for the use of HOV and/or Managed Lanes to move freight at off-peak hours.

The RTP and EIR needs to address the express mitigation stipulated in the 1985 MOA between the City of San Diego and Caltrans to divert truck traffic to I-805 to the maximum extent feasible and to address noise and air pollution impacts to Central Elementary School (Items #7 and #9). Here again the proposed GMAP and RTP are in conflict with the mitigations stipulated in the 1985 MOA.
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Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the scope of the EIR for the RTP 2007 Update. Please contact me if you have additional questions regarding our comments.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Jay Powell, CHCDC Executive Director

Enc
Summary of Comments to the June 14, 2007 Public Scoping meeting
Copy of 1985 MOA
Copy of 1993 MOA

File: 30/TransitNow/RTP 2007 Update EIR Scoping Comments 062807
Summary of Comments of City Heights residents and City Heights Community Development Corporation staff to the Regional Planning Technical Working Group on June 14, 2007

Environmental concerns related to the Mid City section of the SR-15 mentioned in the Public Scoping Meeting held on June 14, 2007 at the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (Agenda Item #9) by City Heights residents and staff from the City Heights Community Development Corporation (CHCDC).

Assumptions: The EIR will analyze the project’s impacts on the physical environment. The EIR will address how the project impacts the following issue areas:

1. Land Use
2. Social Environment
3. Visual Resources
4. Transportation
5. Air Quality (including Greenhouse Gas Emissions)
6. Noise
7. Energy
8. Geology/Paleontology
9. Hydrology/Water Resources
10. Biological Resources
11. Cultural Resources

City Heights Community Development staff and community residents raised the concerns listed below at the June 14th Public Scoping meeting:

NOISE AND AIR QUALITY

The community wants to know how the Good Movements Action Plan will affect the air quality and noise levels in this community. The Mid-City section of the I-15 is not as wide as Freeway 805 (it was deliberately designed to minimize the freeway footprint in this area). This section of the freeway impacts the community at crossover transit stations located at El Cajon Blvd and University Ave and the Teralta Park located on top of the SR-15. This impact must be considered when making decisions. Further more, it is our understanding that mitigation originally agreed upon in 1985 has not been implemented.

Central Elementary School is adjacent to the freeway; even if there is a reduction of truck pollution with the clean air programs mentioned in the draft RTP there is no gauge against which to measure how that will affect children’s lungs in the long run. Additionally, as mentioned in attachment 1, the 1985 MOA calls to “direct trucks away from the project area onto the I-805”.

Alternatives to minimize the amounts of trucks running on the Mid-City section of the I-15 must be considered. This might mean not considering this section as a route for the Goods Movement Action Plan or, implementation of policies or actions to discourage trucks from passing through the Mid-City section of the I-15.

We also request that you to consider that having a BRT dedicated lane in the middle of the freeway not only improves community access to public transportation but, with certainty, reduces air pollution.
The community asks that you consider diverting trucks from our neighborhoods to roads further away from clusters of dense population. We recognize that the Freight Working Group and SANDAG staff have been working to formulate programs to provide overall clean, green and healthful goods movement industry, retrofitting trucks with diesel oxidation catalysts (DOCs) for better quality air; Smart Way Transport Project to save fuel and reduce emissions. We fear that these proposed mitigations will be largely ineffective given the exceptionally close proximity of our community to the I-15 corridor.

SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORTATION and LAND USE

Quality public transportation benefits the SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT by reducing the amounts of cars on streets and freeway. Considering an option that increases the levels of public transportation ridership (i.e. BRT) and decreases (if possible eliminates) truck traffic on this section of the I-15 follows a best practices model.

Accessible and efficient mass transit engages the choice rider, which is a stated goal of San Diego transportation providers. Social environment is enhanced by the presence of more people walking with “eyes on the streets” creating safer communities. Walking, to use public transportation, works to reduce obesity and decreases the risk for heart diseases.

An RTP focus on public transportation in our high density community will further develop a large transit oriented community compatible with SANDAG’s Smart Growth policies.

