APPENDIX E
COMMENT LETTERS AND RESPONSES
## INDEX TO COMMENT LETTERS ON THE DRAFT EIR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency/Organization</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Letter reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Agency</strong></td>
<td>California Department of Toxic Substances Control</td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Del Mar</td>
<td>A2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Escondido</td>
<td>A3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Poway</td>
<td>A4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>A5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board</td>
<td>A6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization/Business</strong></td>
<td>City Heights CDC</td>
<td>B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friends of Batiquitos Lagoon</td>
<td>B2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Move San Diego - Chase</td>
<td>B3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Move San Diego - DeLano</td>
<td>B4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Native American Heritage Commission</td>
<td>B5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pardee Homes</td>
<td>B6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rancho Bernardo Community Planning Board</td>
<td>B7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation Corridor Agencies</td>
<td>B8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Center for Biological Diversity</td>
<td>B9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual</strong></td>
<td>Tom Bartley</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michael Bullock</td>
<td>C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anna G. Daniels</td>
<td>C3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert J. Hoffman</td>
<td>C4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Kacmar</td>
<td>C5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dagmar Landel</td>
<td>C6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diane Nygaard (9-30-2007)</td>
<td>C7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diane Nygaard (10-5-2007)</td>
<td>C8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theresa Quiroz</td>
<td>C9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Denise Steen</td>
<td>C10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

A1-1 To the extent that the environmental database report provides information pertaining to current and former activities on properties within the study area that may be of potential environmental concern, this issue was addressed adequately at this planning level stage of analysis in Section 4.12.2. During completion of the project-specific EIRs pertaining to areas located within the boundaries of the RTP, more detailed information can be provided through conducting site reconnaissances, reviewing historical sources (e.g., historical aerial photographs, Sanborn fire insurance maps, building permits), and conducting interviews with site representatives.

A1-2 This issue was addressed adequately at this planning level stage of analysis in Sections 4.12.2 and 4.12.5. During completion of the project-specific EIRs pertaining to areas located within the boundaries of the RTP, more detailed information can be provided through conducting site reconnaissances, reviewing historical sources (e.g., historical aerial photographs, Sanborn fire insurance maps, building permits), conducting interviews with site representatives, and reviewing files at pertinent regulatory agencies.

The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) has received your submitted Public Notice of Availability of an Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the above-mentioned project. The following project description is stated in your document:

"The 2007 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 Draft EIR addresses issues at a program-level and does not identify impacts associated with specific projects. Subsequent individual project actions would be evaluated on a project-by-project basis."

DTSC provided comments to SANDAG on the Notice of Preparation of the DEIR on June 28, 2007, as follows:

A1-1

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).
This issue was addressed in Section 4.12.3.

This issue was addressed in Section 4.12.7 under HM-MM-3i.
This issue was addressed in Section 4.12.7 under HM-MM-3i.

A sentence indicating that appropriate precautions should be taken prior to construction if the proposed project is located within a "border zone property" was added to Section 4.12.7 under MM-HM-3i.

This issue was addressed in Section 4.12.7 under HM-MM-3i.

The issue pertaining to proper disposal of contaminated soil was addressed in Section 4.12.7 under MM-HM-4. A sentence recommending sampling of imported soil was added to Section 4.12.7 under MM-HM-3i.

This issue was addressed in Section 4.12.7 under HM-MM-3i.

The issue pertaining to proper management of hazardous waste was addressed in Section 4.12.7 under MM-HM-3i.

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.

Your document states: Implementation of the proposed 2007 RTP, including future development of highways, transit, and bicycle facilities, would require compliance with federal, state, and local regulations and procedures pertaining to hazardous substances and wastes. 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.

If buildings, other structures, or associated uses; 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.

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.

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.

If it is determined that hazardous waste 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...
A1-10 Division 20, Chapter 6.5 and the Hazardous Waste Control Regulations (California Code of Regulations, Title 22, Division 4.5).

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) 484-5423 to initiate pre-application discussions and determine the permitting process applicable to the facility.

A1-11 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.

A1-12 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).

A1-13 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.

A1-14 If the site was used for agricultural, cattle ranching 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.

A1-15 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 Tasnifi-Abbas, DTSC's Voluntary Cleanup Coordinator, at (714) 484-5499 for the VCA.

A1-17 A sentence regarding obtaining an appropriate permit from the DTSC was added to Section 4.12.7 under MM-HM-3i.

A1-12 A sentence regarding obtaining an identification number from the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) if hazardous wastes will be generated was added to Section 4.12.7 under MM-HM-3i.

A1-13 A sentence regarding obtaining authorization from the Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA) if hazardous waste treatment processes will be required by the project was added to Section 4.12.7 under MM-HM-3i.

A1-14 This issue was addressed in Section 4.12.7 under HM-MM-3i.

A1-15 This issue was addressed in Section 4.12.7 under HM-MM-3i.

A1-16 This issue was addressed in Section 4.12.7 under HM-MM-3i.

A1-17 The Envirostor database was discussed in Section 4.12.2 under "State/Local Databases." A sentence regarding the fact that DTSC can provide guidance for cleanup oversight through an Environmental Oversight Agreement (EOA) or Voluntary Cleanup Agreement (VCA) was added to Section 4.12.7 under MM-HM-3i.
Mr. Shelby Tucker  
October 9, 2007  
Page 5  

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

Sincerely,

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  
gmoskal@dtsc.ca.gov

CEQA#1798
A2-1 Several comments on the Draft 2030 RTP questioned the ultimate improvements planned for the coastal rail corridor, including double-tracking and the Del Mar tunnel. In 2004, Caltrans and the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) released a draft program environmental impact report / environmental impact statement (PEIR/EIS) for the cumulative impacts in the entire corridor and plan to finalize the document by late 2007. Alternatives were evaluated in the PEIR/EIS and one that was eliminated was an Interstate 5 alignment. Primary reasons were related to constructability, right-of-way, and environmental and visual considerations. It is the intent of SANDAG and other corridor rail agencies to use the PEIR/EIS as the long-range rail plan to conduct project-level studies or make improvements to the rail corridor. Language will be added to the Final 2030 RTP to indicate that in areas where a preferred alignment has not been chosen, detailed project-specific environmental work will be completed. Furthermore, improvement projects that are programmed and will be constructed over the next 5 to 10 years include the Santa Margarita Bridge Replacement and Second Main Track Project and the Del Mar Bluffs Stabilization Project.

A2-2 Comment noted. The EIR did analyze project alternatives with an increased emphasis on transit.

---

September 17, 2007

Shelley Tucker
Associate Regional Planner
SANDAG
601 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101

SUBJECT: COMMENTS ON THE EIR FOR THE 2007 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Dear Mr. Tucker,

The City of Del Mar is pleased to provide our comments to SANDAG on the recently released 2007 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) EIR. The City of Del Mar generally concurs with the elements being proposed in the RTP; however, we would like the following items to be considered as part of the plan implementation:

Coastal Rail Improvement Program (2-16) and Goods Movement Action Plan (Table 2.6-5)
- The RTP included under the reasonably available funds $470 million for Coastal Del Mar/Encanto Hill Tunnel. The City of Del Mar has significant concerns with the proposal to put the railroad tunnel under the town of Del Mar and requests that during the initial environmental process that a full study of the I-5 alignment for railroad be included and that the City of Del Mar be a participant in the EIR process.

General – The City of Del Mar appreciates the emphasis that the RTP places on Mobility, Livability and Efficiency. However, we believe that more funds should be spent on transit alternatives and options. This would include more rail and bus improvements and stronger encouragement of pedestrian-oriented developments and communities through some funds for local agencies and stronger land use guidelines.

Again the City of Del Mar appreciates the efforts by SANDAG to put together this very comprehensive plan that looks toward 2030 with a vision to improve livability in the San Diego Region while protecting the environment we live in and that our children will inherit.

Sincerely,

David Driskill
Deputy Mayor
City of Del Mar

Cc: City Council Members
Lauraine Brekke-Etrasan, City Manager
Linda S. Niles, Planning & Community Development Director
David Nenner, Public Works Director
Carmen Kaspar, City Engineer

Telephone: (858) 755-9393 • Fax: (858) 755-2794
Caltrans and SANDAG are working with the corridor cities to identify projects to provide more immediate relief to the existing SR 78/I-15 interchange. SANDAG will work with the corridor cities to initiate a corridor study to identify the long-term needs and ultimate improvements in the corridor. Language about the future SR 78 corridor study will be added to the RTP in Appendix F, Related Studies/Reports.

It is agreed that a project-level EIR would be required in order to address the potential environmental impacts of the referenced light rail extension and transit facility. The range of environmental issues evaluated in this environmental document would be determined through preparation of an Initial Study.
The 70 dBA standard for the City of Escondido in Table 4.6-3 is the high end of the conditionally acceptability range. Land use planning decisions are made by the land use jurisdictions such as the City of Escondido, and uses in the conditional range should not be approved if conditions do not warrant approval. SANDAG concurs that all efforts should be made to maintain noise levels below the conditionally acceptable range, in the lower range, which is commonly identified as generally acceptable.

I would also like to point out that 70 dBA should not be used as the planning criteria for any new facilities. The LADWP correctly notes that 70 dBA is at the high end of acceptability but fails to note that 60 dBA is the desired level for exterior noise. Reliance on the 70 dBA standard to determine significance should be limited to situations where only minor increases occur to existing situations.

We would like to thank you for the opportunity to comment on the RTP DEIR. It was very helpful that it, along with the appendices were posted on the SANDAG website. Please feel free to call me at (760) 839-4545 if you have any questions or would like any clarification. We look forward to working with SANDAG, CALTRANS, and other jurisdictions to implement the RTP once approved.

Sincerely,

Jonathan Brindile, AICP
Director of Community Development

cc: Charles Grimm, Assistant City Manager
    Edward Dominguez, PE Acting Director of Public Works
    Rob Zane, PE Deputy Director of Public Works
    Joyce Masterson, Assistant to the City Manager
Comment noted. This correction will be made in the Final EIR.

The referenced statement will be amended in the Final EIR to encompass the entire community.

The graphic is correct. The predicted ADT for SR 241 is projected to be 13,000.

The Reasonably Expected Revenue scenario in the RTP includes $12.9 billion of the overall $58 billion to enhance the local street and road network, which includes operational improvements such as integrated management systems to optimize intersection movements and traffic signal progression.

SANDAG will consider bikeway design issues in the regional bike plan to be completed in the coming year and will consider a wider standard at that time.
A4-6  SANDAG will reevaluate all the regional bikeway corridors in the context of the Regional Bike Plan and will identify an alternative at that time. In the mean time, the eastern section of that alignment can be eliminated. This modification would not change the conclusions or significance of impacts identified in the EIR.

A4-7  Comment noted.

A4-8  While widening SR 67 to four lanes is included in the RTP (Page 2-11), Caltrans is completing an analysis of more immediate safety improvements to the highway. The study is due before the end of 2007.

A4-9  The base population used in the forecasting models comes directly from the California Department of Finance, which we are obligated to use. Short-term fluctuations in the rate of population growth are to be expected, but do not invalidate the long-term growth trend. Therefore the 2030 population projection is valid.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the EIR for the 2007 RTP. Please contact me at (951) 686-4657 or lyon@ci.poway.ca.us if you have additional questions regarding our comments.

Sincerely,

Jim Lyon
Senior Planner

c: Patti Brindle, Interim Director of Development Services
Frank Castelenuoto, City Engineer
Zoubir Ouadah, Senior Traffic Engineer
At this time, the sum of the jurisdictions' lands planned for residential development does not meet the expected demand for housing. Thus, approximately 100,000 units housing one or more San Diego region workers must be located outside, but near, the region. These workers constitute expected increases in interregional commuting. SANDAG did look at an alternative land use scenario based upon the Board-accepted Smart Growth Concept Map. This alternative land use scenario did impose additional jobs/housing balance within the region and was included in the RTP, but not analyzed in the EIR as it was not a reasonable alternative due to the fact that SANDAG does not have land use authority. This topic is discussed on page 4.1-23 of the DEIR.

The differences between the existing policies land use assumptions and the land use assumptions used in the Smart Growth Concept Map were assessed in Section 4.1.3 of the DEIR. In general, the Smart Growth Concept Map assumptions increased the number of housing units that could be built within the region by approximately 85,000 compared to what is allowed under existing plans and policies.
Traffic impacts related to future congestion were determined by comparing existing levels of peak period freeway congestion with modeled peak period freeway congestion conditions in 2030. Significance Criterion-TC-1 was then applied. Under this criterion, a significant traffic circulation impact would be identified if 2030 RTP implementation would substantially increase the percent of congested peak period freeway travel conditions. It was determined that a substantial increase would not occur (DEIR Pg. 4.4-11). This modeled outcome is consistent with the Mobility and Efficiency goals of the RTP.

Please see response to comment B4-6 below. The DEIR identifies the percentage of peak period freeway travel that would be subject to "congested conditions (i.e., LOS E or F).

As of the date of the NOP, GP 2020 policies had yet to be confirmed by the County Board of Supervisors. On page 4.1-16, the EIR detailed how SANDAG anticipated the currently changing land use policies in the unincorporated areas. As described in the document, the results of the 2030 Regional Growth Forecast Update in the unincorporated areas were reviewed in detail and approved by County staff. The capacity information determined through the growth forecasting process was used in developing the subregional forecast, which served as a basis for the Proposed 2030 RTP.

As noted on page 4.1-27 in the EIR, there is a notable inconsistency with the existing adopted County of San Diego General Plan, where facilities needed to support currently adopted land use patterns are not provided (e.g., a widened SR 76 east of I-15 and a widened I-8 from Los Coches to Willows Road). The need for these facilities will be examined in all future updates to the RTP.
Attachment A  June 25, 2007 NOP Comment Letter
Attachment B  Comparison of OP2020 Traffic Model Assumptions with 2007 RTP Update

cc:  Megan Jones, CAO Staff Officer, DCAO, M.S. A-6
     Prisilla Jacekowitch, Administrative Secretary, Department of Planning and Land Use
     Nick Ortiz, Department of Public Works, M.S. O314
     Bobbie Stephenson, Department of Planning and Land Use, M.S. O650
June 25, 2007

Shirley Tucker
Associate Regional Planner
SANDAG
401 B Street, Suite 609
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). 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 have 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.

Kids - The Environment - Safe and Livable Communities

Attachment A
5. 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-encumbered General Plan 2030 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 destinations 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 Alternative, the EIR should also address a joint travel/lane balance alternative. The joint travel/lane balance alternative might address congestion issues in the highly urbanized area. A joint travel/lane balance throughout the region has the potential to reduce commute 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 (LOSs) operations from the unincorporated communities to the employment areas 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-56 and SR-76.

12. The EIR should address the Year 2030 land use and roadway network assumptions for the County's East County area. The majority of the lands in the East County area are designated for Industrial and Technology Business Park uses which are currently vacant or undeveloped. SANDAG and the County should develop the Year 2030 land use and roadway network assumptions for the County's East County area which will be critical for identifying the future transportation needs.

13. The EIR should assess the future transportation needs of the Clay Mesa region and its impact on regional economic growth.

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 the current County policies.
June 29, 2007

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 arteries in the North County communities due to commutes likely 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 the 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 (619) 674-4762.

Sincerely,

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

cc: Vince Niccetti, CAC Staff Officer, DCAO, MS A-6
Robert Gorelko, County Traffic Engineer, Department of Public Works, MS 0334
Nick Ortiz, Project Manager, Department of Public Works, MS 0334
Jennifer Campisi, Land Use Environmental Planner, DPLU, MS 0600
Pricilla Jakowics, Administrative Secretary, DPLU, MS 0610
### Attachment B

**Comparison of GP2019 Traffic Model Assumptions with 2007 RTP Update**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-680</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-80</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-101</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:**
- **I-680**: Contra Costa Expressway
- **I-80**: Interstate 80
- **US-101**: U.S. Highway 101
October 4, 2007

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

Dear Ms. Tucker:

SUBJECT: Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan (SCH# 2007051145).

The San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (SDRWQCB) appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The project proposes to update the 2003 RTP, and address all forms, or modes of transportation including automobiles, public transit, bicycles, pedestrians, and inter-city roads. The RTP contains public policies, strategies, projects and programs aimed at meeting the mobility needs of the growing San Diego Region through the year 2030.

Our comments are submitted in compliance with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines §15066 requiring responsible agencies to focus on shortcomings in the document, and on additional alternatives or mitigations that should be included in the DEIR. The SDRWQCB recognizes that the RTP is a planning document, and it is difficult to accurately quantify potential impacts to waters of the state as a result of implementation of the RTP. Therefore, the comments provided below are of a general and regional nature.

The SDRWQCB regulates discharges of wastes in order to protect the quality of waters of the State, broadly defined as “the chemical, physical, biological, bacteriological, radiological, and other properties and characteristics of water which affects its use.” Implementation of the proposed RTP is likely to result in a number of discharges, including:

1 California Water Code, §13050.
Early consultation with the SDRWQCB, for subsequent specific project plans is encouraged, as project reconfiguration may be required to avoid and minimize impacts to State waters. The above list identifies some of the discharges that would require coverage by a permit issued by the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) or the SDRWQCB:

Effects of Urban Development on Water Quality

The RTP is an important tool for managing the water quality effects of urban development, and an essential consideration for the SDRWQCB's work on effective regional control of nonpoint source pollution, storm water pollution, and water quality certification. Most water quality impacts of urban development may be most effectively avoided by directing the location, pattern, and design of the development, rather than through more traditional methods of regulation. Many of the intractably degraded waters currently on the State Water Board's '303d List' of impaired waterbodies are degraded by conditions most directly within the purview of local and regional planning agencies.

Implementation of the RTP may impact water quality in watersheds located throughout the San Diego Region. Watersheds are complex natural systems in which physical, chemical, and biologic components interact to create the beneficial uses of water resources. Poorly planned urban development upsets the natural interactions of these components and degrades water quality through a complex web of interrelated effects.
The primary impacts on water quality from poorly planned urban development projects include:

- **Direct impacts** – the direct physical impacts of filling and excavation work upon wetlands, riparian areas, and other waters of the State;
- **Pollutants** – the generation of urban pollutants during and after construction;
- **Hydrologic Modification** – the alteration of flow regimes and groundwater recharge by impervious surfaces and stormwater collection and conveyance systems;
- **Watershed-level effects** – the disruption of watershed-level aquatic functions, including pollutant removal, floodwater retention, and habitat connectivity.

These impacts typically degrade water quality, increase peak flows and risk of flooding, and destabilize stream channel systems (resulting in engineered solutions to correct disrupted flow patterns), and the near-total loss of natural functions of surface water systems in the affected basins.