Additionally, the recently completed transit plaza decks over the I-15 represent not only significant economic investment but also appropriate land use per redevelopment planning. Failure to maximize the potential of these decks adversely impacts the value and potential of this resource and the surrounding properties.
MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT
Concerning Mitigation for State Route 15 (40th Street Corridor)

The State of California, Department of Transportation (State) proposes to improve a 2.2 mile segment of State Highway Route 15 through a portion of the City of San Diego (City) along the 40th Street corridor in an area known as the Mid-City Community. While this highway improvement project (the project) is needed to accommodate projected traffic in the region, significant adverse impacts to the Mid-City community could result unless they are properly mitigated. These impacts involve the issues of community cohesion, physical separation, visual intrusion and noise.

The following paragraphs describe proposed major design features, right of way disposition plans and improvement responsibilities associated with the project. These measures are considered to satisfactorily mitigate the impacts of the project. The Final Environmental/Section 4(f) Statement prepared by the State (approved in 1975) and the recent Environmental Study summarize how the potentially significant adverse impacts are to be avoided.

1. A primary goal in the development of the Freeway is to cover the eight blocks between Adams and Landis, subject to the availability of funding. The State, in accordance with this Mitigation Agreement, commits itself as of this date to provide for the cover of the block between Polk and Orange Avenues. The City, in accordance with this Agreement, commits itself to provide for the cover of one additional block. Additional State and Federal funding will be vigorously pursued for the cut and cover of the remaining blocks other than the State.
block prior to the completion of design. Local fund sources will be pursued, consisting of potential tax increments flowing from the establishment of a redevelopment project area, possible allocation of capital improvement funds, and lease revenues that might be derived from private development of the cover.

2. The State will design the project in such a manner that any amount of freeway cover between Landis Street and Adams Avenue is not precluded. The detailed design phase will extend over a 36-month period after the Freeway Agreement is executed. The design will be kept "open" for additional areas of freeway cover for 18 months after the Freeway Agreement is executed. During the period between 18 months and 36 months after execution of the Freeway Agreement, additional cover may still be added if the concept is known and the State is so advised, pending conclusion of final details.

During the design phase of the project, the State shall periodically review the details of the project design with the City and respond as appropriate to suggested modifications.

3. The State will grade the fill in Park de la Cruz and the Adams Avenue loop area to City specifications. Planting, irrigation facilities, paved pathways and parking areas will also be included in the project. The State, subject to such terms and conditions as may be set by the California Transportation Commission (CTC), will offer to quit-claim such rights as it has in the Adams Avenue loop area to the City.
4. The State will offer to the City development rights for park or other public use of airspace above any blocks covered with a deck. Such use must be in accord with then current laws and will be subject to approval of the CTC. Any proposed private residential or commercial use of airspace will also be subject to CTC approval.

Certain segments of cover may be constructed with City and/or private funding sources. These segments could be developed with revenue-producing uses, subject to approval of the CTC including, but not limited to, commercial and residential development. Any revenues resulting from such uses may be utilized to amortize the costs incurred in constructing the cover. It is recognized that such an approach will be subject to CTC approval and may require special legislation.

5. The State will, subject to such terms and conditions as may be set by the CTC, offer to convey to the City fee title to any small excess remainder parcels bounded by the freeway slopes and 40th Street or Central Avenue between Landis Street and Adams Avenue. The parcels may be included in the streets rights of way or used as small park-like public areas.

6. The State will construct pedestrian overcrossings at or near Landis Street and Monroe Avenue.

7. The State will construct noise barriers at locations where they are warranted under current policies. The design details of size, location and type will be subject to mutual agreement between the State and the City. Noise barriers may include landscaped sound, walls and other approved attenuation techniques. The selection of
specific techniques will be based in large part upon the
objective of creating a "soft" interface between the
freeway and the surrounding community which protects and
enchants the community's design character.

The State will conform to the requirements of Section
216 of the Streets and Highways Code relative to control
of freeway noise as it would apply to schools in the
area. Negotiations with the San Diego Unified School
District will begin shortly after a Freeway Agreement is
executed. Qualified consultants or state employees in
the fields of acoustics, air quality and traffic, se-
lected or approved by the School District and funded by
Caltrans, shall provide recommendations of appropriate
architectural and/or mechanical measures for considera-
tion and approval by the School District and Caltrans in
order to satisfactorily resolve the following concerns
related to the completed Freeway project and its con-
struction phase.

A) Control of noise within the buildings and on the
school playground from the Freeway as well as Cen-
tral Avenue traffic.

B) Air quality within and around the school.

C) Traffic and Circulation relative to safe access to
the school.