The State and Regional Water Boards are primarily responsible for the coordination and control of water quality. The CEQA process provides for RVWQCB to use this tool to accomplish this statutory responsibility. Additional technical information germane to our statutory responsibilities is provided in the attachments to this letter. As implementation of the RTP proceeds from the programmatic level to the individual project level, the project level CEQA documents should incorporate the information and analyses from the following Attachments to this letter:

- **Attachment 1. Urban Development: Potential Water Quality Impacts and Required Analyses.** Outlines and diagrams the potential effects of land development on water quality and identifies related information needs.
- **Attachment 2. Low Impact Development References.** Lists documents providing guidance on principles and practices to avoid water quality and quantity problems associated with urban development.
- **Attachment 3. Terrestrial Habitat Connectivity Related To Wetland, Riparian, and Other Aquatic Resources.** Provides information and references on the importance of stream corridors, wetlands, and other waters in maintaining local and regional habitat connectivity.

**Scope and Level of Needed Analyses**

The project specific CEQA analyses, for projects included in the RTP, should characterize the cumulative, direct, and indirect impacts to the quality of waters of the

---

2 Water Code section 13001
Impact-avoidance measures as described throughout Section 4.9.6 are proposed to protect water quality and resources from the construction and operation associated with the proposed facilities.

The use of LID is required under mitigation measure MM-Water-1g on page 4.9-29.

Impact-avoidance measures as described throughout Section 4.9.6 are proposed to protect water quality and resources from the construction and operation associated with the proposed facilities.

The use of LID is required under mitigation measure MM-Water-1g on page 4.9-29.

Impact-avoidance measures as described throughout Section 4.9.6 are proposed to protect water quality and resources from the construction and operation associated with the proposed facilities.

The use of LID is required under mitigation measure MM-Water-1g on page 4.9-29.
This information is presented in Figure 4.9-2: Regional Perspective of Major Capital Projects and San Diego Basin Watershed.

3. Identification of Affected Waters

A clear understanding of the location and nature of the waters potentially affected by future projects included in the RTP is fundamental to protecting the quality of those waters.

Future project specific CEQA documents should:

a. Provide a planning area scale map and general description of all waters potentially affected by projects included in the RTP, tabulated and organized by watershed (drainage basin) and waterbody type, e.g., wetlands, riparian areas (as defined by the National Academy of Sciences), streams, other surface waters, and groundwater basins (a greater level of discrimination is usually appropriate, e.g., of wetland type).

b. For surface waters expected to be directly affected by projects authorized by the RTP, identify approximate acreage and, for drainage or shoreline features, number of linear feet potentially impacted, and sum the total affected acres and linear feet by waterbody type.

c. Identify at planning area scale any "isolated" wetlands or other waters excluded from federal jurisdiction by court decisions.  

*Riparian areas are transitional between terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems and are distinguished by gradients in biophysical conditions, ecological process, and biota. They are areas through which surface and subsurface hydrology connect water bodies with their adjacent uplands. They include those portions of terrestrial ecosystems that significantly influence exchanges of energy and matter with aquatic ecosystems (i.e., a zone of influence). Riparian areas are adjacent to perennial, intermittent, and ephemeral streams, lakes, and estuarine-marine shorelines" (National Research Council. Riparian Areas: Functions and Strategies for Management. National Academy of Sciences, Washington, D.C. 2002). Riparian areas are created and maintained by periodic inundation by overbank flood flows from the adjacent surface water bodies.


California Environmental Protection Agency

*Recycled Paper
4. Habitat Connectivity Analysis

Riparian corridors and other waters within the regulatory purview of the SDRWQCB play an important role in maintaining habitat connectivity. Both aquatic and terrestrial habitat may be fragmented by impacts to streams, riparian areas, or other waters.

Future project specific CEQA documents should:

a. Analyze the regional importance of riparian corridors in and along waterbodies, the potential effect of disrupting such corridors, and the potential for enhancing such corridors through mitigation measures.

b. Include information regarding any sensitive plant and animal species that likely utilize the riparian corridors.

c. Identify any impacts to riparian habitats or other waters that could compromise future remediation of existing connectivity barriers.

d. To effectively perform the required analyses, specific projects should consider the information and literature referenced in Attachment 3, Terrestrial Habitat Connectivity Related To Wetland, Riparian, and Other Aquatic Resources, including recent data on the role of riparian corridors as movement corridors in California.

Use of Bioengineering Techniques for Stream Bank Stabilization

The SDRWQCB strongly supports the use of bioengineering stabilization practices (e.g., live staking or fascines, live brush mattresses, vegetated riprap, vegetated articulated concrete blocks) as described in mitigation measure MM-Water-1f. When feasible, these types of techniques should receive priority consideration over more conventional engineering techniques (grouted riprap, channel armoring) used to stabilize stream banks.

Restoration of Channelized Watercourses

As discussed in Section 4.10.3 (SC-Bio-2), projects included in the RTP would have substantial permanent and temporary impacts to aquatic resources throughout the region. Mitigation for the permanent impacts to wetlands, in compliance with State’s policy requiring “No Net Loss” of wetlands, will be a very difficult task. The SDRWQCB strongly supports, whenever feasible, the restoration of channelized, hardscaped water courses by removal of concrete lined conveyances to restore the original stream morphology and ecological functions (as described in mitigation measure MM-Water-3a). Mitigation opportunities for creation of wetlands are less common every day.
A6-6 (cont.)  Restoration of channelized water courses should be included in each analysis, and implemented where feasible, for all projects included in the RTP.

Thank you for providing the SDRWQCB with this opportunity to comment on the DEIR for the Regional Transportation Plan. We welcome the opportunity to work with SANDAG to make the transportation projects implemented under the RTP examples of outstanding environmental sustainability in California. If we may clarify any of our comments or be of further assistance, please contact Christopher Means of my staff at (650) 637-5581 or cmmeans@waterboards.ca.gov.

Respectfully,

[Signature]

JOHN R. ODERMATT, P.G.
Senior Engineering Geologist

JRO: cjm

Enclosures:

Attachment 1, Urban Development: Potential Water Quality Impacts and Required Analyses.

Attachment 2, Low Impact Development References

Attachment 3, Terrestrial Habitat Connectivity Related To Wetland, Riparian, and Other Aquatic Resources
INTRODUCTION

This Attachment consists of a table and a diagram showing how urban development can affect water quality, and the information needed to predict and manage the impacts. Pollution pathways are described and diagrammed at the level of detail at which potential effects can be analyzed and management measures applied. The table and diagram are described (and in electronic version hyperlinked) below.

Watersheds are complex natural systems in which physical, chemical, and biologic components interact to create and maintain the beneficial uses of water on which society's well being and economy depend. Similarly, disturbances to natural watershed dynamics caused by urban development degrade water quality through a complex of interconnected causes and effects. Unmanaged, these pollution pathways ultimately destroy the physical, chemical, and biological integrity of the watersheds in which they occur, diminishing or destroying the beneficial uses.

The table and diagram are:

Table 1. Potential Effects Of Urban Development On Beneficial Uses and Required Analyses outlines the causes of water quality degradation caused by urban development, provides literature citations for each of the effects, and identifies for each effect the project-specific information needed to assess and mitigate its adverse impact to water quality.

Figure 1. Potential Effects Of Urban Development On Beneficial Uses flowcharts the causes and effects listed in Table 1. It begins on the left with three activities which are associated with urbanization: filling, construction (active construction and post-construction phases), and channelization. Figure 1 ends on the right with the resulting impaired beneficial uses and the potential for increased maintenance and property damage. In between are intermediate processes. Cause-and-effect relationships are shown by arrows.
### TABLE 1

**Potential Effects of Urban Development on Beneficial Uses and Required Analyses**

Urban development degrades water quality through a complex of interrelated causes and effects.

How to Use this Table. Table 1 outlines the pollution pathways potentially associated with urban development, provides literature citations for each cause-and-effect relationship, and identifies the information needed to assess and manage potential effects on a project-specific basis. The pollution pathways are described at the level of detail at which project-specific potential effects can be analyzed and management measures applied. The same analysis can also be applied more broadly at a general level, e.g., to urban development that would be authorized under a land-use general plan. This Table is comprised of three worksheet sub-tables described below. (In the electronic version of this table, the sub-tables are accessed via tabs at the bottom of the page).

The "Potential Water Quality Impacts and Required Analyses" worksheet displays the potential causes and effects (in the "Cause" and "Effect" columns respectively) of water quality degradation associated with urban development and the information needed to assess and manage project-specific effects (the "Needed Analysis" column). Because of the complex nature of watershed dynamics, many "effects" are also "causes" along the pollution pathways, and the number in square brackets listed with each "effect" cross-reference to its enumerated place in the "Cause" column. Additionally, each of the "effects" is footnoted, and the footnote number refers to the associated note in the "Notes" sub-table.

A related flow-chart diagram (Figure 1, "Potential Effects of Urban Development on Beneficial Uses") graphically displays these cause-and-effect relationships.

The "Notes" worksheet displays the summary literature citations for each of the "effects" in the "Potential Water Quality Impacts..." sub-table, keyed to the numeric footnotes in the "Effects" column.

The "References" worksheet displays the full literature citations, indexed by author.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAUSE</th>
<th>EFFECT</th>
<th>NEEDED ANALYSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. FILL &amp; EXCAVATION</td>
<td>Decreased Flood Storage. [4]</td>
<td>1) Quantify reduced flood storage in each affected basin&lt;br&gt;2) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fill on or excavation in wetlands, riparian areas, or other waters of the state.</td>
<td>Fill can impinge on natural storage, volume of ephemeral, intermittent, and perennial channels, backwaters, and wetlands, reducing capacity to retain run-off.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Change in Groundwater Storage. [10]</td>
<td>Fill and excavation can decrease groundwater recharge and cause lower water tables by changing soil percolation characteristics and reducing the area of standing water in recharge basins.</td>
<td>1) Quantify groundwater response to changes in percolation&lt;br&gt;2) Identify locations where linear alignments could act as a conduit to drain groundwater and locally lower watertables&lt;br&gt;3) Identity mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fill and excavation can bury or remove vegetation and can change site features to prevent reestablishment of characteristic species.</td>
<td>1) Identify and map types and areas extents of affected vegetation&lt;br&gt;2) Identify mitigation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUSE</td>
<td>EFFECT</td>
<td>NEEDED ANALYSES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Production of Urban Pollutants.</td>
<td>Construction can produce pollutants through improper use and disposal of toxic construction materials.</td>
<td>1) Identify mitigation for inclusion in stormwater pollution prevention plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| B. Change in Soil Erosion.                 | Active construction can dramatically increase soil erosion by exposing and overexposing soils. Unknown is compounds by the increased runoff typically accompanying construction. | 1) Identify location and extent of planned grading. Display proximity to slope relationships to receiving drainage.  
2) Document exposure of soils and subsoils in areas proposed for grading.  
3) Quantify amount and duration of increased sediment loads to each affected drainage.  
4) Identify mitigation. |
| C. Increased Runoff.                       | Construction can increase both the total and peak volume of stormwater runoff by removing vegetation, connecting soil, eroding surface soil, creating steep graded slopes, and eliminating terrain depressions and ephemeral and intermittent drainages that would naturally slow the movement of stormwater. | 1) Identify total and peak volumes of increased runoff for each affected drainage.  
2) Identify mitigation. |
| D. Impaired Beneficial Uses.               | Projects which fragment habitat and reduce wildlife movement along riparian and other corridors. They can degrade remaining patches of wetlands and other habitat by changing their physical characteristics and by isolating and exposing small populations of plants and animals, resulting in local or regional extinctions. | 1) Characterize and map at project-area and regional scales existing wetlands, along with riparian corridors and other water features supporting habitat connectivity.  
2) Identify effects of construction on terrestrial and aquatic habitat connectivity (refer to Enclosure 3).  
3) Identify mitigation. |
| 2A. CONSTRUCTION                           | Clearing, grading, and construction of structures and facilities. |  |

2B. POST-CONSTRUCTION  

Ongoing effects of constructed environment.  

A. Dry weather discharge.  

Construction can cause dry season "nuisance" runoff from activities such as landscaping irrigation, driveway and vehicle washing, and basement dewatering.  

1) Characterize volumes, seasonality, and other pertinent characteristics of "nuisance" flows for each affected drainage.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAUSE</th>
<th>EFFECT</th>
<th>NEEDED ANALYSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Increased Groundwater Pumping. [6]</td>
<td>Construction can cause increased groundwater pumping for domestic or landscape use.</td>
<td>1) Identify and map locations of increased pumping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Production of Urban Pollutants. [7]</td>
<td>After construction, urban areas can generate pollutants, nutrients, oxygen demanding substances, heavy metals, petroleum hydrocarbons, bacteria, viruses, and other pollutants from activities such as landscape care and vehicle operation and maintenance.</td>
<td>1) Quantify projected increase in pollution production in each affected basin. 2) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Change in Soil Erosion. [8]</td>
<td>After construction, erosion can be reduced to below natural levels because soils are covered with buildings and pavement, and runoff is routed through storm drains.</td>
<td>1) Identify and map locations of soil erosion. 2) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Increased Runoff. [9]</td>
<td>After construction, maintained landscapes and impervious surfaces such as roofs and driveways increase total and peak runoff. The increased flows move quickly over paved surfaces and are collected, concentrated, and further accelerated in storm drain systems. The combination of increased flows and more frequent transport causes a more &quot;flashy&quot; hydrograph, especially for smaller, more frequent floods.</td>
<td>1) Identify and map locations of increased runoff. 2) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. CHANNELIZATION

Reengineered changes in flow conveyance.

<p>| A. Decreased Flood Storage. [10] | Channelization can reduce flood storage within a basin by restricting flows to the active channel, thereby preventing detention of floodwater in backwaters and on the adjacent floodplain. | 1) Quantify and map reductions in flood storage in each affected basin. 2) Identify mitigation. |
| B. Change in Groundwater Storage. [11] | Lifting channel bottoms can change groundwater storage by reducing percolation and groundwater recharge. Deepening natural channels can drain adjacent shallow water tables. | 1) Quantify and map locations of reduction in recharge rates. 2) Consider effects on channelization on shallow water tables and associated wetlands. 3) Identify mitigation. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAUSE</th>
<th>EFFECT</th>
<th>NEEDED ANALYSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C. Channel Destabilization</td>
<td>Channelization can cause channel destabilization by changing the balance between the stream’s flow, sediment load, and channel form. Destabilization tends to affect entire stream systems. For example, channelization can concentrate and synchronize peak flows from tributary streams, causing increased channel erosion both above and below the channelized reach. The eroded sediment is then deposited downstream when the flow slows down, where it may initiate further destabilization.</td>
<td>1) Identify basin-wide hydrologic and flow geometric effects of channelization in each affected drainage. 2) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Increased Flooding Frequency</td>
<td>Constricted channels (e.g., in leveed sections) can cause water to back up, resulting in localized upstream flooding. Rapid passage of floodwaters through “improved” channels can increase flooding downstream by concentrating and synchronizing tributary peaks.</td>
<td>1) Quantify basin-level hydrologic effect of channelization on each affected basin, including changes in flood return frequencies. 2) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Decreased Pollutant Removal</td>
<td>Channelization can decrease natural pollutant removal by reducing instream structural complexity and tributary flow aeration, increasing flow velocity, reducing nutrient flow, and by causing change in vegetation.</td>
<td>1) Map waters lost to channelization in each affected drainage and characterize type, areal extent, and pollutant removal value. 2) Quantify effects on pollutant loadings to each affected waterbody and downstream receiving waters. 3) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Change in Wetland and Riparian Vegetation</td>
<td>Channelization and associated maintenance can directly destroy wetland and riparian vegetation and can change site features to prevent reestablishment of characteristic species.</td>
<td>1) Map and identify types and areas of affected vegetation. 2) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUSE</td>
<td>EFFECT</td>
<td>NEEDED ANALYSES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Impaired Beneficial Uses</td>
<td>Channelization and associated maintenance can directly impair beneficial uses by reducing waterbody area, increasing stream velocity, disrupting riffle and pool sequences, cover, and other structural features; changing substrate; cutting off nutrient inputs to and from backwaters and riparian wetlands, devegetating riparian reaches, and reducing aesthetic and recreational value. Reduced overbank flooding can adversely affect reproduction of riparian vegetation and wetland and riparian functions. Channelization can inhibit the movement of fish, other aquatic biota, and wildlife, and thus isolate and reduce the viability of populations up and downstream. Construction of channels will introduce sediment, nutrients, and toxins into the water system.</td>
<td>1) Identify short and long-term effects of previous channelization projects on beneficial uses. 2) Characterize and display at project area and regional scales existing wetlands, along with riparian corridors and other water features supporting nontidal connectivity. 3) Identify effects of channelization on terrestrial and aquatic habitat connectivity. 4) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Decreased Flood Storage</td>
<td>A. Increased Runoff. Reduced flood storage on the floodplain and in channels, evaporation, backwaters, and other natural depressions increases and accelerates runoff.</td>
<td>1) Quantify total and peak volumes of increased runoff for each affected drainage. 2) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Increased Groundwater Pumping</td>
<td>A. Change in Groundwater Storage. Increased groundwater pumping can lower water tables locally or in distant donor basins.</td>
<td>1) Quantify and map locations of project-induced changes in groundwater levels. 2) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Dry Weather Discharge</td>
<td>A. Change in Baseflow. Dry weather runoff from urban activities is low and relatively consistent.</td>
<td>1) Quantify hydrologic effects of dry weather flows on the baseflow of each affected drainage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Increased Pollutant Delivery</td>
<td>A. Increased Pollutant Delivery. Dry weather runoff can carry the pollutants generated by the activity causing the flow, e.g., pesticides, nutrients, and petrochemicals from landscape maintenance and cleaning sidewalks and vehicles. Collection of polluted dry weather flows in catch basins may result in shock loadings when it is displaced by subsequent storm flows.</td>
<td>1) Quantify and characterize pollutant loadings from activities generating dry weather runoff to each affected drainage. 2) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Production of Urban Pollutants</td>
<td>A. Increased Pollutant Delivery. Increased production of urban pollutants can cause increased delivery of pollutants to surface and groundwater.</td>
<td>1) Quantify and characterize pollutant loadings from activities generating dry weather runoff to each affected drainage. 2) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUSE</td>
<td>EFFECT</td>
<td>NEEDED ANALYSES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Changes in Soil Erosion</td>
<td>3. Channel Destabilization [11] Changes in upland soil erosion can destabilize stream channels by changing the amount of sediment carried into the stream. The stream may then erode or aggrade its channel to balance its available energy with the changes in its sediment load. 1. Increased sediment from construction causes channel aggradation, changing stream cross sections and redirecting flows. 2. Decreased sediment from a paved watershed can cause channel incision and/or side-cutting. The effect may be compounded by increased runoff from the paved watershed. Aggradation may occur downstream where the flow slows and deposits the eroded sediment, which may deflect flows against the channel banks and cause further bank erosion.</td>
<td>1) Conduct geomorphologic analysis of channel response to increases in construction-related sediment. 2) Conduct geomorphologic analysis of channel response to long-term reductions in sediment delivery to each affected drainage. 3) Identify mitigation. Note: Sediment as a pollutant is considered in No. 7, “Production of Urban Pollutants.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. INCREASED RUNOFF A. Change in Soil Erosion. [8] Increased runoff can dramatically increase soil erosion by causing greater runoff velocities which more effectively displace and carry soil particles. Construction-related soil destabilization can compound the effect. B. Change in Groundwater Storage. [4] Increased runoff can reduce groundwater recharge and lower water tables, since water draining from impervious surfaces is unable to percolate to groundwater at that location.</td>
<td>1) Quantify increases in sheet and gully erosion resulting from increased runoff. 2) Identify mitigation. 1) Map locations of and quantify losses of recharge and water table responses. 2) Identify mitigation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUSE</td>
<td>EFFECT</td>
<td>NEEDED ANALYSES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Increased Pollutant Delivery. [13]</td>
<td>Increased runoff increases pollutant delivery because it can more effectively carry particulate and soluble pollutants to receiving waters. Increased flow velocity reduces contact time with soil and vegetation that might otherwise remove contaminants.</td>
<td>1) Quantify types and quantities of increased pollutant loadings to each affected drainage. 2) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Increased Flooding Frequency. [14]</td>
<td>Increased runoff and greater transport efficiency result in higher peak flows from streams of a given return period.</td>
<td>1) Quantify basin level hydrologic effect of increased runoff on each affected basin, including changes in flood return frequencies. 2) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Change in Water Temperature. [16]</td>
<td>Increased runoff from urban areas can raise the temperature of receiving waters because runoff from impervious surfaces is often warmer than runoff from pervious surfaces or subsurface flow.</td>
<td>1) Model increase in water temperature along stream profile of each affected drainage. 2) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Impaired Beneficial Uses. [18]</td>
<td>Increased runoff can impair beneficial uses by flushing fish and invertebrates out of streams, increasing water level fluctuations and the velocity of flows entering wetlands, and causing salinity changes in estuaries and other nearshore marine waters.</td>
<td>1) Identify direct effects of increased flow on aquatic habitats, hydrologic regime of adjacent wetlands, and salinity of marine receiving waters for each affected drainage. 2) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. CHANGE IN URBAN WATER STORAGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Change in Baseline. [12]</td>
<td>Changes in watertable level can cause changes in the dry weather baseflow of streams fed by groundwater.</td>
<td>1) Quantify for each affected drainage the changes in baseflow associated with lowered water tables and map locations. 2) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Change in Wetland and Riparian Vegetation. [17]</td>
<td>A lowered watertable can dry up wetlands, stress or kill mature riparian vegetation, and reduce or eliminate seedling survival.</td>
<td>1) Identify types and areas of wetlands and riparian areas that would be affected by expected lowering of shallow water tables and map locations. 2) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Impaired Beneficial Uses. [18]</td>
<td>A lowered watertable can impair water supply and other beneficial uses which use groundwater. Seawater intrusion is possible in coastal areas. Aquifer compaction and subsidence can also occur.</td>
<td>1) Identify affects of expected water table lowering on water supply and other beneficial uses and map locations. 2) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. CHANNEL DESTABILIZATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Channelization. [3]</td>
<td>Channel erosion can threaten property and structures, leading to placement of riprap or other engineered stabilization of critical sections.</td>
<td>1) Identify stream reaches in which channel-induced channel destabilization may require channelization. 2) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUSE</td>
<td>EFFECT</td>
<td>NEEDED ANALYSES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Change in Groundwater Storage</td>
<td>[16] Channel incision can de-water shallow aquifers adjacent to the channel. (45)</td>
<td>1) Identify and map stream reaches in which project-induced stream incision may de-water shallow aquifers. 2) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Increased Pollutant Delivery.</td>
<td>[13] Channel erosion can result in increased suspended solids and turbidity in the water column. (47)</td>
<td>1) Identify and map stream reaches subject to project-induced destabilization, quantify changes in channel dimension, and volume of eroded material for each affected basin. 2) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Increased Flooding Frequency.</td>
<td>[14] Channel aggradation can cause local flooding by diverting flows and decreasing stream flow capacity. (46)</td>
<td>1) Identify and map stream reaches in which project-induced destabilization may cause aggradation and associated flooding. 2) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Change in Water Temperature.</td>
<td>[16] Bank erosion and aggradation can increase water temperature by reducing a horizontal channel with shallow flows, increased water surface relative to flow volume, and a smaller proportion of shaded water surface. As a result, summer water temperatures and diurnal temperature fluctuations tend to be greater. (48)</td>
<td>1) Identify and map stream reaches in which project-induced destabilization can increase water temperature. 2) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Change in Wetland and Riparian Vegetation.</td>
<td>[17] Channel destabilization can encroach on riparian wetlands and undermine streamside vegetation. (50)</td>
<td>1) Identify, characterize, and map wetland and riparian areas subject to encroachment by channel destabilization. 2) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Impaired Beneficial Uses.</td>
<td>[16] Channel destabilization can reduce or eliminate fish habitat, recreation, esthetic values, and other uses by affecting deep pools, pool-riffle sequences, undercut banks, substrate suitability, and other structural features. (51)</td>
<td>1) Identify, characterize, and map stream reaches in which channel destabilization can directly impair beneficial uses. 2) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Increased Maintenance and Property Damage.</td>
<td>[16] Channel erosion can undermine streamside buildings, bridges, utility crossings, and other property. Aggradation can bury diversion structures and other infrastructure and may reduce removal to maintain flow capacity.</td>
<td>1) Identify and map stream reaches in which destabilization may cause increased maintenance and property damage. 2) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**12. CHANGE IN BASEFLOW**