D) Location of the cut and cover.

3. The State will revegetate the manufactured slopes with
appropriate groundcovers, shrubs and trees in accordance
with a plan that is jointly prepared with the City.
Trees will be placed throughout the revegetated areas with particular emphasis on large trees along the tops of slopes to better screen the surrounding community between Landis Street and Adams Avenue.

The funding of the landscape improvement shall be available such that the work can immediately follow the freeway construction.

9. The State will, to the extent feasible, sign and direct truck traffic to the I-805 facility as an alternative to Route 15 through Mid-City.

It is understood that the provisions and conditions outlined above are subject to fund, budget, and project approvals by the CTC, the Council and the Federal Highway Administration. It is also understood that the freeway project will not proceed if for any reason the mitigation measures by Caltrans as outlined above in paragraphs 1 through 9 inclusive cannot be implemented.

UTED:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

[Signature]
J. O. GRASBERGER
Acting District Director

CITY OF SAN DIEGO

[Signature]
J. P. Souza
Deputy City Manager

Properly sworn as to form and legality

[Signature]
JOHN M. WITT, City Attorney

By [Signature]
Deputy City Attorney

5-21-85
Date

R-263173
May 23, 1985
City Attorney
City Clerk

Council Docket of May 20, 1985 — UNANIMOUS CONSENT NO. 2

COUNCIL ACTION WAS: Reconsider Council's Action on ITEM-330 of May 14, 1985, proposed amendments to a Mitigation Agreement to Construction of Route 15 Freeway from 0.6 mile north of Route 805 to 0.5 mile south of Route 8.

COUNCIL VOTE WAS: 8-0. District 1 not present.

COUNCIL ACTION WAS: Amend action of May 14, 1985, to insert language in Paragraph 1 to state "subject to budget process" and to add the words "by Caltrans" to first paragraph on page 4. (See memo from City Attorney dated May 15, 1985, and the memo from Department of Transportation dated May 20, 1985 which are attached.)

COUNCIL VOTE WAS: 8-0. District 1 not present.

Please add the above amendments to the agreement approved by Resolution R-263173 on May 14, 1985.

CHARLES G. ABDELMOUR
City Clerk

By Ellen Bovard, Deputy

Enc. Copies of memos from City Attorney and Dept of Transportation.

R-263173
AMENDED
MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
TO AMEND MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING DATED SEPTEMBER 15, 1992
WHICH SUPPLEMENTED MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT DATED MAY 21, 1985
CONCERNING MITIGATION FOR
STATE ROUTE 15 (40TH STREET CORRIDOR)

The State of California, Department of Transportation (State) proposes to improve a 2.2 mile segment of State Highway Route 15 through a portion of the City of San Diego (City) along the 40th Street corridor in an area known as the Mid-City Community.

A MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT (MOA) for this project was signed on May 21, 1985. This Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) will supplement and supersede any conflicting portions of the May 21, 1985 agreement to include the features of the 40th Street Project Strip Map, Attachment 1, of City Manager's Report No. 92-198 issued June 11, 1992 (attached). Funding commitments, providing for the deposit of funds or specific work phases, will be covered by one or more separate cooperative agreements.

The following paragraphs include measures considered to satisfactorily mitigate the impacts of the project and city/state coordination details:

1. Federal funds of $5,000,000 from the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) will be used toward funding of bridge widenings and enhancements and possible park improvements.

2. $1,250,000 of non-federal funds must be available for match of the ISTEA demonstration funds. Every effort will be made by the State to obtain these funds from its own sources including from savings identified in project design. If State funds are not available for match, City funds from the Redevelopment Agency will be used.

3. By Council resolution on June 22, 1992, the City committed up to $2.5 million; and on August 4, 1992, the Council voted to commit an additional $2.5 million in redevelopment funds to provide for additional bridge widenings (see item #18 below). By Council action on August 9, 1993 the above $5,000,000 was withdrawn from this project due to lack of funds.
4. The City will develop and furnish sufficient conceptual park designs and secure local community reviews so that grading and development features to be included in the Caltrans contracts will conform to the City’s ultimate plan of use. The City will operate and maintain all park facilities.

5. Staff from the City, MTDB, and Caltrans will meet regularly with representatives from the Route 15 Construction Oversight Committee during the design and construction process to discuss proposed design for transit, structures, parks and city streets.

6. Caltrans will design and administer contracts for all project features and will regularly review the details of any features that are of special interest to the City and community with such City staff members and representatives from the Route 15 Construction Oversight Committee, or others that the City might designate. As a minimum, reviews will occur when plans are conceptual, 50%, and 90% complete. Caltrans will respond as appropriate to any comments received from the City. City standards will govern in those cases where the features will be relinquished to and maintained by the City. Examples of such features would include bike ways, transit, bridge enhancements and all park facilities and City street modifications, connections and transitions to City streets and landscaping or special signs on City streets. Caltrans will abide by the Streets and Highway Code. Structures and enhancements will meet or exceed the standards already established for the Wightman Street and Adams Avenue overcrossings in the Cooperative Agreement for Stage I signed December 9, 1991.

7. As much as practical and economically feasible as mutually determined by Caltrans and the City, Caltrans shall save existing palm trees to be displaced from the freeway corridor and replant them in the project area or within the same local communities. Caltrans will take the necessary steps to remove, store, and successfully replant the trees. The City’s landscape architect will assist Caltrans in choosing replanting locations.

8. Caltrans will secure funding for a landscaping project(s) to begin planting within 3 months following construction. Such funds are allocated by the California Transportation Commission. In addition to the requirements specified in Article 8 of the May, 1985 MOA, Caltrans will provide planting densities which exceed by 30% what is considered standard highway planting ($20,500 January, 1991 base estimate). Ground covers and/or shrub ground cover will cover the entire planting area. Shrubs will be planted at densities equivalent to those specified for container stock.
in the Land Development Ordinance. In addition to the emphasis on trees at the top of slopes, trees will be interspersed throughout the planting areas. Overhead watering for irrigation will be provided where appropriate. The landscape contractor will be responsible for landscape maintenance and the replacement of all injured and dead plants as determined by Caltrans in consultation with City for a period of one year after plant installation.

In recognition of City's request for above standard highway planting, and in lieu of city sharing in cost of added highway planting water costs, City desires to designate $400,000 of the ISTEA demonstration funds to the cost of the above landscaping project(s).

9. The City will secure slope, grading and drainage rights, and environmental clearance necessary for the STATE to place embankment in the ravine area northwest of Park de la Cruz if the City agrees that this would be desirable.

10. In addition to the work specified in Article 3 of the May 1985 MOA, Caltrans will perform the same type of park construction, install and relocate utilities and install lighting on the block of cover as well as the two park areas mentioned.

11. All water, water meter installations, and meter capacity charges for planted areas in parks, enhanced areas on structures and along city streets on the street side of walls or fences will be furnished by the City. Irrigation lines for such areas will not be connected through State meters. If reclaimed water becomes available in the future in a main along the Route 15 corridor, this water could be used for the irrigation needs inside and outside the freeway right of way. Irrigation systems will be designed to accommodate future reclaimed water.

12. The term "planting" in item #3 of the 1985 Memorandum of Agreement is clarified to include trees, shrubs, ground cover, grass, and overhead irrigation where appropriate as shown on the approved Park General Development Plans.

13. The block of cover will be graded with three feet (average depth) of soil that will be terraced or tapered to conform to the adjacent street elevations as the City may determine to be most appropriate. Soil may be graded to five-foot depth at spot locations for purposes of tree planting. Any future use, other than for public park purposes, would be subject to the stipulations in Article 4 of the May 1985 MOA.
14. The State will design, acquire the necessary property rights, install irrigation and plants along walls on street side and construct sidewalks, cul-de-sacs and parking areas on Central Avenue, Terrace Drive and 40th Street as shown on Attachment 1, of City Manager’s Report No. 92-198 issued June 11, 1992. Planting will be designed so that people cannot be concealed and design will conform to the City Landscape Ordinance.

15. The State will also acquire the necessary property rights and construct improvements to widen and provide right turn lanes on University Avenue approaching the freeway on-ramps a minimum of 150 feet east and west of the ramps. The State will alleviate the effects of ramp metering on local streets and provide funding for alleviation measures.

The City will notify State in writing if ramp metering at University Avenue, El Cajon Boulevard, and Adams Avenue on ramps are projected to cause level of service "F" on the city streets. State will submit corrective measures for City’s review and will apply for the necessary funds from statewide allocation in time to implement corrective measures before the projected problem occurs.