<p>| A. Change in Groundwater Storage. | [16] Reduced stream baseflow can decrease groundwater recharge by reducing wetted area and the amount of water available for recharge in stream channels. (52) | 1) Identify and map affected stream reaches. 2) Quantify losses of recharge and water table response. 3) Identify mitigation. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAUSE</th>
<th>EFFECT</th>
<th>NEEDED ANALYSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Decrease in Water Temperature. [14]</td>
<td>1. Identify and map affected stream reaches.</td>
<td>1) Identify and map affected stream reaches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Quantify temperature effects along stream profile.</td>
<td>2) Quantify temperature effects along stream profile.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Identify mitigation.</td>
<td>3) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Change in Wetland and Riparian Vegetation. [17]</td>
<td>1. Characterize and map affected riparian areas.</td>
<td>4) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Identify mitigation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Impaired Beneficial Uses. [18]</td>
<td>1. Identify and map affected waterbody segments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Characterize and quantify changes in baseflow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Identify direct effects on beneficial uses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Identify mitigation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. INCREASED POLLUTANT DELIVERY Urban pollutants can impair many</td>
<td>A. Impaired Beneficial Uses. [18]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Identify direct effects of increased pollutant loadings on beneficial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Identify mitigation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>uses, e.g., water supply, recreation, fish and wildlife habitat, and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>intermittent streams which are naturally defined by seasonal water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>availability.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Increases in baseflow resulting from dry weather discharge can</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>impair waterbodies such as seasonal wetlands, vernal pools, and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>intermittent streams which are naturally defined by seasonal water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>availability.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. INCREASED FLOODING FREQUENCY</td>
<td>A. Channelization. [3]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Identify stream reaches in which project-induced flooding may</td>
<td>1) Identify stream reaches in which project-induced flooding may require channelization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Identify mitigation.</td>
<td>2) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Impaired Beneficial Uses. [18]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Identify stream reaches in which project-induced flooding may</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Identify mitigation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Identify direct effects on beneficial uses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Identify mitigation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. INCREASED WATER TEMPERATURE</td>
<td>A. Impaired Beneficial Uses. [18]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Identify and map affected waterbody segments.</td>
<td>1) Identify and map affected waterbody segments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Quantify temperature changes.</td>
<td>2) Quantify temperature changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Characterize effects on beneficial uses.</td>
<td>3) Characterize effects on beneficial uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Identify mitigation.</td>
<td>4) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUSE</td>
<td>EFFECT</td>
<td>NEEDED ANALYSES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. DECREASED POLLUTANT REMOVAL</td>
<td>A. Increased Pollutant Delivery. [13] Less removal of pollutants by natural processes can result in greater concentrations of pollutants in receiving waters. [49]</td>
<td>1) Quantify effects to pollutant loadings for each affected waterbody. 2) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. CHANGE IN WETLAND AND RIPARIAN VEGETATION</td>
<td>B. Change in Water Temperature. [15] Loss of riparian vegetation can increase maximum water temperature by exposing more water surface to the sun. Daily and seasonal temperature fluctuations also tend to be greater. [52]</td>
<td>1) Identify and map stream reaches in which loss of riparian vegetation can increase water temperature. 2) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Decreased Pollutant Removal. [16] Removal of vegetation adjacent to a waterbody can reduce removal of pollutants from the waterbody and from the overland flow draining to the waterbody. [53]</td>
<td>1) Describe type, area extent, and pollutant removal value of affected vegetation and map location. 2) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. Impaired Beneficial Uses. [18] Loss of vegetation directly impacts the quality of aquatic and riparian habitat by reducing cover, structural diversity, and nutrient sources. [54] Removal of vegetation can also fragment and isolate remaining patches of habitat, resulting in decreased habitat value over large areas. [55]</td>
<td>1) Identify affected waterbody segments. 2) Characterize direct effects of vegetation loss on beneficial uses. 3) Characterize and display at project-area and regional scales existing wetlands, along with riparian corridors and other water features supporting habitat connectivity. 4) Identity effects of vegetation change on terrestrial and aquatic habitat connectivity. 5) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. IMPAIRED BENEFICIAL USES</td>
<td>Figure 1: End point for water quality impairment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. INCREASED MAINTENANCE AND PROPERTY DAMAGE</td>
<td>Figure 1: End point for maintenance and property damage effects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
POTENTIAL EFFECTS OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT ON BENEFICIAL USES
This diagram shows how urban development can affect beneficial uses of water.

Figure 1
Low-Impact Development References

Low-impact (LID) development generally involves more compact development that:

- minimizes generation of urban pollutants;
- preserves the amenity and other values of natural waters;
- maintains natural waters, drainage paths, landscape features and other water-holding areas to promote stormwater retention and groundwater recharge;
- designs communities and landscaping to minimize stormwater generation, runoff, and concentration; promote groundwater recharge; and reduce water demand;
- promotes water conservation and re-use.

The following documents are among many that provide more specific guidance in LID.


Prince George's County, Maryland, Department of Environmental Protection. Low-Impact Development Hydrologic Analysis. January 2000.


Further Online References:
Ca. Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment: http://www.oehha.ca.gov/ceotox.html
United States Environmental Protection Agency: http://www.epa.gov/smartgrowth/
State Water Resources Control Board

Terrestrial Habitat Connectivity Related To
Wetland, Riparian and Other Aquatic Resources,
Terrestrial Habitat Connectivity as Related To
Wetland, Riparian, and Other Aquatic Resources

"Habitat connectivity" refers to the need for plant and animal populations to have some mobility over the landscape, i.e., to avoid becoming "isolated" or "disjunct." A large body of research has demonstrated that such "isolated" populations face a high probability of eventual extinction, even if their immediate habitats are spared. In general, the smaller such an isolated population, the more quickly it will die out. Urban development typically fragments habitat by creating artificial landscapes which are movement barriers for most species. Unless mitigation measures are taken, isolated, non-viable populations are created as buildings, roads, and landscaping cut off lines of movement.

In the context of wetlands, "habitat connectivity" refers to three related phenomena:

a. The need of some animals to have access to both wetland and upland habitats at different parts of their life cycle. Some wetland animals, e.g., some amphibians and turtles, require access at different seasons and/or at different life stages to both wetland and to nearby upland. Preserving the wetland but not access to upland habitat will locally exterminate such species.3

b. The ecological relationship between separate wetlands. Some wetland communities and their associated species comprise networks of "patches" throughout a landscape. Wetland plants and animals are adapted to the presence of wetland complexes within a watershed and are dependent on moving among the wetlands within the complex, either regularly or in response to environmental stressors such as flood or drought, local food shortage, predator pressure, or influx of pollution. Removing one such water from the complex will reduce the biological quality of the rest, and at some point the simplified wetland complex will be incapable of supporting at least some of the species, even though some wetlands remain.4

c. The role wetlands and riparian corridors play in allowing larger-scale movements. Some strategically located wetlands and continuous strips of riparian habitat along streams facilitate connectivity at watershed and regional scales for terrestrial as well as aquatic and amphibious species.

As noted above, habitat connectivity is critical to biodiversity maintenance, and will become more so because of global warming. Significant range shifts and other responses to global warming have already occurred. The ability of biotic populations to move across the landscape may be critical to their survival in coming decades.5
1 Such mobility may occur at the level of the individual organism (e.g., a bird or turtle travelling between separated wetlands) and/or of the population (e.g., a plant species colonizing a new wetland through seed dispersal); and over different time scales.

2 For the effects of habitat fragmentation and population isolation on the survival of plants and animals, see for example:


3 Regarding the relationship between wetland/riparian and upland habitats, see for example:


4 Regarding the ecological relationship between separated wetlands, see for example:


5 Recent reports comprehensively review observed effects of global change on plant and animal range shifts, advancement of spring events, and other responses. See:


While the planning continues for the I-15 Bus Rapid Transit through Mid-City, crossover centerline stations are no longer possible due to operational safety issues. SANDAG, Caltrans, and the City Heights community will be developing a design for bus rapid transit stations in conjunction with community planning for transit-oriented development, with a goal of implementation in coordination with the startup of I-15 BRT service in 2012. In terms of diesel trucks in the median, the HOV lanes on I-15 through Mid-City are not under consideration for truck use, and the designation of I-15 between I-805 and SR 52 as part of the regional freight network has been removed from the Final RTP.

Figure 2.0-6 in the final RTP EIR will be revised to remove I-15 through Mid-City as part of the Goods Movement Network. SANDAG will work with the City of San Diego, Caltrans, and the community to further analyze the goods movement issue in this part of the region.

While the planning continues for the I-15 Bus Rapid Transit through Mid-City, crossover centerline stations are no longer possible due to operational safety issues. SANDAG, Caltrans, and the City Heights community will be developing a design for bus rapid transit stations in conjunction with community planning for transit-oriented development, with a goal of implementation in coordination with the startup of I-15 BRT service in 2012. In terms of diesel trucks in the median, the HOV lanes on I-15 through Mid-City are not under consideration for truck use, and the designation of I-15 between I-805 and SR 52 as part of the regional freight network has been removed from the Final RTP.
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Figure 2.0-6 in the final RTP EIR will be revised to remove I-15 through Mid-City as part of the Goods Movement Network. SANDAG will work with the City of San Diego, Caltrans, and the community to further analyze the goods movement issue in this part of the region.

B1-5

The 2030 RTP is no longer proposing that I-15 through Mid-City be identified as part of the regional freight network. The Cooperative Agreement cited in this comment does not include SANDAG or the preparation of the RTP.

B1-6

See above response: B1-3.
The DEIR does analyze, at a general level, the potential environmental impacts that could result from the adoption of the RTP. The DEIR evaluates impacts associated with the transportation facility improvements needed to accommodate additional trips encompassing various modes of travel. Differentiation among the purposes of the trips collectively constituting this modeled increase in travel demand is not relevant.

The commenter is apparently reacting to the organization of the document. Rather than having a single chapter discussing regional environmental resources, existing setting and regional conditions are discussed individually in the first subsection of each chapter devoted to an environmental resource or issue.

Even though the DEIR is labeled a “Program” EIR, it must nevertheless analyze all potential impacts from RTP adoption at a general level.

In this instance, there is no legitimate reason that the Centerline BRT, air quality monitoring, and truck re-routing cannot be adopted—th ey are all feasible mitigation measures of the prior I-15 construction. Thus, if these mitigations necessary to a bate the effects of the I-15 construction are not completed prior to the addition of new impacts in the corridor, such as those which would occur from additional goods movement through the area, SANDAG and the project proponent will either need to be responsible for mitigating the new impacts, or we would expect the Mid-City portion of the I-15 to be closed down immediately.

Even though the DEIR is labeled a “Program” EIR, it must nevertheless analyze all potential impacts from RTP adoption at a general level.

CHCDC acknowledges that a Program EIR may “legitimately indicate that more detailed information may be considered in future project EIRs.” 

Al Larson Boat Shop, Inc. v. Board of Harbor Commissioners (2d Dist. 1993) 18 Cal. App. 4th 729, 746. However, the program EIR should “provide an occasion for a more exhaustive consideration of effects and alternatives than would be practical in an EIR on an individual action” and “ensure consideration of cumulative impacts that might be shifted on a case by case basis”. Guidelines to the California Environmental Quality Act, § 15168, subd. (b). In this case, the DEIR must analyze at a general level, all of the potential environmental impacts that could result from the adoption of the RTP. However, in several sections, especially those which relate to the proposed actions to facilitate goods movement throughout the San Diego Region, the DEIR does not contain sufficient analysis of the potential project impacts.

The Environmental Setting Must Be Described in Sufficient Detail to Apprise the Public of the Nature of the Environmental Resources Affected by the RTP.

“Knowledge of the regional setting is critical to the assessment of environmental impacts. Special emphasis should be placed on environmental resources that are rare or unique to that region and would be affected by the project.” CEQA Guidelines §15125, subd (c).

For purposes of the DEIR, an exhaustive inventory of the environmental resources which could be impacted by any of the RTP projects is not warranted; the DEIR must nevertheless include a reasonable description of the regional environmental resources which could be impacted. By contrast, the Environmental Setting section of the DEIR is woefully inadequate, as it is nothing more than a summary of the existing transportation infrastructure that currently exists in the region.
Corridor studies are currently underway for several interstate freeways and state highways within the region. The culmination of this Project Development process is the circulation of a Project Report. This document provides preliminary engineering and right-of-way data for each project alternative. The Project Report is the basis for environmental review of specific project alternatives pursuant to CEQA and NEPA. The analysis desired by the commenter can occur with access to information in the respective Project Reports, which are not yet available.

c. Potential Impacts to Land Use are Not Adequately Described or Analyzed in the DEIR.

The DEIR acknowledges that "a substantial component of the proposed 2007 RTP would be the expansion of transit systems, highway and freeway lanes, and HOV/Managed Lanes. For example, key freeway corridors such as I-5, I-15, and I-805 would be widened to accommodate HOV/Managed Lanes as well as to support the anticipated transit system." DEIR at 4-1.25. The DEIR goes on to say that "widening could necessitate increasing the right-of-way into lands not previously intended for transportation uses." Id. However, there is no documentation in this section of the DEIR to allow the public to judge where this widening will occur, roughly how much additional land will be needed, and what types of land uses will be affected. While SANDAG would not be required to provide detailed analysis at this stage of the impacts in every community potentially affected, it is apparent from the discussion in section SC-LU-1 that SANDAG has much more information about the potential impacts from these projects than is disclosed in the DEIR. The public has a right to a more detailed summary of that information, perhaps with the aid of mapping tools, in order to determine if the overall RTP focus on expansion of highway and freeway lanes is warranted. While the program-level DEIR need not analyze individual projects in the same detail as a project-level EIR, the public must be able to "discern from the [EIR] the analytic route the... agency traveled from evidence to action." Al Larson Boat Shop, Inc. v. Board of Harbor Commissioners (3d Dist. 1993) 18 Cal. App. 4th 729, 740.

d. Potential Impacts to Transportation and Circulation are not Adequately Described or Addressed.

As we have stated previously, the potential impacts from increased goods movement throughout the San Diego region have not been well documented in the DEIR. The DEIR does not discuss the increased cargo throughput that will result from the various goods movement projects listed in the RTP. Again, at a program level, the DEIR must address the potential impacts from increased truck traffic, increased ship calls to the marine terminals, as well as increased train traffic and warehousing activities. Yet very little information is actually contained in the DEIR about these potential impacts. As noted
above, the median lanes have already been committed for rapid transit through Mid-City in prior agreements. Were goods movement, as well as HOV and paying vehicles also allowed to use these lanes, the promised “rapid transit” would likely not be rapid for very long.

The potential to have diesel trucks, HOV vehicles, paid vehicles and transit all using the same lanes would suggest that eventual congestion in those lanes is all but certain, especially given the congestion typical in existing HOV lanes at peak times. Yet no reference is made to the potential for increased congestion in the Transwi/ HOV/Managed/Goods Movement Lanes as a result of increased truck traffic. This conflict was implied in SANDAG’s Regional High Occupancy (HOV)/Managed Lanes (ML) Study, completed in 2002, which formed the underpinning of the RTP’s HOV/Managed Lanes strategy. That study simply acknowledged the prior designation as a “freeway median bus transit way, with on-line stations at University Avenue and El Cajon Boulevard. Thus facility will use right-of-way that could otherwise be used for an HOV facility.” See High Occupancy (HOV)/Managed Lanes (ML) Study at 115 116 (emphasis added). SANDAG must recognize that these lanes cannot serve all circulation purposes, and at a minimum, the DEIR must acknowledge and analyze these potential effects.

Additionally, the DEIR acknowledges that federal law requires long range transportation plans to reflect the most recent assumptions for population, travel, land use, congestion, employment, and economic activity. However, at least regarding employment, it is not clear that the RTP and DEIR rely on up-to-date employment information. We note that at its September 28, 2007 meeting, the SANDAG Board of Directors considered creation of the 2008 Employment and Residential Land Inventory Task Force. This Task Force was to be tasked with updating the 1998 inventory and market analysis of the supply of and demand for employment land in the region, which was updated in 2000. Please clarify whether the employment data used for purposes of the RTP and DEIR was from this 1998 inventory/2000 update, or a more recent study.

c. Potential Impacts to Air Quality are not Adequately Described or Addressed.

As with other sections, it is not clear from the discussion of potential impacts to air quality what assumptions were used related to goods movement in arriving at the conclusions in this section. The RTP assumes an average annual 5% growth rate for all freight. RTP at 6-40. Yet what are the associated projected increases in cargo throughput, in ship calls to the marine terminals, in the need for inland warehousing, in truck traffic, in the use of cargo handling equipment? In order to calculate the emissions estimates included in the DEIR, assumptions related to these questions must have been made. Yet they are not disclosed in the DEIR, and without them, the public cannot adequately evaluate the conclusions in the DEIR. For example, a recent article in the Union-Tribune referred to a study (unnamed) which said ships and commercial boats would become the area’s top source of nitrogen oxide pollution by 2012.” “Ships are Top Port Polluters,” by Mike Lee, San Diego Union-Tribune, September 27, 2007. Yet
B1-13 The DEIR states that, irrespective of the implementation of mitigation measures contained in the document, or included in subsequent project-specific documents, there may be instances where exposure to Toxic Air Contaminants and other harmful pollutants is determined to be significant and unavoidable. Such impact analyses will be conducted at the time plans for specific transportation improvements are available.

B1-14 An analysis of existing diesel particulate emissions on various freeways would not provide information relative to the impacts of future projects. The diesel PM impacts of future projects will be very time sensitive because of the regulations requiring sharp reductions in diesel PM emissions in the coming years.

B1-15 Mitigation measures relative to ship emissions, or any other aspect of the program, must be limited to actions that can be implemented by SANDAG. The EIR cannot impose mitigation measures on the Port of San Diego. Therefore, MM-AQ-2e is limited to SANDAG’s participation in and direction of the Regional Freight Working Group.

Regulation of ship emissions is imminent. On January 1, 2007, new California Air Resources Board (CARB) regulations concerning Ship Auxiliary Engines took effect. The regulations require ocean-going vessel operators to limit auxiliary engine emissions within 24 nautical miles of the California Coast. They require vessels to hook up to onshore electricity sources when docked. They require use of cleaner fuel by 2010. It is estimated that between 2007 and 2010 these regulations will reduce NOx emissions by 15,000 tons and particulate emissions by more than 23,000 tons. Enforcement of these regulations was initially blocked by a lawsuit; a recent Ninth Circuit court granted a request to enforce the regulations while the suit is decided.

CARB has also enacted regulations governing Mobile Cargo Handling Equipment at Ports and Intermodal Rail Yards. Mobile cargo handling equipment is any motorized vehicle used to handle cargo at or around ports. The regulation will provide 865 tons of diesel PM emission reductions and 18,600 tons of NOx emission reductions throughout California between the years of 2007 and 2020. These emission reductions will occur in areas near ports and intermodal rail yards, many of which are in designated State and federal non-attainment areas for PM10, PM2.5, and ozone.

B1-16 City Heights is one of the higher-density, transit-supportive areas of the region and therefore, one of the areas in the plan in which transit investments are concentrated. With new arterial rapid and bus rapid transit (BRT) services, City Heights residents will have high-frequency, high-end transit service to major destinations such as SDSU, Sorrento Valley and Downtown San Diego. Further, more frequent connections to the trolley also are funded through not only arterial services such as the El Cajon BRT, but improvements to local bus service.
North City, North County, and other employment centers. For example, one of the main purposes behind the push for expanded and rapid bus service in City Heights is to give community residents better (and in some instances new) access to jobs, not only in Downtown San Diego, but also in communities like Santee Valley. (Again, CHCDC is concerned that up-to-date employment information may not have been used for the DEIR analysis—see comment page 5.) City Heights has been left out of the area which can access the trolley system, and in fact there are more than 200,000 residents within the trolley ring that are unable to access that system. Accordingly, the DEIR must not only analyze trip times on existing transit routes, it must also identify transit lines/legs that are missing from those communities that are most reliant on public transportation. Without this analysis, the claim on page 4.13-10 that the RTP will not result in significant environmental justice impacts cannot be substantiated.

Additionally, the DEIR fails to meaningfully analyze potential environmental justice impacts from the burdens of the RTP. This is all the more important given the forecasted pattern, noted on page 4.13-3, of “heightened clustering of [low-income TD26] immediately adjacent to transportation routes/freeways.” It notes that “many of the proposed transportation improvements would unavoidably occur within proximity to these populations. There remains the potential for disproportionate impacts from the proposed transportation improvements related to noise, air quality, displacement of populations, accessibility, and communities.” DEIR at 4.13-8. Yet, the DEIR goes on to claim that because these impacts may be localized, they can only be analyzed for disproportionate effects at the project level. Id. This is illogical on its face. One of the purposes for a program-level EIR is to be able to assess programmatic cumulative impacts which may not be able to be analyzed on a project-by-project basis. See CEQA Guidelines §15168. Disproportionate impacts are much more clear when detailed maps showing multicultural communities and low-income communities, which SANDAG has overlaid with proposed project locations, which SANDAG also has. This analysis is most critical for those projects which involve freeway widening and new or expanded truck routes. Without this analysis, the claim on page 4.13-10 that “No significant impacts would lead to disproportionately high and adverse impacts to the identified minority or low-income communities in the San Diego Region” is entirely without substantiation or merit.

In short, both the EIR and RTP need to make clear commitments to the BRT system in SR 15 through Mid City. These mitigations were promised over 20 years ago, for a project that was completed almost 10 years ago. Yet, the Centerline BRT has still not been completed, even though over $19 million in funding has been allocated in the 2006 RTP (MPO IDW626C). Without the completion of this mitigation, there will be environmental justice impacts to the community of City Heights in the form of increased air pollution, increased traffic congestion, less ability to access job centers, and less community cohesion. These impacts must be fully analyzed in the DEIR, especially if proposed use of the right-of-way intended for the BRT is diverted for other purposes, as is proposed in the RTP.

B1-17 As noted in Chapter 4.13 of the EIR, environmental justice analysis for the RTP consists of two components: (1) issues of equity of access for minority populations and/or low-income populations and (2) issues of potential disproportionate high and adverse impacts to minority populations and/or low-income populations.

In terms of equity of access issues, the EIR notes that, based on trip distribution zone (TD26) demographic analysis, minority populations and low-income populations will, in general, experience parity of access (or better) under the RTP when compared to non-minority populations and non-low-income populations, with few exceptions. Further, these exceptions represent relatively minor degrees of access difference (specifically, 19 minutes average travel time for low-income populations versus 18 minutes average travel time for non-low-income populations and non-work trips within 15 minutes averaging 62 percent for low-income populations and 64 percent for non-low-income populations). Low-income populations fare better than non-low-income populations for work/school trips within 30 minutes and homes within 0.5 mile of a transit stop. Minority populations are projected to experience equal or better levels of service than non-minority populations on the equity of access performance measures of average travel time, work/school trips within 30 minutes, non-work trips within 15 minutes, and homes within 0.5 mile of a transit stop. In summary, as stated in the EIR, the RTP itself, at the programmatic level, is not likely to result in disproportionate high and adverse impacts related to equity of service provided by the proposed transportation improvements in minority populations and low-income populations within any of the regional transportation corridors examined.

In terms of potentially disproportionate high and adverse impacts to minority populations and/or low-income populations based on environmental or public health factors associated with individual projects during construction or operational phases, this analysis will require both (1) a knowledge of local populations and (2) a knowledge of project specifications and related impacts. Population data for areas near proposed projects do exist and are summarized in the EIR; however, information on project level alternatives have not yet been developed, nor have project level environmental impacts been analyzed. The EIR does point out that there are potential environmental justice concerns that would need to be assessed at the project level given the location of minority populations and low-income populations adjacent to a number of the proposed project areas. The presence of those populations is known; however, the nature, magnitude, and location of project specific impacts are not. Given this lack of information at the project level, an analysis of environmental justice would necessarily be speculative at this point. For example, without a specific project footprint, it is not known if residential displacements would occur for a given project and, if they did occur, whether those displacements would disproportionately accrue to minority populations and/or low-income populations along the project route.

Once noise, air quality, visual, displacement of residences and/or businesses, and community cohesion impacts, among others, are understood for a given project, they can then be examined for potential disproportionate distribution among minority and non-minority and low-income and non-low-income populations. Prior to understanding what specific adverse project impacts will be generated and where they will be generated, however, it is not possible to
understand the potential differential distribution of those impacts. Further, without understanding potential community enhancement measures or other beneficial community outcomes likely to be associated with any given project, it is not possible to understand the potential distribution of positive impacts associated with transportation improvements at the project level. In short, as stated in the EIR, potential environmental justice impacts related to disproportionate high and adverse impacts to minority populations and low-income populations would need to be examined at the project level rather than at the programmatic level as the level of detail required for those analyses does not yet exist. Demographic data suggest that environmental justice issues may be of concern; environmental justice analysis incorporating project design and impact data will be required when those data become available.
The growth assumptions underlying the RTP were developed in consultation with all local jurisdictions in the County. The RTP represents a plan for needed transportation infrastructure to serve the land uses projected by each of these jurisdictions. The DEIR acknowledges that implementation of the RTP could result in secondary effects. Possible potential effects are listed; it is clear in this context that there is a potential for impacts to additional issues.

According to the CEQA Guidelines (§15131) and in the context of a plan-level document, economic or social effects of a project are not treated as significant effects on the environment. Although it may be possible to trace a chain of cause and effect from the program elements through potential economic or social changes resulting from the proposed RTP, these changes are not necessarily physical changes to the environment and therefore are not a subject of the EIR.

With respect to environmental justice impacts, please see the response to comment B1-14. The DEIR recognizes and states that the increase in PM10 emissions would be an adverse impact. For a judgment of “considerable,” which is subjective, the magnitude of the program impact must be viewed in the overall context of PM10 emissions in the basin. Mobile source emissions are less than 5 percent of area emissions, and an increase of these emissions by less than 10 percent is judged to be less than considerable. It is noted that the “considerable” threshold is included in the definition of significant cumulative impact in order to avoid the “one-molecule” conclusion that any increase would be a significant impact.
i. The Alternatives Analysis is Based Upon Faulty Mode-Split Assumptions, and Lacks Sufficient Data Upon Which the Public Can Meaningfully Evaluate the Alternatives.

CEQA requires that an adequate discussion of alternatives must provide sufficient “information to the public to enable it to understand, evaluate, and respond to the agency’s conclusions.” Laurel Heights Improvement Association v. The Regents of the University of California (1988) 47 Cal. 3d 376, 404. The discussion must contain “facts and analysis, not just the agency’s bare conclusions or opinions.” Id. In the case of the DEIR, the analysis of alternatives contains many conclusions and opinions which are not supported by facts and analysis.

The overarching problem with the analysis is that assumptions are made that the mode split will remain at today’s levels. For a plan which forecasts to 2030, this is pure speculation and irresponsible. The analysis states, page 7-47, “Any number of unforeseen factors could cause a significant shift in the mode split of regionwide system users from single-occupancy vehicles to transit use. Such a shift would be most encouraged by land use patterns that favor smart growth and accessible alternative transportation.” The DEIR thus contains no analysis of the ability of the RTP to shape the transportation choices of residents in the region- it just assumes that people will make the same choices they have always made. This is faulty reasoning and results in the Revenue Constrained Alternative falsely appearing to be the most environmentally superior alternative, when in fact common sense dictates that greater use of public transit will result in less air pollution, more community cohesion, less net loss of lands, and greater transportation and environmental equity. In fact, only the transit emphasis alternatives will promote environmental equity by focusing transportation resources in communities where they are needed most, and where the greatest proportion of people who rely on public transit live. These alternatives could finally serve to connect urban core communities such as City Heights, to the trolley system, and to job centers in other communities.

Additionally, it is not clear from the discussion whether goods movement projects are included in the analysis of the alternatives, which are limited in the discussion to highway improvements and transit improvements. A section on goods movements must be included in the alternatives section, to highlight for the public which goods movement projects, and their associated impacts, would be included in each alternative scenario.

III. Conclusion

CHCDC supports provisions of the RTP which will provide new transit options for City Heights and the Region as a whole. Nevertheless, we are very concerned that the region as a whole and City Heights in particular will be negatively impacted by the tremendous increases in goods movement proposed in the RTP. At a minimum, these increases must be specified and analyzed in the DEIR for the RTP so that the public and SANDAG Board will have full information upon which to consider the proposed RTP.

B1-20 Alternatives to the 2030 RTP are discussed in Section 7.0. As the 2030 RTP is a plan to be implemented over many years by many constituent projects, it is not possible in many cases to make detailed quantitative distinctions between RTP alternatives for many environmental impact categories. The impacts of the 2030 RTP were identified to the extent possible at this time. The comparative impacts of the alternatives were then examined. In some instances, a qualitative distinction was possible (i.e., extent of freeway congestion). In other instances only an ordinal ranking of impacts distinguishing alternatives is possible. In additional instances, information available at this time allows only qualitative comparisons.

B1-21 We disagree with the comment that “the DEIR contains no analysis of the ability of the RTP to shape the transportation choices of residents in the region- it just assumes that people will make the same choices they have always made.” Mode shares can and do change, and depend on several factors, including the magnitude of alternatives to driving alone and supportive land uses. For example, higher transit investments are made in the denser corridors of San Diego both now (e.g., El Cajon Boulevard) and in the future (serving planned smart growth areas). Mode shares in corridors that do not have supportive land uses most likely will not experience the same modal shifts. While the Revenue Constrained Alternative is generally considered the Environmentally Superior alternative, it does not include the higher level of transit improvements found in the Reasonably Expected Revenue scenario.

B1-22 Please see response to comment B1-5.
Thank you for your consideration of our comments. Please contact Jay Powell, CHCDC Executive Director, with any questions you may have about this letter.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Jay Powell
Executive Director
SANDAG's Regional Comprehensive Plan supports smart growth in the San Diego region. The Smart Growth Concept Map, accepted by the SANDAG Board for planning purposes in June 2006, serves as a framework for implementing smart growth and provides a mechanism for connecting higher land use intensities, mixed land uses, public transit, and pedestrian amenities.

SANDAG held five public workshops throughout the region. SANDAG staff provided an overview of the major components of the Draft 2030 RTP. Additionally SANDAG, Caltrans, and transit operator staff were available throughout each workshop to answer specific questions from members of the public. SANDAG staff also provided additional presentations on the Draft 2030 RTP at a number of other local meetings.

Comment noted.

Comment noted.

We fully support the emphasis upon public transportation. All regional planning needs to revise itself from sprawl to planning for pedestrian and public transportation use. Thank you.

The public workshops were not adequate to fully educate citizens about this plan. We request further workshops and community discussions be held for the public before this plan is adopted.

We incorporate in this letter all comments made regarding this environmental document and add our voice to the need for a comprehensive environmental study. The plan approaches upon valuable natural resources.

We wish to be noticed at the following address about any further workshops, hearings, publications or documents concerning this project.

Very truly yours,
Dolores Welty
Friends of Estuaries Lagoon
2076 Sheridan Road
Encinitas, CA 92024
760-947-9897
B3-1 The Reasonably Expected Scenario includes components recommended by both the ITPR and Move San Diego. In terms of the latter, the 2030 RTP includes the use of transit guideways in the Downtown San Diego to Kearny Mesa and Sorrento Mesa areas.

B3-2 This comment does not address the adequacy of the EIR, however, Table 6.2 (on page 6-10 of the Draft RTP) summarizes the major recommendations from the ITPR. ITPR conclusions and recommendations are detailed in the 2030 RTP Technical Appendix.

B3-3 See comment B3-1.

B3-4 This comment does not address the adequacy of the EIR, however, the costs of Direct Access Ramps, which are shared by both managed lanes users and transit riders, are included in the HOV/Managed Lanes side, not the transit side in the 2030 RTP.

B3-5 This comment does not address the adequacy of the EIR, however, this comment is addressed in the 2030 RTP. The use of BRT is reserved for those services that have a dedicated facility such as a lane or a restricted facility such as a Managed Lane. The term "Rapid Bus" is used for other regional services that have dedicated infrastructure but offer other attributes of BRT-like service at a lower cost (e.g., transit priority measures for Rapid Bus routes include transit signal priority and queue jumper lanes at busy intersections).
This comment does not address the adequacy of the EIR, however, in-line stations were discussed in the December 8, 2006 SANDAG Transportation Committee agenda item, which stated that SANDAG would further evaluate their effectiveness. The Committee approved the staff recommendation, which is provided in the 2030 RTP Technical Appendix (Page TA 11-3).

This comment does not address the adequacy of the EIR, however, the Reasonably Expected transit network serves all but nine Smart Growth Concept Map areas with high-frequency service and follows a key ITPR principle - to concentrate services in San Diego's urban core area. The Reasonably Expected scenario results in a 17% increase in daily VMT per capita over 2006 conditions and a 20% increase in daily transit passenger miles per capita.