16. Overcrossing structures at University, Orange, El Cajon, Meade and the deck at Polk Avenue will accommodate without structural modifications any future undergrounding of existing aerial utilities. The Wightman structure is designed to accommodate these utilities.

17. The City and Caltrans will use their best efforts to provide for non-motorized access from Adams Avenue to Camino del Rio South within the Route 15 corridor. Caltrans will prepare a feasibility study and estimate of approximate cost for funding consideration by City and other agencies.

City to investigate the feasibility with SANDAG of providing a bikeway from Park della Cruz to Adams Avenue. Caltrans will cooperate on the investigation as to the use of 40th Street, Central Avenue, and/or Terrace Drive or other areas in the corridor that may be available for bicycle use by redesign of retaining walls for the bikeway.

18. The sidewalk and widened areas outside the face of curbs on the following structures will be funded using $5,000,000 federal demonstration grant funds; $1,250,000 non-Federal matching funds and state funds:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>WIDTH OUTSIDE OF SOUTH CURB TO BE FUNDED BY</th>
<th>WIDTH OUTSIDE OF NORTH CURB TO BE FUNDED BY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>DEMO &amp; MATCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY AVENUE</td>
<td>8.0'</td>
<td>47.0'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORANGE AVENUE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL CAJON BOULEVARD</td>
<td>10.0'</td>
<td>45.0'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEADE AVENUE</td>
<td>5.0'</td>
<td>10.0'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the bridge widenings, demonstration and matching funds will be used for additional enhancements along Wightman Street, University Avenue, Orange Avenue, El Cajon Boulevard, Meade Avenue, and Adams Avenue.

19. Any commercial use of widened structures will be subject to CTC approval including air rights lease payments.

20. State will offer city first refusal for purchase of excess property not needed for highway purposes that is independently developable. Property will be offered at fair market value.

21. The State having previously provided the Metropolitan Transit Development Board (MTDB) with a similar statement, also assures the City that, should MTDB adopt a future Light Rail Transit (LRT) or express bus system along SR-15, it shall be accommodated in the median, including the areas beneath the Wightman Street and Adams Avenue structures, without reducing the number of freeway lanes. This assurance is based on the LRT design criteria supplied to the State by MTDB staff and confirmed for its adequacy by State in coordination with City staff. Conditions to accommodate the LRT include the potential re-striping of lanes and/or shoulders and an upgrading of equipment to operate on the 6.3% grade north of Adams Avenue or else the construction of elevated structures approaching Mission Valley. In the design of University Avenue and El Cajon Boulevard overcrossings State will construct the structures to provide for the future need of elevators and/or escalators and/or stairs for light rail or bus transit access and will ensure they are not precluded from future construction including provisions for future utilities on widened structures.
22. Caltrans will design and build off ramps at University Avenue and El Cajon Boulevard to accommodate dedicated bus lanes and platforms in addition to automobile lanes as requested by MTDH. The bus lanes and platforms will be located between regular ramp lanes.

23. State will coordinate its landscaping and enhancement plans with the design projects currently underway on University Avenue, El Cajon Boulevard, and Adams Avenue, with the respective Business Improvement Association. State will ensure that the freeway corridor is consistent with the Mid-City Community Plan and Neighborhood Element through consultation with the appropriate recognized Planning Groups.

24. Caltrans will prepare cooperative agreements defining more specifically the responsibilities and costs of both parties for each phase of work requiring the expenditure of funds or staff services by Caltrans.

25. State and City will work with SR-15 construction oversight committee to discuss subjects raised by the community. Recommendations which resolve these subjects shall be considered for incorporation into either the Cooperative Agreement or an amendment to the Memorandum of Understanding as appropriate.

26. State will consider and discuss with city staff City’s request for freeway signs informing freeway users of various business districts. Consideration and discussions will not occur until State’s design of freeway signing commences, estimated to occur in late 1993.

27. State agrees to accept control of and maintain those portions of park deck found not safe for park purposes by an independent air quality study to be funded by the STATE, said study to be done within six months of time all freeway lanes are opened to traffic.

28. It is the State’s desire and intent to have this State Route 15 freeway construction project open to traffic by the end of calendar year 1998.