This comment does not address the adequacy of the EIR, however the 2030 RTP includes a greater emphasis on funding both existing services in San Diego's urban core area and new regional services, also concentrated in this area.

This comment does not address the adequacy of the EIR, however, the ITPR methodology was reviewed before the transit networks were developed. Table 4.5 (on page 4-16 of the Draft RTP) summarizes comparative annual cost estimates using this methodology. Most of the regional services called for in the 2030 RTP were within a reasonable range of these comparisons depending upon the type of service (e.g., freeway-based with off-line stations such as the I-15 BRT services). An annual station maintenance cost was included in these calculations as the ITPR recommendation suggests, so that add-ons such as TVMs are included. In October 2006, the SANDAG Transportation Committee approved the I-15 BRT Operations Plan, which provided updated operations and maintenance costs. This analysis also was used in the 2030 RTP development.

This comment does not address the adequacy of the EIR, however, operating subsidies were determined by applying farebox recovery assumptions to annual operations costs. Farebox recovery assumptions were based on the type of route and corridor it served. For example, a higher assumption was used for a route like the El Cajon Blvd route versus the El Camino Real Rapid Bus.
This comment does not address the adequacy of the EIR, however, this formula will be considered as part of specific project development work when detailed operations costs are developed.

B3-12 This comment does not address the adequacy of the EIR, however, proposed actions in the 2030 RTP include development of a regional parking strategy and a toolbox of successful strategies for developing and maintaining transit centers (see Chapter 6). Smart parking also is mentioned in the advanced technologies section as a way to manage parking at stations.

B3-13 This comment does not address the adequacy of the EIR, however, SANDAG developed a specific modeling coefficient to represent BRT in the 2030 RTP and did not model BRT routes with the LRT coefficient, which was the case for the Mobility 2030 (the 2003 RTP). This new coefficient was between LRT and express bus, not LRT.

B3-14 This comment does not address the adequacy of the EIR, however, as stated in responses to your previous comments, a greater emphasis was placed on urban core corridors, with “higher concentrations of transit riders.” The ITPR also noted that the basis for an effective transit network is local bus service. One-third of the transit dollars in the 2030 RTP are spent on improvements to San Diego's existing transit system.

B3-15 The ITPR process was intended to provide advisory recommendations for SANDAG's consideration in developing the 2030 RTP.
VIA FACSIMILE & U.S. MAIL

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

Re: Draft Environmental Impact Report for the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan
RCH No. 20070311145

Dear SANDAG

This letter is submitted on behalf of Move San Diego in connection with the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan ("RTP" or "Project") and related Draft Environmental Impact Report ("EIIR").

Move San Diego, a non-profit corporation, has developed a better-performing transit plan based upon Global Best Practices, called the FAST (Financially Achievable Saves Time) Plan. The FAST Plan was presented by Move San Diego representatives to SANDAG senior management in July of this year. Move San Diego's experts designed the FAST Plan to support smart growth in a more efficient and effective manner than the proposed Project or any alternative analyzed in the DEIR. Information regarding the FAST Plan is available at www.movesandiego.org.

Move San Diego believes the RTP policies are inconsistent with the plan proposed. While the policies support smart growth and expanded transit, the plan actually promotes sprawl and greater use by solo drivers and increased vehicle miles traveled. While the policies support greater reliance on public transportation, SANDAG has taken steps to make public transit more inaccessible and more expensive. Furthermore, planning for funding choices does not match the policies.

INTRODUCTION

The California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"), Pub. Res. Code §§ 21000 – 21177, must be interpreted "so as to afford the fullest possible protection to the environment within the reasonable scope of the statutory language." Friends of Mammoth v. Board of Supervisors (1972) 8 Cal. App. 2d 547, 550. CEQA is essentially "an environmental full disclosure statute, and the EIR is the method ... [for] disclosure ..." Rural Landowners Assn. v. City Council (1983) 142 Cal. App. 2d 1013, 1020. An EIR's purpose is "to provide public agencies and the public in general with detailed
This comment addresses the transportation modeling effort supporting the RTP via a series of questions. The model documentation and output, at over 100 pages, is too much information to append to the RTP or DEIR. The model documentation is currently in draft format; however, it should suffice to answer the questions below. Please refer to the FTP link below to download the model documentation plus some of the output that is being asked for:

ftp://ftp.sandag.cog.ca.us/pub/RTP/modeldoc/

Comment B4-1 comprises a series of questions. These are listed individually and responded to below:

Q: What assumptions were made in modeling the transit network?
A: See section 6.5 for Transit Network Input assumptions

Q: What is the Farebox Recovery Rate discussed in the RTP?
A: While the transit fare values are an integral transportation model input, farebox recovery rates are not used in assessing travel demand.

Q: What is the Interregional Commute Model?
A: The ICM is used to account for people who work in San Diego County but live in either Riverside, Orange, Imperial counties or Baja California. The ICM is described in the existing model documentation - please refer to section 1.3.2 of this document:


Q: What cost assumptions are used for transit modeling, including LRT, bus and BRT?
A: Fares for the transit modes can be found in section 6.5.4 of the draft model document on the FTP link above.

Q: Where is the data that was used to support the various models?
A: The data to support the growth forecast and transportation models are extensive. Any specific data set requests will be accommodated and all data can be found at the link provided above.

Q: What changes have been made to the mode choice model?
A: Please refer to section 6.9 of the draft model document provided on the FTP link above.
Q: What coefficients were used? What values were used?

A: The table below is table 18 from section 6.9.2 of the draft model document on the FTP link above:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time/Cost Component</th>
<th>Purpose/Income</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Purpose/Income</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Home Work / College</td>
<td>Home-Other</td>
<td>Other-Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Auto In-Vehicle</td>
<td>-0.028</td>
<td>-0.056</td>
<td>-0.084</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>-0.032</td>
<td>-0.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Auto Terminal</td>
<td>-0.056</td>
<td>-0.112</td>
<td>-0.168</td>
<td>-0.032</td>
<td>-0.064</td>
<td>-0.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Transit In-Vehicle</td>
<td>-0.028</td>
<td>-0.056</td>
<td>-0.084</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>-0.032</td>
<td>-0.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Transit First Wait</td>
<td>-0.042</td>
<td>-0.084</td>
<td>-0.126</td>
<td>-0.026</td>
<td>-0.051</td>
<td>-0.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Transit Transfer Wait</td>
<td>-0.084</td>
<td>-0.168</td>
<td>-0.252</td>
<td>-0.040</td>
<td>-0.080</td>
<td>-0.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Transit Auto Access</td>
<td>-0.028</td>
<td>-0.056</td>
<td>-0.084</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>-0.032</td>
<td>-0.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Short Walk</td>
<td>-0.042</td>
<td>-0.084</td>
<td>-0.126</td>
<td>-0.024</td>
<td>-0.048</td>
<td>-0.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Mid Walk</td>
<td>-0.056</td>
<td>-0.112</td>
<td>-0.168</td>
<td>-0.032</td>
<td>-0.064</td>
<td>-0.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Long Walk</td>
<td>-0.084</td>
<td>-0.168</td>
<td>-0.252</td>
<td>-0.048</td>
<td>-0.096</td>
<td>-0.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Bicycle</td>
<td>-0.098</td>
<td>-0.196</td>
<td>-0.294</td>
<td>-0.064</td>
<td>-0.128</td>
<td>-0.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Modes</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q: What is the projected ridership by route and stop?

A: Standard transportation model output includes a report called ‘onoffpr.xls’ which depicts transit boardings by stop by route and by configuration. Spread sheets can be found for the relevant alternatives on this FTP site:

ftp://ftpx.sandag.coq.ca.us/pub/RTP/modeldoc/on_off_reports/

Q: Where is the data that supports the analysis of the various alternatives discussed?

A: The transportation model output data also is very extensive in terms of volume. Any specific data set requests can be found at the link provided above.

Comment noted.
This comment does not address the adequacy of the EIR, however, please see responses to previous Move San Diego comments (Comments B3-1-15).

Please see response to comment B4-1.

With respect to construction emissions, quantitative projections are not required. The DEIR reasonably recognizes that construction emissions of NOx and particulates may be significant on some projects and includes a series of mitigation measures required on all SANDAG construction projects whether or not the impacts are found to be significant. The VMT data contained in the 2030 RTP are consistent with the VMT data in the Eight Hour Ozone Attainment Plan for San Diego County. SANDAG staff collaborated with the San Diego Air Pollution Control District on the Attainment Plan. SANDAG incorporates data regarding highway and transit projects into the Travel Demand Models for estimating and projecting vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and speed. ARB's on-road emissions inventory in EMFAC2007 incorporates these VMT and speed estimates. The air quality analysis supporting the RTP EIR was performed using EMFAC2002 per direction from the USEPA. The differences between the outputs of these two models is minute; the increase in VMT modeled is consistent with the ozone attainment plan.

The DEIR states on page 5-3 that the planned improvements in the proposed 2030 RTP would facilitate additional housing and population growth. This is identified as a significant growth inducing impact.

The DEIR states on page 4.3-11 that the planned improvements in the proposed 2030 RTP would result in visual impacts that are significant and that cannot be reduced below a level of significance. The Visual Resources impact analysis addressed community character on page 4.3-9 by stating that "In urbanized areas, roadways and ancillary improvements such as sound walls introduced by the proposed 2030 RTP may also result in adverse visual impacts depending on the scale of improvements and location of sensitive viewers, including the driving public, users of gathering places, rest areas and vista points, and a large number of residents who live around resources. Highway widening and the construction of HOV and managed lanes and park-and-ride lots may result in some loss of existing freeway landscaping. Although these activities generally occur in urbanized environments, these actions could have an adverse effect on visual quality, depending upon nearby sensitive viewers."

There is no recognition of growth associated with the adoption of the RTP. DEIR at 4.1.28 - 29.

There is no discussion of aesthetics or community character impacts associated with development of the RTP. See e.g., DEIR at 4.3-11.
B4-8 This statement is not correct. The Alternatives section in the DEIR analyzes the Transportation/Circulation impacts of each of the alternatives by comparing the relative percentages of "congested peak period travel conditions." A congested peak period travel condition equates to a LOS E or F. Hence, level of service is at the heart of the comparison of alternatives, including the Revenue Constrained Alternative (see page 7-29 of the DEIR).

B4-9 The DEIR identifies the range of noise sources that could contribute to higher sound levels during the construction of projects included in the 2030 RTP and during subsequent operation of these facilities (see pages 4.6-13 to 4.6-21). It identifies the fact that project-specific acoustical studies, using the noise standards employed by local, state, and federal government, will be conducted as projects are designed (page 4.6-26). Such analyses do take into account ambient noise conditions. Mitigation measures are formulated as a result of these analyses and implemented when reasonable and feasible (see pages 4.6-26 to 4.6-28). Nevertheless, the DEIR concludes that significant and unavoidable noise impacts would result from implementation of the 2030 RTP (page 4.6-28).

B4-10 The DEIR states that new transportation projects may impact significant historic properties (page 4.11-10). Project-level analysis for specific transportation improvements identifying impacts to previously recorded historic resources, or those encountered as part of project surveys, cannot occur until project plans and project right-of-way requirements are known. This comment iterates the eligibility criteria for the California Register of Historical Resources. They are the criteria that will be employed by cultural resource specialists when they evaluate the significance of resources in proximity to transportation improvements. Satisfaction of one or more of these criteria typically leads to a determination of potential eligibility and, in turn, site significance. Undoubtedly, there will be instances in the future in which transportation improvements will impact potentially significant historic resources. In these instances, various data retrieval programs and other resource mitigation programs will be employed. Such mitigation programs, after review and approval by the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), are regarded as reducing impacts to historic resources to a level that is less than significant; hence the less than significant determination made in the DEIR.

B4-11 The DEIR states that the planned improvements in the proposed 2030 RTP would facilitate additional housing and population growth. This is identified as a significant growth inducing impact. The DEIR identifies cumulatively significant land use, air quality, noise, biological resources, energy, cultural resources, hazards and hazardous materials, global climate change, water resources, and visual resources impacts that will not be mitigated to a level below significance.
The level of specificity provided by the mitigation measures included in the 2030 RTP is appropriate for a program-level EIR. The compliance criteria are supplied by the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program included in the Final EIR.

The project objectives of the 2030 RTP EIR are the Policy Goals and Objectives of the 2030 RTP. Examination of these Goals and Objectives, which are presented in Table 2.0-1 (on page 2-5 of the DEIR), reveals that they are extremely broad. They cover a wide range of transportation, land use, and quality of life factors.

The No Project Alternative included in the DEIR conforms to the requirements of the referenced section of the CEQA Guidelines. It assumes no new roadway improvements in the region beyond those "reasonably expected to occur." These are roadway improvements that are already designed, funded, and for which environmental documents have been certified.

Comment noted.
CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Marve San Diego requests that SANDAG reject the RTP and the DEIR as prepared. If you have a question or need additional information, please contact me. Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Sincerely,

Everett DeLano
VIA FACSIMILE & U.S. MAIL

Michael Hix, Principal
Transportation Planning
SANDAG
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101

Re: Draft Environmental Impact Report for the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan, SCH No. 200700114a

Dear Mr. Hix:

When we spoke yesterday I asked whether SANDAG would agree to an extension of the time in which to submit comments on the DEIR in light of the fact I recently received certain information. You indicated that SANDAG would not extend the deadline, but you agreed to provide answers to questions and comments received after the deadline.

I told you I would provide a brief comment letter, but that I would have further comments and questions as I continued to review the applicable records and reports. I also anticipate I will have further comments and questions once I receive responses from SANDAG to my initial comment letter. That letter is enclosed herein.

I appreciate your cooperation and look forward to our continuing dialogue.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Everett Delano

Enc.
As detailed in MM-Cult-1a, a Project Implementation Agency (PIA) shall conduct a records search at the appropriate facilities to determine whether the project area has been previously surveyed and whether resources were identified (page 4.11-11 of the DEIR). As further detailed in MM-Cult-1b, in the event that the records indicate that no previous survey has been conducted, the agency will obtain a recommendation from a qualified cultural resources expert or an appropriate facility regarding the need for survey (page 4.11-12 of the DEIR).

These procedures are standard and would be required for any project-level cultural resource study for a project implementing a component of the 2030 RTP.

Please see response to comment B5-2 above.

Please see response to comment B5-2 above.

Please see response to comment B5-2 above.

Please see response to comment B5-2 above.
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.

Local agencies should consider expedience, 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 (310) 933-6251 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Dave Singleton
Program Analyst

Attachment: List of Native American Contacts

B5-6  Comment noted.

B5-7  Comment noted.
Native American Contacts
San Diego County
September 6, 2007

Barona Group of the Captain Grande
Rhonda Welch-Scalco, Chairperson
1095 Barona Road
Lakeside, CA 92040
sus@barona-nsn.gov
(619) 443-6812
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

Ewiaapaay Tribal Office
Harlan Pinto, Sr., Chairperson
PO Box 2260
Kumeyaay
Alpine, CA 91903-2260
wrlkl@louisingruck.net
(619) 445-6313 - voice
(619) 445-9120 - fax

Santa Ysabel Band of Diegueno Indians
Johnny Hernandez, Spokesman
PO Box 130
Santa Ysabel, CA 92070
brandietaylor@yahoo.com
(760) 765-0845
(760) 760-0520 Fax

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

Sycuan Band of the Kumeyaay Nation
Danny Tucker, Chairperson
5459 Sycuan Road
Diegueno/Kumeyaay
El Cajon, CA 92021
sstucker@sycuan-nsn.gov
619 445-2613
619 445-1627 Fax

Manzanita Band of Kumeyaay Nation
Leroy J. Elliott, Chairperson
PO Box 1302
Kumeyaay
Boulevard, CA 91905
(619) 766-4900
(619) 766-4057 Fax

Viejas Band of Mission Indians
Bobbi L. Demott, Chairperson
PO Box 909
Diegueno/Kumeyaay
Alpine, CA 91903
dagullar@viejassn.gov
(619) 443-3910
(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 70606.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 907.04 of the Public Resources Code and Section 6297.36 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is to be used only for contacting local Native American tribes in regard to consultation requirements for the proposed SCH9908761.00, CEQA Notice of Completion, draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan; San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG); San Diego County, California.
Native American Contacts
San Diego County
September 6, 2007

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

Pala Band of Mission Indians
Robert H. Smith, Chairperson
12196 Pala Mission Road, PMB 60
Pala, CA 92059
(760) 881-3500
(760) 742-1411 Fax

Campo Kumeyaay Nation
H. Paul Cuero, Jr., Chairperson
36190 Church Road, Suite 1
Campo, CA 91906
chair@palef.com
(619) 478-5045
(619) 478-5818 Fax

Peocho Band of Mission Indians
Pau'atu Macario, Cultural Resources Center
P.O. Box 1477
Tecate, CA 92583
(851) 308-9295 Ext 8106
(851) 376-2768
(851) 506-9491 Fax

Los Coyotes Band of Mission Indians
Katherine Saubel, Spokesperson
P.O. Box 189
Warner, CA 92086
loscoyotes@gmail.com
(760) 782-2701 FAX

Rincon Band of Mission Indians
Angela Veltri, Rincon Culture Committee
P.O. Box 68
Valley Center, CA 92082
council@rincontribe.org
(760) 748-1421
(760) 749-8901 Fax

Mesa Grande Band of Mission Indians
Mark Romero, Chairperson
P.O. Box 270
San Diego, CA 92070
msoagrandeband@msn.com
(760) 782-3818
(619) 782-9092 Fax

Kwaaymii Laguna Band of Mission Indians
Carmen Lucas
P.O. Box 775
Pine Valley, CA 91962
(619) 700-4207
Native American Contacts
San Diego County
September 6, 2007

Inaja Band of Mission Indians
Rebecca Osuna, Spokesperson
3906 Maple Street
Escondido, CA 92025
(760) 737-7628
(760) 747-8588 Fax

Rincon Band of Mission Indians
Vernon Wright, Chairperson
P.O. Box 88
Valley Center, CA 92082
(760) 749-1051
(760) 749-8901 Fax

Kumeyaay Cultural Repatriation Committee
Steve Banegas, Spokesperson
1098 Barona Road
Lakeside, CA 92037
(619) 443-6612
(619) 443-0981 FAX

Santa Ysabel Band of Diegueno Indians
Devon Reed Lomayesva, Esq, Tribal Attorney
PO Box 701
Santa Ysabel, CA 92070
(760) 765-0846
(760) 766-0320 Fax

San Luis Rey Band of Mission Indians
Russell Ronco, Chairman
1206 Old Pomerado Road
Poway, CA 92064
(619) 748-1596

Ewiiaapaayp Tribal Office
Will Mixailin, Executive Director
PO Box 2250
Alpine, CA 91900-2250
(519) 445-9126 - Fax

La Posta Band of Mission Indians
ATTN: James Hill, EPA Director
PO Box 1120
Diegueno, CA 92045
(619) 478-2113
(619) 478-2126 Fax

San Luis Rey Band of Mission Indians
Carmen Mejado, Co-Chair
1889 Sunset Drive
Vista, CA 92081
(760) 724-6505

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 7350.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 6207.34 of the Public Resources Code and Section 6237.5 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting local Native American with regard to cultural resources for the proposed
5CH200700146; CEQA Notice of Completion; 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
September 6, 2007

Campo Kumeyaay Nation
ATTN: Fidel Hyde, EPA Supervisor
36190 Church Road, Suite 1  Kumeyaay
Campo, CA 91906
(619) 478-6860
(619) 478-5818 Fax

La Jolla Band of Mission Indians
ATTN: Rob Roy, Environmental Director
22000 Highway 76  Luiseno
Pauma Valley, CA 92061
la-jolla-sherry@aol.com and
(760) 742-3790
(760) 742-1764 Fax

Cillini Lintorn
P.O. Box 507  Diegueno/Kumeyaay
Santa Ysabel, CA 92070
(760) 742-5684
cjoile173@aol.com

Charles Devers, Chair
Cultural Committee; Pauma & Yulma Reservation
P.O. Box 389  Luiseno
Pauma Valley, CA 92061
(760) 742-1289
(760) 740-4543 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 7605.35 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5007.44 of the Public Resources Code and Section 6697.58 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting local Native American with respect to cultural resources for the proposal SCH#2006070146, CEQA Notice of Completion: draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for 2007 Regional Transportation Plan, San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG): San Diego County, California.
B6-1 Widening SR 56 to six lanes will be added to the Revenue Constrained and Reasonably Expected Revenue scenarios in the Final 2030 RTP. The HOV lanes would remain outside of the Reasonably Expected scenario. The EIR for the 2030 RTP evaluates the cumulative impact of all the projects in the plan but does not analyze project-specific impacts. This modification does not change the significance conclusions in the EIR.

September 11, 2007

Hon. Mary Sessom, Chair
Board of Directors
San Diego Association of Governments
401 B Street
San Diego, CA 92101

Dear Chairwoman Sessom:

I am writing to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the proposed 2007 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). In particular, I am concerned about the potential adverse community and environmental effects of the new, lower funding priority assigned to the widening of SR 56 from four to six lanes and completion of two HOV lanes.

SR 56 is a vital link between I-5 and I-15, serving the rapidly growing residential, commercial, and business communities in the north end of the City of San Diego. A significant impact of the regional demand for housing and jobs is projected to be accommodated in this corridor. Most of that planned development is now approved and includes funding for local infrastructure. Including $53 million in increased contributions toward the SR 56 widening of SR 56 (see attachment). Much of it will be constructed and equipped to advanced environmental standards. 

SR 56 opened in 2005 and is already impacted by congestion and travel delays as evidenced by Figure 1.4 in the draft RTP (attached). Conditions are projected to be much worse by 2020 as shown in Figure 1.5 (attached).

The currently adopted 2001 RTP includes the widening project (from four to six lanes) in the Revenue Constrained Scenario at a cost of $40 million. The HOV lanes appear in the Reasonably Expected Scenario as a combined cost (including the widening to six lanes) of $180 million.

In the 2001 draft RTP, the widening and HOV lanes are included only in the Unfunded Scenario, a very low priority of funding, given the strategic importance of this transportation corridor. Completion of these two projects will obviously be delayed from the dates contemplated in the 2003 RTP. This will result in unacceptable and unanticipated impacts, including displacement of future growth in the near and intermediate term in other sensitive areas of the region and to adjoining counties.
The adverse community and environmental impacts of significant delays in the completion of these two projects must be thoroughly analyzed and disclosed in the final EIR, including, but not limited to the following:

1. Air quality and global warming impacts due to increased congestion in the corridor.
2. Land use, air quality, energy and global warming impacts of forcing growth to more remote locations.

We hope you will direct that this analysis be included in the final document and that there be a thorough review of alternative strategies to fully fund the widening of SR-56 on the schedule contemplated in the 2003 RTP.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Beth Fischer
Division President – San Diego
TITLE: STATE ROUTE 56 - EXPANSION TO 4 LANES

DEPARTMENT: ENGINEERING & CAPITAL PROJECTS

PROJECT: T-128

CONTRACTOR: 2

COMMUNITY PLAN: PYK

DESCRIPTION:

CONVERSION OF THE FOUR LANE PAVEMENT INTO A SIX LANE FACILITY. HIGHEST OCCUPANCY VEHICLE LANE CAN BE ACCOMMODATED WITHIN THE CENTER MEDIAN AT SOME POINT IN THE FUTURE. OTHER REGIONAL FUNDING IS UNEVENLY DETERMINED.

REFERENCE:

BLACK MOUNTAIN RANCH PUBLIC FACILITIES FINANCING PLAN PROJECT T-3-2

TURFORD STEPHEN'S PUBLIC FACILITIES FINANCING PLAN PROJECT T-1-2B

DEL MAR MESA PUBLIC FACILITIES FINANCING PLAN PROJECT A-3-1C

JUSTIFICATION:

DUE TO THE REGIONAL SERVICING NATURE OF THIS PROJECT, IT IS AGGREGATED WITHIN THE FEDERAL, STATE, OR OTHER OUTSIDE FUNDING FOR THE DEDUCTIBLE 18.05 WILL BE OBTAINED. IN THE ABSENCE OF THIS OTHER TYPICAL SOURCE, DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE INDIVIDUAL SUBURBAN AREAS OF THE NORTH/OF THE FUTURE URBANIZING AREA MAY BE REQUIRED TO UPS, OR AT LEAST, WILL ASSIST THE COST OF THIS PROJECT.

FUNDING METHOD:

THE ABOVE ALLOCATION OF COST REPRESENTS EACH SUBURBAN AREA'S SHARING, SUFFICIENTLY FUNDING FROM OTHER SOURCES. THEIR ALLOCATION MAY BE REDUCED AS OTHER SOURCES ARE IDENTIFIED. IF OUTSIDE FUNDING IS OBTAINED FOR THIS PROJECT, THEIR BLACK MOUNTAIN RANCH AND PACIFIC HIGHLANDS RANCH WILL BE ADDRESSED WITH A PROPORTIONAL AMOUNT. ANY REIMBURSEMENTS WILL BE CALCULATED BY A TRAFFIC FLIP, ANALYSIS. THE PROPORTIONAL SHARE FOR PACIFIC HIGHLANDS RANCH WOULD BE REDUCED FROM 40% TO 15%, THEREAFTER, ANY REIMBURSEMENTS WOULD BE DISTRIBUTED TO ALL SUBURBAN ON A PROPORTIONAL BASIS.

OBJECTIVE:

COST ALLOCATIONS ARE BASED UPON THE TOTAL COST OF PROJECT T-12A AND

COMMUNITY PROJECT T-1-2B

SCHEDULE:

THIS PROJECT WILL BE COMPLETED WHEN FUNDING IS AVAILABLE.
Regional Issues Committee of the  
Rancho Bernardo Community Planning Board  
15721 Bernardo Heights Parkway, Ste B-230  
San Diego, CA 92128  
www.RBPlanningBoard.com  

October 5, 2007  

SANDAG  
Attn: Shelby Tucker  
401 B Street, Suite 800  
San Diego, CA  

Re: Draft Environmental Impact Report for the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan  

Dear Ms. Tucker:  

The Regional Issues Committee of the Rancho Bernardo Community Planning Board appreciates the opportunity to provide our comments regarding the adequacy and accuracy of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Unfortunately, there has not been sufficient time to bring this matter to the full Planning Board for consideration; therefore, specific recommendations from the full Board regarding the Transportation Plan will be forwarded to SANDAG following our next Board meeting which is scheduled for October 18, 2007. In the meantime, the Regional Issues Committee provides the following comments regarding the Draft EIR:  

1. **High-Speed Passenger Rail Service Along the I-15 Corridor**  
   In August 2004, the Planning Board expressed serious concern regarding the feasibility of constructing high-speed rail service through the I-15 corridor (refer to the attached comment letter regarding the Programmatic EIR/EIS). The magnitude of the impacts related to such issues as community character, visual quality, noise, and landform alternation have yet to be adequately addressed at the state or local level, yet the draft RTP includes a proposal to dedicate $100 million for high-speed rail within the I-15 corridor with only minimal acknowledgement of potential impacts within the Draft EIR. Before significant funding is dedicated to this project, it is essential that both the SANDAG Board of Directors and the public be provided with adequate information to fully understand the effects that this proposal would have on the communities within the I-15 corridor.  

2. **The addition of a high-speed rail system within the I-15 corridor will result in significant impacts to the environment and these impacts should have been addressed in the Draft EIR. It is not adequate to simply state that the overall effects of the proposed transportation improvements will have significant, unmitigated impacts on the environment. Therefore, the EIR should be revised to include additional analysis and**
B7-2
(Cont.)

acknowledgment of the potential environmental effects of adding high-speed rail to the 1-15 corridor. Although the Land Use section includes broad references to transit improvements in the form of light rail, inter-city rail, and commuter rail, its discussion of the determination of community cohesion as a result of the implementation of these various types of transit is far too generalized. The effects on community cohesion from adding light rail in higher density areas or improving rail service along an existing rail corridor are substantially different from that of establishing an entirely new rail system within the 1-15 corridor. The EIR should be revised to address these differences in the magnitude of potential effects. The Draft EIR lacks any discussion of the potential impacts to visual quality as a result of implementing this project, and the majority of the mitigation measures for visual impacts relate to landscaping. Other measures for reducing the visual impacts of transportation improvements, particularly those that will be elevated above existing structures, should include sensitive design both in the sighting of such facilities and in their overall appearance (e.g., structural color, lighting, signage). Table 4.6-7 in the Noise section should be revised to include a discussion of potential noise impacts related to a high-speed rail system along the 1-15 corridor, a system that is likely to be elevated above the existing freeway at least in some locations.

B7-3
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1. Connecting Our Homes to Employment Centers

The Draft EIR describes the benefits to the environment of the extensive transit system included in the RTP; however, to achieve these benefits, measures must be in place to ensure that riders will have the ability to get from their transit stops to their places of employment. This is particularly important in the North County where the transit system is not as fully developed as it is in the southwestern portion of the County. To effectively reduce impacts related to traffic congestion, noise, and air quality as a result of the development of light rail systems, the EIR should include mitigation measures that will ensure the development of well-integrated light-rail and bus systems, particularly in the vicinity of major employment centers, such as the Palomar Airport Road corridor. The development of feeder bus lines to serve the Rancho Bernardo industrial park from the new transit center should also be addressed.

2. Accommodating "Smart Growth"

The Draft EIR also describes the benefits of implementing smart growth principles to improve connections between land use and transportation plans. The document states that through the coordination of transportation infrastructure and services with land use planning, the RTP hopes to avoid increased traffic congestion, reduced mobility, and a deteriorating quality of life. It should also be stated in the EIR that in order to achieve these benefits, the transportation infrastructure required to support smart growth development must be in place at the time of occupancy. Otherwise, the development simply represents a higher density project that will contribute to traffic congestion and a deteriorating quality of life.

3. Regional Water Supply

Although the Draft EIR discusses the issue of water usage during the construction of the various transportation facilities, it does not address the long term need for water to irrigate the landscaped areas associated with many of these facilities. The EIR should
incorporate additional mitigation measures that require the use of reclaimed water for landscaped areas in all new transportation projects, and encourage the conversion to the use of reclaimed water for existing facilities that would be improved as a result of the implementation of the RTP.

Thank you for this opportunity to provide comments. We look forward to reviewing the Final EIR when it becomes available.

Sincerely,

John Woods, Committee Chair

Attachment:  Letter dated August 30, 2004 from the Rancho Bernardo Community Planning Board to the State of California regarding the California High-Speed Rail EIR/EIS

cc:  Rancho Bernardo Community Planning Board Members
     Councilmember Brian Maienschein
     County Supervisor Pam Slater Price
August 30, 2001

Attn: California High-Speed Train
Draft Program EIR/EIS Comments
925 L Street, Suite 1425
Sacramento, CA 95814

Subject: Comments Regarding the Adequacy of the draft Program EIR/EIS for the Proposed California High-Speed Rail System

Dear Mr. Leavitt and Mr. Valenstein:

The Rancho Bernardo Community Planning Board, a City of San Diego recognized community planning group, has reviewed the Program EIR/EIS for the Proposed California High-Speed Rail System and finds that the draft, as currently prepared, does not adequately address the environmental consequences of the proposed project, nor does it address a reasonable range of project alternatives. In addition, the project description and impact analyses do not provide adequate information to allow the public or the decisionmakers to fully comprehend the scope of the proposal. We believe that the document, as currently prepared, is seriously flawed, both in its evaluation of impacts and in its discussion of feasible mitigation. We therefore request that the document be revised to incorporate an adequate analysis of the issues presented below.

Alternatives

The Council on Environmental Quality NEPA Regulations describe the alternatives section as the heart of the EIS. As such, the alternatives presented in an EIS should be reasonable and implementable, must be given equal treatment, and must provide clear choices for the decisionmaker.

Similarly, the CEQA Guidelines in Section 15126.6 state that an EIR shall consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decisionmaking and public participation. Because an EIR must identify ways to mitigate or avoid the significant effects that a project may have on the environment (Public Resources Code Section 21002.1), the discussion of alternatives shall focus on alternatives to the project or its location which are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project, even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives, or would be more costly.

This program EIR/EIS fails to consider an adequate range of alternatives. For a project of this magnitude, there are clearly additional alternatives that must be evaluated, including alternative routes, alternative technologies, and alternative designs for achieving the purpose and needs of the project. The Rancho Bernardo Community Planning Board requests that the discussion of alternatives include
an alternative system design in which the high-speed rail system would only be constructed to the edges of the State's major metropolitan areas, rather than extending through them. Under this alternative, passengers could still move quickly from one city to another, but rather than traveling directly to the center of the city, the trains would stop at an appropriate transit center at the outskirts of the city, allowing passengers to travel to their final destination via a variety of existing or new, less costly feeder transit lines, including trolleys, buses, and other existing rail lines. The implementation of such an alternative would substantially reduce the significant, unmitigated adverse effects of the proposed project on community character and visual quality and would avoid additional noise, vibration, and traffic congestion impacts within existing communities.

A specific example of why such an alternative should be considered is that fact that under the current proposal the high-speed rail line would be constructed all the way into the center of the City of San Diego. However, the construction of the line from Escondido south into San Diego would simply replicate SANDAG's current Transit First plans for mass transit in the I-15 corridor. An alternative should be developed that would tie the proposed high-speed rail project into existing and planned transit systems, rather than trying to overlay a redundant service on top of currently planned local projects. If travelers were to take the high-speed train to the Bay Area, wouldn't they transfer from the larger system onto BART when they reached one of the BART transfer stations? Why would this project need to duplicate existing opportunities on the BART? The same is true for the I-15 corridor into the City of San Diego. Wouldn't it be more reasonable, (with less cost and fewer impacts), to take the high-speed rail system south into the Escondido Transit Center, and at that point transfer onto SANDAG's Transit First system, which would provide more convenient access to communities along I-15 corridor and into the center of the city of San Diego? As stated above, we believe that such an alternative would not only be more cost effective, but it could achieve the same project objectives with far fewer significant, adverse impacts to existing communities and the environment.

Project Description

Section 15124 of the CEQA Guidelines requires an EIR to describe a proposed project in a way that will be meaningful to the public and to the decisionmakers. Unfortunately, this document is so general that it is not possible for the affected community members or the decisionmakers to grasp the magnitude of the impacts that could result from the implementation of this project. Although this is a program EIR/DEIS that covers the entire state, significantly more effort should have been made in describing how the system would be implemented within each community. It is apparent that little thought was given regarding how this facility would be constructed within various communities. For instance, within the portion of the I-15 corridor that extends from Lake Hodges to Mira Mesa in San Diego County, no right-of-way will be available for new facilities once the current freeway improvements are completed. That will require the development of an elevated rail line through this entire section of San Diego. Similarly regarding the height and design of the structures, how views could be altered or blocked, how the required construction would be accommodated within already overcrowded transportation corridors, and the effects of construction on existing traffic circulation are not provided at an appropriate level of detail to afford meaningful consideration of environmental consequences.
Existing Conditions/Project Setting

The discussion of existing conditions is extremely generic in nature and does not provide adequate information to allow for a comprehensive analysis of environmental consequences, even at the programmatic level. This is particularly true with respect to aesthetics and visual resources, noise and vibration, traffic and circulation, and biological resources. Where descriptions are provided for the segment between March Air Base and Miramar, they are generally inaccurate. For instance, the local street system along the I-15 corridor in northern San Diego is described as being constructed in a grid pattern. Due to the existing topography in northern San Diego, which consists of a series of canyons and mesas, no such grid pattern exists. On the contrary, relatively few parallel arterial roadways exist in this area, making traffic congestion on our local freeways that much more significant.

The document also fails to describe the proximity of residential development to the existing freeway corridor, the existing visual amenities within the corridor that could be impacted, and the significant open space areas, such as the Lake Hodges/San Pasqual Valley area and Los Penasquitos Canyon, that would have to be crossed by an elevated rail line.

Descriptions of other existing and planned transit projects in the vicinity of the proposed project have been omitted and an explanation of how the high-speed rail system would interact with these other transit programs should be provided.

Environmental Consequences

Once again, the anticipated impacts of the project are generic in nature and do not adequately address the magnitude of the impacts that could occur along various portions of the alignment. The CEQA Guidelines state that a program EIR will be most helpful in dealing with subsequent activities if it deals with the effects of the program as specifically and comprehensively as possible. The content of this document is neither specific nor comprehensive, and as a result, the document should be revised to provide a meaningful description of potential project impacts and associated mitigation measures.

Specifically, the discussion of aesthetics and visual resources fails to take into consideration the surrounding topography when addressing the potential effects of an elevated rail through a community. Little if any analysis of impacts to existing community character is presented, yet the impacts to a community such as Rancho Bernardo would be significant due to the high visibility of an elevated rail line passing through the center of the community. If the rail line were to be elevated between Rancho Bernardo Road and Bernardo Center Drive, it would be visible from a substantial portion of the community and the elevation would be so much higher than the surrounding area that it would not be possible to screen the facility. Because of these conditions, the draft EIR/EIS should have determined that in this portion of the corridor, impacts related to community character and visual quality would be significant and unmitigable.
As currently prepared, the document fails to disclose the anticipated noise impacts to sensitive receptors along the proposed alignment, particularly in areas where the system would be elevated. The document should clearly describe the incremental noise impacts generated by 120+ mph trains, traveling in both directions, at a frequency of every ten minutes in such locations. The current analysis seems to assume that because noise levels are already high along the I-15 corridor that additional noise can be generated within the corridor without creating new impacts. This is clearly not the case, particularly where the line would be elevated.

It is likely that there are numerous locations along the route where elevating the line would actually place the trains closer to sensitive receptors than they would be if they were constructed at grade. This is clearly the case along the I-15 corridor between Lake Hodges and Mira Mesa. For instance, within the I-15 corridor in the vicinity of Rancho Bernardo, elevating the rail line would place the train at elevations similar to the adjacent homes, which are situated above the existing freeway. The draft EIR/EIS implies that all such noise impacts can be mitigated. How would noise impacts be realistically mitigated in situations such as those in I-15 corridor where the elevations are too high to construct sound walls or other noise reducing structures?