29. Neither STATE nor any officer or employee thereof shall be responsible for any damage or liability occurring by reason of anything done or omitted to be done by CITY under or in connection with any work, authority or jurisdiction delegated to CITY under this Memorandum of Understanding. It is also agreed that, pursuant to Government Code Section 895.4, CITY shall fully indemnify and hold STATE harmless from any liability imposed for injury (as defined by
Government Code Section 810.8) occurring by reason of anything done or omitted to be done by CITY under or in connection with any work, authority or jurisdiction delegated to CITY under this Memorandum of Understanding.

30. Neither CITY nor any officer or employee thereof shall be responsible for any damage or liability occurring by reason of anything done or omitted to be done by STATE under or in connection with any work, authority or jurisdiction delegated to STATE under this Memorandum of Understanding. It is also agreed that, pursuant to Government Code Section 895.4, STATE shall fully indemnify and hold CITY harmless from any liability imposed for injury (as defined by Government Code Section 810.8) occurring by reason of anything done or omitted to be done by STATE under or in connection with any work, authority or jurisdiction delegated to STATE under this Memorandum of Understanding.

It is understood that the provisions and conditions outlined above are subject to fund, budget, and project approvals by the CTC, the City Council, the Redevelopment Agency of the City of San Diego and the Federal Highway Administration with review by the Construction Oversight Committee.

EXECUTED:
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

By:  

[Signature]
Acting District Director

CITY OF SAN DIEGO

By:  

[Signature]
Jack McGroarty
City Manager

Approved as to form and legality this AUG 0 9 1993 day of

_____________________, 1993.

JOHN W. WITT
City Attorney

By

_____________________

K-282487
RESOLUTION NUMBER R-282487
ADOPTED ON AUG 9 1993

BE IT RESOLVED, by the Council of The City of San Diego, that the City Manager be and he is hereby authorized and empowered to execute, for and on behalf of said City, an Amended Memorandum of Understanding to Amend a Memorandum of Understanding Dated September 15, 1992 Which Supplemented a Memorandum of Agreement Dated May 21, 1985 Concerning Mitigation for State Route 15 (40th Street Corridor), with the State of California, Department of Transportation, to define responsibilities regarding bridge, deck, and freeway enhancements on State Route 15 in Mid-City, under the terms and conditions set forth in the Amended Memorandum of Understanding on file in the office of the City Clerk as Document No. RR-282487

APPROVED: JOHN W. WITT, City Attorney

By John K. Riess
Deputy City Attorney

JKR:pev
07/20/93
Or.Dept:E&D
R-94-111
Form=r.auaggr
Passed and adopted by the Council of The City of San Diego on AUG 09 1993 by the following vote:

YEAS: HARTLEY, STEVENS, BEHR, STALLINGS, MCCARTY, VARGAS, MAYOR GOLDMING.

NAYS: NONE.

NOT PRESENT: WOLFSHEIMER, ROBERTS.

AUTHENTICATED BY:

SUSAN GOLDMING
Mayor of The City of San Diego, California

CHARLES G. ABDELNOUR
City Clerk of The City of San Diego, California

(SEAL)

By: ____________________________, Deputy

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the above and foregoing is a full, true and correct copy of RESOLUTION NO. R-282487, passed and adopted by the Council of The City of San Diego, California on AUG 09 1993

CHARLES G. ABDELNOUR
City Clerk of The City of San Diego, California

(SEAL)

By: ____________________________, Deputy
9/2/93
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(Revised the Print only, keep the

Dear Mr. John Doe, X6697
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City

enhancement on State Route 15 in X4D-

regarding bridge, deck and lanes.

Transportation, to define responsibilities

State of California, Department of

Route 15 (Guth Street Corridor), with the
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Amended Agreement of Understanding for

(San Diego, California)

Office of the City Clerk

Filed August 9, 1993

DOCUMENT NO. 88-256487
July 10, 2007

File No.: 645.07.12678.A12048

Mr. Shelby Tucker
San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG)
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101

Dear Mr. Tucker:

Re: Project SCH# 2007051145, Notice of Preparation of Draft Environmental Impact Report - 2007 Regional Transportation Plan

Thank you for your Notice of Preparation (hereinafter NOP) of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the above-entitled project. Because of our statutorily mandated duties; i.e., the administration and enforcement of the laws and for the investigation of traffic accidents on all toll highways and state highways constructed as freeways, including transit-related facilities located on or along the rights-of-way of those toll highways or freeways, we have significant interest in the transportation proposals. We have been asked by our Special Projects Section to assess traffic related matters that may affect our area operations.