A comprehensive noise analysis should be conducted that takes into consideration the existing elevations of sensitive receptors and the proximity of the line to those receptors, as well as the existing and future noise levels generated from within the I-15 corridor. Further, the cumulative effects of all of the uses within the corridor on adjacent sensitive receptors should be considered.

Too few visual simulation overlays have been provided in the draft EIR/EIS. As a result, none of the examples are representative of the current or planned conditions within the I-15 corridor between Lake Hodges and Mira Mesa. The photographs that are provided give the impression that there is sufficient space to easily insert the high-speed rail lines into the existing freeway right-of-way. These photographs are misleading and do not accurately depict the effects of the project on the surrounding area. The document should include photo simulations that accurately describe how the rail system would realistically fit into the I-15 corridor once the Managed Lanes project is completed.

The potential effects of existing soil problems along the corridor are also inadequately addressed. What could be the effects of increased vibration in areas with known soil problems? For example, in Rancho Bernardo there are ancient landslides present along both sides of I-15.

Mitigation Measures

The discussion of mitigation is extremely generic, with no discussion of how effective specific mitigation measures would be in specific situations. The EIR/EIS should be revised to address specific conditions that would be experienced along the route and incorporate realistic and feasible mitigation measures that would reduce anticipated impacts to below a level of significance. The document should also clearly identify those significant impacts that cannot be mitigated. For example, the visual impacts of constructing an elevated line between Rancho Bernardo Road and Bernardo Center Drive in Rancho Bernardo would be significant and unmitigable.
Project Feasibility

No discussion is provided regarding how rail lines can be accommodate within the footprint of existing transportation corridors. There are steep grades on I-15 through Rancho Bernardo and numerous overpasses and on and off ramps. Can the rail line be elevated above all of these structures? What would that height be? These are only some of the questions that have not been addressed in the draft EIR/EIS with respect to the feasibility. Another important question is whether the mitigation measures suggested in the document are actually feasible and if so, would they be effective in reducing impacts to below a level of significance.

The Rancho Bernardo Community Planning Board believes that there are feasible alternatives to the current proposal that have not been adequately addressed. Alternative designs, such as the one proposed earlier in this letter, would significantly reduce the adverse affects of the project on those communities located along the I-15 corridor in the San Diego region. We respectfully request that additional alternatives be developed and incorporated into a revised draft EIR/EIS. In addition, we request that a more comprehensive analysis of potential impacts to completed in order to provide the public and the decisionmakers with a complete understanding of the consequences to existing communities and the natural environmental of implementing the proposed project.

We appreciate this opportunity to provide comments and request that we be kept informed of future actions associated with this proposal.

Sincerely,

Original signed on 8/30/04

Victoria Touchstone, Corresponding Secretary
for Jim Denton, Planning Board Chairman

cc:  Brian Maienschein, San Diego City Council, District 5
     Assemblyman George Perea
     State Capitol Building, Room 4009 Sacramento, CA 94249-0075;
     San Diego District Office, 9950 Mira Mesa Blvd., Suite 120, San Diego, CA 92131
Will revise as appropriate.

Table 2.0-2 budget estimates for SR 241 must be updated to reflect the latest budget approved by the FETC Board of Directors. Updated budget information for SR 241 has been transmitted to SANDAG for inclusion in the final 2030 RTP. We request that Table 2.0-2 be revised to indicate the current project cost in 2006 dollars consistent with the RTP. As submitted to SANDAG in March 2007, the total project cost for the first phase of SR 241 (including prior year expenditures) is $401.9 million. The build-out phase scheduled for 2030 remains $150 million, for a total project cost of $551.9 million. The updated budget information for SR 241 will be included in the Final 2030 RTP and EIR.

4.10-19 Table 4.10-5. Table 4.10-5 provides a summary of 2030 habitat impacts for major highway and expressway projects. SR 241 is not included. Habitat impact information discussed in the South Orange County Transportation Infrastructure Improvement Project (SOCTIIP) Draft EIS/Final EIR should be included in a manner similar to that for other highway and toll lane projects included in the Proposed Project.

SR 241 is a project that is proposed by the Transportation Corridor Agencies (TCA). The lead agency for the SR 241 is outside of the San Diego region. It is included in the RTP for air quality conformity purposes since a small portion of the project is within San Diego County. The portion in San Diego County is completely within land owned by the federal government. The CEQA document was certified by the TCA Board of Directors in February 2006. The document is available at http://www.thetollroads.com/home/finalseir.htm. The project has no budgetary impact to the 2030 RTP. <http://www.thetollroads.com/home/finalseir.htm>
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4.10-24 through 29, Table 4.10-6a and Table 4.10-6b. These tables do not include SR 241 in the summary of impacts on listed species potentially affected by the RTP. This information is readily available in the SOCTIP Draft EIS/Final SEIR and should be included in these tables along with the impacts of other highway and expressway projects in the Proposed Project.

R8.5 4.3.3, Impact Analysis, SC-Vis-1. Potential visual impacts associated with highways and expressways included in the Proposed Project—such as SR 11 and SR 125—are discussed in this section. It would be appropriate to include SR 241 in this discussion, based on the information readily available in the SOCTIP Draft EIS/Final SEIR.

9.1, References. The SOCTIP Draft EIS/Final SEIR should be listed as reference source that informed the RTP DEIR. The SOCTIP environmental documents were available throughout the drafting of the 2007 RTP DEIR. The SOCTIP Final SEIR was certified by the PEITCA Board of Directors in February 2006; the SOCTIP Draft EIS was released for public review and comment in May 2004.

The Agency is available to assist SANDAG in making the above clarifications in the Response to Comments. Please contact either me (949-754-3460, lowe@ajbca.com) or Carla Walecka (313-342 9373, carlwaleca@sandiego.gov) with any questions you may have.

Sincerely,

David Lowe
Acting Chief Engineer

Attachment
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Engr</th>
<th>raw</th>
<th>const</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004 &amp; Prior</td>
<td>34,100,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>3,800,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>11,000,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>13,000,000</td>
<td>2,400,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>12,000,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>6,000,000</td>
<td>8,000,000</td>
<td>60,000,000</td>
<td>74,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>7,600,000</td>
<td>126,000,000</td>
<td>136,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>84,000,000</td>
<td>87,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23,000,000</td>
<td>24,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SANDAG Draft RTP Hearing

September 14, 2007

Good Morning!

My name is Tom Bartley. I am a member of the San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce Transportation Committee and I work for ISE Corporation.

First, I would like to acknowledge the recent successes of the 511 information network and the significant amount of work that went into the draft regional transportation plan. I especially like the statement that said San Diego can not build its way out of the current congestion, something that our Los Angeles neighbors to the north have known for some time. The planned coastal rail projects are commendable for increasing efficient transportation of people and goods. The choice of a balanced road and transit plan at first seemed reasonable, but it is not clear why that choice is the best way to move forward with the region's transportation.

I found the plan to have other short comings:
November 9, 2007

San Diego Association of Governments
Attn: Shelby Tucker
Associate Regional Planner
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101
E: stt@sandag.org
F: 619-699-1905

RE: CBD Comments for the SANDAG RTP EIR (SCH 20070511-45).

Dear Ms. Tucker,

These comments are submitted on behalf of the Center for Biological Diversity in partnership with the Frank G. Wells Environmental Law Clinic at the UCLA School of Law. This letter concerns the EIR for SANDAG’s Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), Mobility 2030 – The Transportation Plan for the San Diego Region (file number SCH 2007051145). The Center for Biological Diversity submitted comments on the RTP after the original Notice of Preparation was issued. While the deadline for public comment has passed, we would appreciate SANDAG including our submission with the materials to be considered at SANDAG’s upcoming November 30 board meeting.

The Center for Biological Diversity (“Center”) is a non-profit environmental organization dedicated to the protection of native species and their habitats through science, policy, and environmental law. The Center has over 35,000 members throughout California and the western United States, including in San Diego County.

These comments first examine the EIR’s numerous positive aspects in engaging with climate change analysis and mitigation planning. We then discuss potential improvements to the proposed measures and examples of new strategies that should be adopted to ensure that the EIR for the RTP includes all feasible mitigation measures to reduce the significant impacts resulting from the project’s contribution to climate change.
I. THE EIR’S CLIMATE CHANGE BACKGROUND, EMISSIONS QUANTIFICATION, AND ALTERNATIVE’S ANALYSIS IS POSITIVE,

A. The EIR Provides Scientific and Regulatory Background on Global Warming

Before assessing a project’s contribution to global warming, the EIR should provide an accurate and relevant summary of global warming and its impacts. The summary should make a good faith effort at full disclosure and avoid minimizing the severity of global warming’s impacts (CEQA Guidelines 14 C.C.R. § 15151).

SANDAG’s EIR discusses the effects of Global Warming by providing an overview of Global Climate Change (EIR, p.255). Furthermore, in the regulatory section - section 4.7.2 - the EIR gives a detailed history of laws that were enacted to combat climate change. The regulatory section first describes federal laws, then laws passed by the state of California, and finally laws or programs passed by the City of San Diego and the City of Chula Vista (EIR, p.257).

B. The EIR Quantifies Emissions from the RTP

SANDAG’s EIR provides a table and descriptions of the annual estimated greenhouse gas (“GHG”) emissions for 2030. The EIR also provides estimates of GHG emissions under the no build and existing conditions scenarios (EIR, p.275), which is important for an accurate analysis of the environmental impacts from the project and project alternatives.

C. The EIR Makes a Good Significance Determination

SANDAG acknowledges that the construction of the transportation improvements would increase energy consumption. SANDAG also properly considers the substantial increase in energy consumption associated with the construction equipment and vehicles primarily powered by nonrenewable fuels a significant impact (EIR, p.278). SANDAG concludes, “the incremental GHG emissions associated with construction and operation of the regional transportation network under implementation of the proposed 2007 RTP would cause a cumulatively considerable incremental contribution to the significant cumulative (worldwide) impacts when viewed in connection with worldwide GHG emissions” (EIR, p.282).

This reasoning is consistent with the CEQA Guidelines which state, “cumulatively considerable means that the incremental effects of an individual project are significant when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects” (CEQA Guidelines § 15064(h)(1)). Once a project’s impacts are determined to be cumulatively considerable, a project’s impacts require a mandatory finding of significance (Pub. Res. Code § 21083(b)).

SANDAG’s reasoning is also similar to other lead agencies who have determined that any increase in greenhouse gases above existing levels is a significant impact under CEQA (see Marin Countywide Plan Update DEIR, 2007).
D. The EIR Contains Good Range of Project Alternatives

This EIR contains four alternatives: (1) No Project alternative; (2) Transit Emphasis alternative; (3) Transit Emphasis Urban Core alternative; and (4) Revenue Constrained alternative.

The No Project alternative addresses what would be expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved (EIR, p. 476). With the Transit Emphasis alternative, funds would be spent primarily on transit capital expenses, a large part on transit operating expenses, and the remainder on transit projects in the highway system (EIR, p. 478). The Transit Emphasis Urban Core alternative is similar to Transit Emphasis alternative except that the transit network focus is on maximizing transit service in the downtown urban core area (EIR, p. 480). The Revenue Constrained alternative derives a transportation network based on current sources and levels of federal, state, and local transportation revenues projected out to the year 2030 (EIR, p. 481).

The alternatives considered in the EIR consist of more than just plans that envision varying degrees of funding -- they envision alternative mixes of various transportation improvements. Furthermore, the alternatives provide projects that call for higher density development, mixed use, and site locations in urban areas that will reduce the vehicle miles traveled.

Finally, CEQA guidelines require each EIR to identify the environmentally superior alternative, and if the No Project alternative is so identified, then another alternative must be selected (EIR, p. 465). The No Project Alternative was found to have the least number of purely environmental impacts. However, because the No Project Alternative cannot be selected, the Revenue Constrained alternative is the Environmentally Superior alternative to the Project (EIR, p. 510). The revenue constrained alternative was chosen because it results in the least new construction of any of the RTP alternatives (EIR, p. 56).

E. The EIR Contains a Good Breadth of Mitigation Measures

We are pleased with the breadth of measures included to mitigate the project’s GHG emissions. In general, the adoption and updating of municipal general plans and transportation plans should include measures to reduce pollution such as the provisions listed below:

(1) Expanded public transportation service and infrastructure, such as bus and light rail lines

(2) Energy efficiency/green building requirements, adopted via ordinances, codes, and regulations

(3) Installation of electric vehicle charging stations

(4) Expanded infrastructure for pedestrian and bicycle circulation
While the 2030 Regional Transportation Plan is prepared in connection with the local general plans which outline the local long range plans for future development, local agencies that issue building permits and adopt land development/building policies and ordinances have the authority implement green building requirements. In addition, SANDAG recently entered into a Memorandum of Understanding with the California Energy Commission to update SANDAG’s Regional Energy Strategy, prepare a Climate Change Action Plan, expand the Sustainable Region program recently completed for the City of Carlsbad, and prepare an Alternative Transportation Fuels and Vehicles program.

The Sustainable Region program is intended to assist local jurisdictions in the development of energy management plans that could be considered with the implementation of renewable energy projects, green building options, and energy efficiency. According to SANDAG’s agreement with the California Energy Commission, the plan will be implemented in 2008.

The Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the 2030 Regional Transportation Plan includes a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP). The MMRP summarizes each impact identified in the EIR, the mitigation measure that addresses the impact, the specific action to be taken to implement the mitigation measure, the timing to implement each mitigation measure, and the party responsible for implementing the mitigation measure.

While the breadth of mitigation measures shows a good approach to analyzing all feasible mitigation, some of the measures should be strengthened in order to guarantee their effectiveness. As a matter of policy, measures to reduce climate change impacts may not be deferred until some future time or must include performance standards to assure their effectiveness (see CEQA Guidelines § 15126.4(a)(1)(B)). Aspirational goals or policies do not meet the standards of CEQA and mitigation measures should be strictly enforceable through the mitigation monitoring plan. Therefore, each mitigation measure should:

1. Specify the agency in charge of monitoring and enforcing the measure;
2. Include a deadline for the implementation of the measure; and
3. Specify the action to be performed so that members of the public can read the measure and understand the agency’s responsibilities.

Based on the guidelines listed above, the following mitigation measures should be improved:

MM-AQ-2a – states that certain Caltrans specifications shall be incorporated into Caltrans projects, but it fails to state which agency will monitor/enforce.
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**MM-AQ-2b** – lists dust control measures that are to be incorporated into project specifications, but fails to state which agency will monitor/enforce.

**MM-AQ-2d** – lists measures to be incorporated in order to reduce diesel emissions, but fails to state which agency will monitor/enforce.

**MM-EN-1b** – lists energy efficiency measures that are to be incorporated when applicable, but fails to state which agency will monitor/enforce.

B9-3

**MM-EN-1e** – states that SANDAG shall encourage lawmakers and agencies to design programs to promote use of sustainably produced renewable fuels, but it does not include a description or examples of activities that constitute “encourage.”

**MM-EN-1d** – states that SANDAG shall produce a white paper, but does not give a deadline.

**MM-GCC-1d** – states that SANDAG will work with its member agencies to increase the number of AFVs. However, the measure does not state that the number of AFVs will actually increase or state ways in which SANDAG will “work” to increase the number of AFVs.

B9-5

**MM-GCC-1g** – states that SANDAG shall prepare an analysis of potential pricing strategies to reduce GHG emissions, but does not give a deadline.

**MM-GCC-1i** – states that SANDAG shall conduct a public information program to educate the public about the connection between individual transportation behavior and global climate change but fails to provide a deadline.

The EIR does a good job of quantifying the GHG emissions that will result from this RTP, but the EIR fails to disclose an estimate of the amount of GHG emissions that will be reduced because of the implementation of all the mitigation measures. A good faith analysis of emissions would include the potential reductions achieved through integration and incorporation of mitigation measures.

C. The EIR fails to Offset the Remaining GHG Emissions

Once all measures to avoid and minimize GHG emissions have been adopted, the project should offset the remaining GHG emissions. The EIR states that implementation of the proposed

B9-4 SANDAG will include the preparation of the referenced white paper in the work being prepared on the Regional Energy Strategy. The agreement between SANDAG and the California Energy Commission identifies a completion date for that work by April, 2009.

B9-5 SANDAG is working with the California Energy Commission to identify opportunities for alternative fuel vehicles in both municipally owned vehicle fleets and those owned by franchisees of the jurisdictions, such as trash haulers, green waste haulers, and curbside recyclable haulers. SANDAG also will work with local jurisdictions to identify grant funding and other funding possibilities to aid in the transformation of fleets to use the municipal actions as a model for broader outreach to the community. SANDAG also will look at the most appropriate locations for siting alternative fuel infrastructure to best leverage geographic, institutional, financial, and environmental resources.

B9-6 SANDAG will evaluate the feasibility of potential funding sources after the 2030 RTP is adopted. Sources that are approved by the SANDAG Board will be incorporated in to future updates of the RTP. Potential pricing strategies also could be evaluated as part of the Regional Energy Strategy that will be completed in 2 years.

B9-7 SANDAG has tentatively scheduled public workshops for the draft Regional Climate Action Plan in August, 2008. Outreach and dissemination of the plan should be concluded by April, 2009.

B9-8 It would be speculative to quantify emissions reductions from the implementation of plans and projects that have not been developed to date. For example, MM-GCC-1e and MM-GCC-1a call on SANDAG to update the Regional Energy Strategy and prepare a Climate Action Plan for the region, respectively. Precise emissions reductions will depend on what measures are included in these plans and the extent to which local agencies incorporate the actions into their own plans. Similar circumstances exist for many of the mitigation measures, and quantifying emissions reductions will only be feasible as these measures are developed and implemented.

B9-9 The measures recommend in this comment will be considered in the Regional Energy Strategy update and in the preparation of the region’s first Regional Climate Action Plan. It is anticipated that SANDAG will evaluate regional Greenhouse Gas emissions (GHG) and measures that can be implemented to reduce GHG emissions beyond the transportation sector when the Regional Comprehensive Plan is updated. At this time, however, SANDAG is not positioned to implement on-site mitigation measures such as building retrofits or installation of renewable generation, as these measures are outside of SANDAG’s regulatory authority.
B9-10 SANDAG carefully evaluated recommended measures to reduce GHG that were submitted in response to the Notice of Preparation from both the office of the California Attorney General and the Center for Biological Diversity. SANDAG developed Appendix C to the EIR which outlines those GHG measures that were included in the EIR as mitigation measures, already incorporated into the 2030 RTP, and/or outside SANDAG’s regulatory authority.