As you have indicated, the plan “contains public policies, strategies, projects and programs aimed at meeting the diverse mobility needs of the growing needs of the San Diego region through the year 2030.” We will await your DEIR before we offer any comments, criticisms or suggestions.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on your plan. If you have any questions regarding this letter and our comments, please contact Lt. Sean Barrett at (619) 220-5492.

Sincerely,

C. M. McGAGIN, Captain
Commander
San Diego Area

cc: Special Projects Section
Agenda Item #9: Public Scoping Meeting for Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report for the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan.

Questions and Comments included:

Mr. Chopyk asked what consultant is preparing the EIR. Ms. Tucker responded that it is being prepared by EDAW. Mr. Chopyk requested the name of the EIR project manager. Ms. Tucker responded that his name is Mr. Graham.

Ms. Gregor read comments from Diane Nygaard that were sent via e-mail questioning whether SANDAG had provided sufficient outreach on the NOP. Ms. Tucker responded by stating that a notice was sent to over 700 people and distributed to many of SANDAG’s working groups through e-mail. There have been two public scoping meetings, including this one. Notices have been posted on-line, in the San Diego Union Tribune, North County Times, San Diego Daily Transcript, La Prensa, Asian Journal, and announced at numerous committee and working group meetings.

Theresa Quiroz, resident of City Heights, agrees with the comments of Ms. Nygaard’s e-mail, and commented that the average person needs help understanding the process of environmental review. She furthered that a Regional Plan makes statements for areas that are very different. For example, in City Heights there is a park on top of the freeway and a school immediately adjacent. She stated that the RTP EIR does not take into account these local issues.

Joyce Brown, City Heights Development Corporation - Resident Services, stated that the park and elementary school just referred to are used by the children of her residents. She referenced a study completed by the children’s hospital that determined that the children in City Heights have the highest rate of asthma than those in any other city. She stated that her group represents stakeholders, and they should be notified about the meetings that directly affect them. She stated that City Heights has one of the highest levels of transit ridership in San Diego.

Chair Fritz requested the sign-in sheet be passed around once again to make sure the public attending the TWG meeting would be notified of future meetings.

Maria Cortez, President of Terra Alta West, spoke as a resident concerning the allergy and asthma issues affecting the residents of City Heights. She stated that the promises made to City Heights, such as the Centerline transit project, have not been realized. She pointed to the experiences of friends and family who would be taking the Centerline once it is available. She noted that there has been a lot of growth in City Heights, but that the transportation hasn’t kept up. She requested that City Heights not be forgotten in the transportation planning process.

Juan Antonio Ramirez, City Heights Community Development Corporation, referenced the Centerline project. Mr. Chopyk requested information concerning this project, and Mr. Ramirez provided a general background of the transit service. He commented that many of the City Heights residents he speaks with are willing to take transit if it is made available. He stated he supports the transit emphasis alternative of the RTP. He added that the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between Caltrans and the City of San Diego states that the section of Interstate I-15 in City Heights is not to handle big truck traffic loads. He requested that the RTP
further consider environmental concerns such as air quality, noise, and land use that directly impact City Heights.

Ms. Brown provided a quote from the MOU between Caltrans and the City of San Diego. She pointed to comments on the district requirement to mitigate noise, and assign truck traffic to I-805 from the I-15. She stated the MOU is supposed to stand for memorandum of understanding, but it really stands for method of usurping.

Mr. Chopyk asked about the parties involved in the MOU. Ms. Tucker requested that a copy of this memorandum be provided, and if comments could additionally be submitted in writing. Ms. Brown asked if the dates of the public workshops have been determined. Heather Werdick, SANDAG staff, responded that information regarding the public workshops will be distributed upon the release of the draft RTP, and the SANDAG Board will be discussing that on June 22nd. She stated that the workshops will most likely be held in the last two weeks of July, and discussions have been underway to further discuss the draft RTP at City Council and Planning Commission meetings.

Chair Fritz inquired about the inclusion of the Centerline project in the RTP. Ms. Werdick said the I-15 managed lanes project is included with the BRT and highway improvements in the Revenue Constrained and the Reasonably Expected Revenue Scenarios of the draft RTP. There are ongoing discussions concerning the status of the additional lanes, and once a determination is made, it will be finalized in the plan. Chair Fritz stated that the project is “sort of” included in the plan. Ms. Werdick responded that the final determination has not yet been included.

Ms. Cortez commented that at a past meeting, City Heights residents were told that the northbound lanes on the I-15 would be High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes, but that at another meeting, they were told that they would be BRT. Mr. Anderson from the City of San Diego said there have been meetings concerning this issue because it is important to have north/south public transit opportunities, but that the needs for goods movement complicate that.

Mr. Anderson further commented that environmental justice concerns regarding issues such as housing and school facilities are surfacing issues that have been seen through projects in Otay Mesa and Barrio Logan. He said the EIR should make sure to address the environmental justice issues especially due to recent research done in Los Angeles. He stated that the upcoming workshops are to help the communities understand the draft RTP, and requested a presentation for the Planning Commission of the City of San Diego. Mr. Batchelder commented that the freeway and freight movement issues will confront us all.

Ms. Quiroz asked if the decision concerning the Centerline project will be made before the EIR is completed. Ms. Werdick answered that SANDAG must first determine the project list for the environmental review. Then, input and comments from the public and from public agencies can be included in the final RTP. Chair Fritz stated that if the Centerline project was not included in the proposed project, it could be analyzed as an alternative. Ms. Werdick responded that this would be the case except in the no-build scenario.

Mr. Ramirez asked if the managed lanes on I-15 would only be north of SR 163. Ms. Werdick responded that they are north of SR 163 with one lane in each direction south of 163 that can be called a carpool lane or a BRT lane, but a final determination has not been made. Mr. Ramirez
said that the SANDAG Transportation Committee defined it as a BRT. Ms. Werdel referenced page 21 in the provided packet that outlines this in further detail. She stated that plans are not changed until there is a final determination made. Mr. Ramirez questioned the technical analysis on the Goods Movement Action Plan. He stated that the environmental issues should be more important than goods movement.

Paul Lare, resident of City Heights, stated that he rides the bus everyday and solicits input regarding transit operations. He stated that City Heights residents cannot get to doctors appointments. Some of these are schizophrenic and have serious ailments that rely on medical care. He addressed the elementary school adjacent to I-15 and stated that the school children are greatly affected by asthma. He stated that this subject revolves around three facets: money, politics, and the human interest. He stated that this is a golden opportunity for San Diego to move forward. We are looking at a city with the second largest population in California, and we need to promote change. The residents of City Heights need to be able to get to work, and take care of their health.

Ms. Brown added that Paul is a City Heights resident that is an example of the ability to mobilize the community. She stated that many residents are very interested in the community, and want to help.

Jon Brindle, City of Escondido, commented that one of the City of Escondido’s concerns is to ensure the designs provide for an efficient transition from the HOV lanes at SR 78 and I-15. He understands that the transit alternative has an alternate design which will not be as efficient, and he would like to document his concern regarding that particular issue.

Mr. Anderson asked if all scenarios are being evaluated equally in terms of CEQA analysis. Rob Rundle, SANDAG staff, responded that they are not being evaluated equally. The split between highways and managed lanes will be more closely analyzed. The other alternatives will be evaluated, but with less detail. Mr. Anderson further questioned if global warming impacts will be addressed. Mr. Rundle answered that this will be analyzed in the RTP and the program EIR. Mr. Anderson asked if a less detailed analysis of the transit first scenario would provide adequate information to analyze global warming impacts. Mr. Rundle answered that SANDAG has the outputs for that part of the analysis, but that we will not going to go into detail concerning issues such as habitat impacts and soil impacts. There will be a CO₂ and NOX comparison between alternatives. Mr. Anderson asked why the transit option is not being further analyzed. Mr. Rundle stated that this is based on the direction of the SANDAG Board, and if they choose to move forward with the transit alternative, there would be a more detailed analysis.

Mr. Chopyk asked if there are any federal funds involved in the project to determine if there is a need for National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) review. Mr. Rundle responded that the RTP is not subject to NEPA, but that the specific projects would be. Chair Fritz asked if this is set up for a two-tier EIR process. Mr. Rundle said that that would be ideal, but that that was not the direction of the Board.

Mr. Lare asked if the BRT utilizes federal funding because he would like to influence our congressional representatives. Ms. Werdel answered that most bus routes do receive federal funds.