D. SANDAG Should Consider Emulating Mitigation Measures from Other Similar Transportation-Related Plans

i. California has Provided CEQA Guidance on Climate Change Analysis

The state of greenhouse gas and CEQA regulation remains fluid in California. The California Air Resources Board (CARB) and the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) have not yet issued final regulations explaining how to analyze a project’s climate change impacts under CEQA. However, there is guidance available both from CARB/OPR and other project proponents’ plans. SANDAG should consider this guidance in finalizing the RTP EIR. In cases where SANDAG’s statutory authority is limiting, SANDAG can at a minimum establish a structure for coordinating with constituent agencies to encourage them to consider these practices if SANDAG itself lacks the authority to do so itself. Establishing an interagency coordination program combined with incentives may be a positive way to ensure that other agencies implement positive greenhouse gas reduction measures.

CARB issued its latest list of AB 32 Early Action Measures on October 25, 2007. AB32 is the California Global Warming Solutions Act, which mandates significant cuts in the state’s Greenhouse Gas emissions by the year 2020. SANDAG should consider incorporating these strategies into the RTP EIR. Besides this guidance from the implementing agency, the California Attorney General suggests that project proponents seeking advice on how to properly consider climate change impacts and propose mitigation measures should refer to guidance from the OPR. The SANDAG RTP and EIR already contain some of these strategies and should be commended for their inclusion. However, SANDAG does not consider other feasible mitigation measures and should do so before it finalizes the document. They are listed below, along with the jurisdiction(s) that has implemented them.

ii. SANDAG Should Consider Model Climate Change Mitigation Measures and Adopt Measures not Already Included in the RTP and EIR

For the following section, see Appendix A for a full listing of the OPR guidance and referenced plans with the relevant page numbers. CARB guidance is available on the agency’s website. Digital versions of the documents have been included on a CD-ROM with our hardcopy submission.
(1) Transportation Alternatives Programs:

(a) Increase carpool, vanpool, car sharing, and other transportation alternative incentives for city employees, students, and private sector workers through employer-based programs (City of San Diego, City of San Luis Obispo, Sonoma County, City of Berkeley, City of Chula Vista, City of San Francisco, Marin County)

(b) Provide incentives for increased private sector ownership of alternative fuel and low-emissions vehicles, including purchase incentives and use incentives, i.e. HOV use (City of Santa Monica, City of Chula Vista, City of San Francisco, Marin County)

(c) Provide dedicated public transportation for high-volume corridors such as downtown-airport, downtown-entertainment district, downtown-university, etc. where public transit options are currently absent or not competitive with driving (City of Los Angeles, City of Chula Vista, City of San Francisco)

(d) Improve transit outreach to language-isolated communities and traditional non-users (City of Los Angeles, City of Arcata, City of Chula Vista)

(e) Introduce disincentives like congestion fees and increased parking prices to encourage more transit use. Federal incentives from the Department of Transportation are available for municipalities that adopt these measures. (City of Arcata, City of Chula Vista, City of San Francisco, Marin County)

(f) Encourage compressed scheduling, telecommuting and other transit neutral work modes (Marin County)

(e) Accommodate bicyclists and improve bike lanes. Study a bike sharing program like San Francisco or Paris. Require a regional bike transit program and implementation program with defined deadlines. Require bike carriers/racks on all public transit. (City of San Francisco)

(2) Transportation Efficiency Improvements:

(a) Improve real-time routing/re-routing of mass transit vehicles using GPS-linked software (City of San Diego)

(b) Improve integration of customer preferences and GIS mapping to optimize route selection (City of San Diego, City of Chula Vista)

(c) Introduce traffic signal synchronization (Marin County)

(d) Implement idling restrictions in bus/train yards and layover zones (City of San Diego, CARB Early Action Measures)

B9-11 SANDAG through RideLink, the Regional Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program, strongly promotes public and private sector Employer-based commute alternative programs. RideLink assists employers, employees, and students with identifying and using alternatives to driving alone to commute to work or school. The 2030 RTP calls for increased emphasis on TDM which will allow the RideLink message to reach a broader audience including outreach to inter-regional partners in Orange County, Riverside County, and Baja California.

B9-12 See Response to Comment No. 5

B9-13 The 2030 RTP incorporates new Rapid Bus, Bus Rapid Transit, and use of the Managed Lanes which will reduce door-to-door travel times in heavily used travel corridors. New and improved transit services serving high-density corridors such as El Cajon Boulevard in the City of San Diego or point-to-point services to major activity centers such as employment areas in Sorrento Valley and University City are included in the RTP. Improvements along arterial routes such as transit signal priority and queue jumpers at congested intersections are intended to provide a competitive advantage to driving alone. Managed lanes and direct access ramps to Bus Rapid Transit stations are intended to provide a time advantage for transit.

B9-14 The two transit operators, MTS and NCTD, provide community outreach.

B9-15 The 2030 RTP discusses additional potential revenue sources in Chapter 4. Additional pricing mechanisms and parking surcharges are included as a way to provide additional transportation improvements. SANDAG currently employs congestion pricing in the I-15 corridor and plans to expand this to three other corridors in the 2030 RTP.

B9-16 RideLink assists employers in developing customized telework, flextime and compressed work week programs. In addition to the traditional employer-based outreach, SANDAG is teaming up with the US Department of Labor to provide a Telework Forum in January 2008.

B9-17 SANDBAG is currently preparing a comprehensive Bicycle Master Plan that will better integrate local bicycle plans and regional non-motorized travel priorities.

B9-18 SANDAG is currently testing a transit-shoulder lane project that enables busses in congested traffic to use the shoulder lanes to increase trip time reliability and provide a travel time incentive to bus users.

B9-19 Market research and customer preferences were completed prior to developing the regional transit vision, a precursor to the RTP. GIS is one tool that is used by both the regional agency and local transit operators for transit route planning.

B9-20 At a regional level, regional signal coordination is a key element under our System Management element discussed in Chapter 7 as a regional strategy for improving regional mobility. Through the implementation of the Arterial Traffic Management System network, SANDAG provides the tool that enables local agencies to better manage and coordinate signal timing across jurisdictional boundaries.

B9-21 This is a transit operations comment and we will pass along the recommendation to the transit operators.
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B9-22 (e) Lobby for increased state and federal subsidies and emissions reduction legislation (City of Arcata, City of San Francisco)

B9-23 (f) Mandate tire pressure monitoring for bus fleets and public vehicles. Also introduce programs to oil change and auto mechanic establishments offer this service. (CARB Early Action Measures)

(3) Transportation Capital Programs:

B9-24 (a) Increase transit and other public agency ownership of alternative fuel and low-emissions vehicles. Accelerate retirement of older high emission vehicles. (City of Santa Monica, City of Arcata, City of Berkeley, City of San Francisco, Marin County)

B9-25 (b) Increase use of lower-emission fuels (Sonoma County, City of Santa Monica, Marin County)

B9-26 (c) Aerodynamic and frictional retrofitting i.e. fairings, lower resistance tires (Sonoma County, CARB Early Action Measures)

B9-27 (d) Improve non-vehicular transport infrastructure i.e. bike paths and walkways (City of Santa Monica, City of Arcata, City of Berkeley, City of Chula Vista, City of San Francisco, Marin County)

B9-28 (e) Improve dedicated HOV, busway, and rail corridor infrastructure (City of Santa Monica, City of San Francisco, Marin County)

B9-29 (f) Install energy efficient transportation signage and signaling i.e. LED lights (City of Berkeley)

B9-30 (g) Use blended cement formulae for construction projects and source concrete and aggregate from suppliers who are energy efficient producers (CARB Early Action Measures)

C. SANDAG Should Explain Why Certain Mitigation Measures are Outside Their Jurisdiction

Even after examining SANDAG’s bylaws and authorizing legislation (AB 1703), the exact bounds of SANDAG’s statutory authority remain unclear. SANDAG should explain to the public why it claims certain proposed programs to be outside its authority or infeasible.

D. SANDAG Should Clarify Which Mitigation Measures are Included in the RTP or Already Underway

For items listed as “already included in the RTP”, SANDAG should reference the section(s) where these items reside. For items listed as already being done by SANDAG, SANDAG should specify which current program is involved. As currently formatted, items already included in the RTP and items already being done by SANDAG cannot be distinguished from each other. SANDAG should therefore add notations to disaggregate the two groups.

B9-22 SANDAG staff is currently participating in the drafting of California Transportation Committee Guidelines for Regional Transportation Plans regarding transportation and land use planning and GHG reduction. SANDAG staff is also participating in efforts with the American Planning Association to a draft Policy Guide regarding Planning and Climate Change

B9-23 Please see response to comment no. 21.

B9-24 New transit vehicle purchases must be alternative-fuels. Currently, 45% of all transit buses in the county (395 of 886 total) are fueled by compressed natural gas (CNG), including 53 new CNG buses delivered in 2005.

B9-25 SANDAG is working with the California Energy Commission to identify opportunities for alternative fuel vehicles in both municipally owned vehicles and those owned by franchisees of the jurisdictions, such as trash haulers, green waste haulers, and curbside recyclable haulers. SANDAG also will work with local jurisdictions to identify grant funding and other funding possibilities to aid in the transformation of fleets to use the municipal actions as a model for broader outreach to the community. SANDAG also will look at the most appropriate locations for siting alternative fuel infrastructure to best leverage geographic, institutional, financial, and environmental resources.

B9-26 Retrofitting vehicles to reduce friction was not deemed an appropriate mitigation measure since it is not a widely accepted best practice, is questionable in its cost-effectiveness, and is outside SANDAG’s regulatory authority.

B9-27 SANDAG has an existing Bicycle and Pedestrian Program that funds planning, design, and construction of bicycle and pedestrian projects at the local and regional level. The current program is expanding to include neighborhood safety and traffic calming projects. SANDAG is currently in the process of developing a Regional Bicycle Plan which will include, as a component, project prioritization and funding strategy. The funding strategy will lay the groundwork for finding the best balance for all non-motorized transportation projects.

B9-28 The 2030 RTP provides dedicated rights-of-way for bus rapid transit (BRT) services including taking advantage of freeway Managed Lanes/HOV facilities along with dedicated transit guideways in key high volume transit travel corridors where Managed Lanes/HOV facilities are not planned. Other capital improvements, including the completion of Coastal rail double-tracking, are included in the 2030 RTP to increase commuter rail service.

B9-29 See mitigation measure no. MM-EN-1b in the Energy and Global Climate Change chapter.

B9-30 See mitigation measure no. MM-GCC-1j in the Energy and Global Climate Change chapter.

B9-31 As discussed in Section 4.7.4 (Impact Analysis) and Section 4.7.7 (Residual Impacts), factors that are expected to impact GHG include but are not limited to state and federal regulatory actions; local land use decisions; technological improvements; regional economic conditions; the fuel-efficiency and fuel-source of private automobiles; the price of oil, gasoline, diesel, electricity, and other fuels; the source of region’s electric power (i.e., proportion of renewable and
nonrenewable sources); the amount of oil imported by the U.S.; and the forecasted regional population increase by approximately 918,000 people or 29.93 percent by 2030. SANDAG is a regional government agency with the responsibility to create a regional transportation plan (RTP) and construct a regional transportation system. Pursuant to California Public Utilities Code § 132360 et seq., SANDAG is also required to prepare and adopt a regional comprehensive plan (RCP) based on the local general and regional plans that integrates land uses, transportation systems, infrastructure needs, and public investment strategies, within a regional framework, in cooperation with member agencies and the public. SANDAG’s planning for the RTP and RCP is done via a collaborative process. SANDAG has not been granted authority by the legislature to direct land use planning decisions. Instead, SANDAG’s role is to provide comprehensive information to those entities at the federal, state, and local level that do have land use authority. Although SANDAG can and will attempt to influence state and federal regulatory actions that could impact GHG, it has no control over these government bodies. SANDAG has no permitting or licensing authority over private industry or ability to control fuel prices or imports. SANDAG encourages smart growth and mixed use development, but has no ability to control population growth. Finally, SANDAG has developed a regional energy strategy and will continue to support efforts to increase use of renewable energy resources in the region, but SANDAG is not recognized by the Public Utilities Commission or any other entity as an agency with any authority over energy resource choices for the region.

B9-32 Many components of the 2030 RTP are consistent with land use/transportation strategies that reduce GHG and therefore are not mitigation measures identified in the EIR. SANDAG has made a commitment to integrate better land use and transportation planning through the development of the Regional Comprehensive Plan and subsequently with the extension of the TransNet Ordinance which includes a smart growth incentive program to encourage local jurisdictions to increase densities around existing or future transit investments. Specific mitigation measures are all identified in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program that is part of the Final EIR.
E. SANDAG Should Allow Sufficient Time to Consider Public Commentary

Comments submitted by the deadline will not be available to the public until November 23. SANDAG should allow the public and decision-makers full opportunity to review and integrate comments from the public and responsible and trustee agencies. This process should not be rushed for a project of this magnitude. SANDAG should allow for adequate time between the release of public comments and responses to comments to assure the public has time to fully address issues in the Final EIR prior to adoption of the RTP.

F. SANDAG Should Address Several Technical and Formatting Issues

There are a number of technical and procedural issues that SANDAG should resolve:

(1) The mitigation measures are not numbered consistently - at times they are referred to by letter (i.e. a, b, c, etc.), and other times they are referred to by number (i.e. 1, 2, 3, etc.).

(2) EIR Appendix C is formatted in a confusing manner. It is unclear exactly what the distinction is between items on page C-1 and page C-2, given that some appear on both lists and others are only found in a single location.

(3) SANDAG should specify how it intends to conduct oversight on its various mitigation measures and specify public reporting requirements for instances of non-compliance. This is especially true when an outside agency or firm is partially or wholly responsible for the mitigation measure in question.

III. Conclusion

A. The SANDAG RTP EIR is Generally a Strong Document and Should Serve as a Model for Other Lead Agencies and Project Proponents

We commend the agency on conducting a hard look at greenhouse gas emissions and climate change through the CEQA process. Overall, the document positively engages with climate change issues and honestly contemplates several reasonable mitigation measures that will serve to reduce the project’s greenhouse gas impacts. There are, however, some deficiencies that can be improved via simple changes, as well as other matters for longer-term implementation that would make the RTP even more effective at reducing its climate change impacts as required by CEQA. To the extent that SANDAG’s position as a regional transit agency means it lacks the jurisdiction to impose certain programs on its constituent bodies, those particular reforms should, at a minimum, be discussed cooperatively with the municipal agencies that will be responsible for carrying out the plans.

B. SANDAG is working to provide the responses to comments and the Final EIR to the public as soon as it is available. All responsible agencies will receive the response to their comments at least 10 days prior to the November 30, 2007 SANDAG Board meeting.

C. SANDAG has made minor edits to the final document.

D. Appendix C outlines the comments received during the Notice of Preparation of the Draft EIR. Page C-1 outlines general comments in the comment letter and page C-2 is a summary of an attachment to the Attorney General’s comment letter that provided recommendations from the Federal Highway Administration to address GHG emissions.

E. SANDAG’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the 2030 RTP is currently a table that lists environmental impacts, mitigation measures, actions, timing, and responsible party (SANDAG is typically not the responsible party). As the “Areawide Clearinghouse” for environmental documents, SANDAG has the ability to monitor whether responsible parties comply with mitigation measures. SANDAG will monitor and report whether the mitigation measures identified in the EIR are actually implemented.

F. SANDAG staff is currently participating in the drafting of California Transportation Committee Guidelines for Regional Transportation Plans regarding transportation and land use planning and greenhouse gas reduction. SANDAG staff is also participating in efforts with the American Planning Association to a draft Policy Guide regarding Planning and Climate Change. In addition to these state and national efforts, SANDAG is coordinating a regional climate change task force, composed of agencies and organizations that are deeply involved in climate change planning, such as the San Diego Foundation and the California Center for Sustainable Energy. This task force is engaged in coordinating regional climate change activities and developing a strategic regional approach to mitigation planning.
Please do not hesitate to contact Jonathan Evans at 213-598-1466 or jevans@biologicaldiversity.org if you have any questions regarding comments on the SANDAG RTP EIR. The Center and Sierra Club wish to be placed on the mailing and notification list for all future environmental decisions regarding this Project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Jonathan Evans
Staff Attorney
Center for Biological Diversity

Jeffrey Abinou
Law School Student
UCLA School of Law

Josh Mukhopadhyay
Law School Student
UCLA School of Law

Enclosures:

Appendix A
CD-ROM including documents listed in Appendix A
The plan seems to be focused on catching up to the current congestion due to daily commuter and student travel. Attention to the transportation needs of business and tourist visitors was lacking. San Diego’s beaches and tourist attractions need better transportation choices for congestion relief.

I suggest coordinating a transportation plan with the Airport Authority around Lindbergh Field and the other county airports. A regional link to Orange County and other Los Angeles airports should also be considered.

Similarly, more attention needs to be given to goods movement, that is, more long term choices for rail and heavy-duty vehicles.

Recent presentations to California Air Resources Board indicate that the pollution contribution from mobile sources is the fastest growing threat to San Diego air quality. Yet the RTP does not take into account future effects of vehicle exhaust on air quality or global warming.
• The plan could be made more aware of energy conservation. I suggest applying the following simple energy efficiency rating for better highway design:
  ○ Look at exit and on ramps and other highway crossings. Roads should go uphill to help slow traffic and downhill to help speed up traffic. The rating is to add the weight of all the estimated average vehicle traffic, multiply the weight in pounds by the grade change in feet. The number is positive if the grade change assists traffic and negative if it works in the opposite direction. This can save brake wear and thousands of gallons of fuel by the 40,000 to 50,000 vehicles per day at heavily used freeway ramps.
  ○ A corollary to this energy efficiency rating at grade crossings is to put the higher speed highway at the lower elevation and the lower speed road over the top.

• The border with Mexico needs a compatible transportation strategy for the near term and long term needs of moving both people and goods. The future Punta Colinet port will easily over load the San
Diego region highways to move goods to the rest of the United States. SANDAG studies indicate that billions of dollars per year are lost to the San Diego area because of border congestion. The RTP needs a border infrastructure strategy.

- More bicycle friendly and pedestrian friendly transportation needs to be added to the plan.
- Many transportation infrastructure projects will pay for themselves by offering faster transportation. Private money is available. Public/private partnerships should be part of the plan.
- Finally, I propose that 1% of the annual transnet expenditures be used to fund one or more ongoing new technology developments like Magnetic Levitation, linear electric propulsion, guided vehicle lanes, trams, gondolas, exotic bus rapid transit, and hybrid highway/rail systems. San Diego did not make the final cut in the awarding of $100 million by the US Department of Transportation. Perhaps more innovation and creativity is needed.

San Diego cannot use the same old approaches with massive
amounts of concrete and steel and 6 lane highways to build its way
to better transportation.

- Modern future urban planning has shown that business and
  
  naturally
  
  housing development follows behind the development of
  transportation corridors rather than adding transportation to already
devolved areas. The RTP needs a long term component that sets
goals 30 to 50 years into the future as a planning document to

consistent guidance

for continuous planning development.

Thank you for listening to my comments.
From: Mike Bullock <mailto:mike_bullock@earthlink.net>

To: rtp@sandag.org

Cc: NCCChair@sierriclubsandiego.org ; NorthCountyTimesLetters
<mailto:lettuce@notime.org> / soosandiego@gmail.com

Sent: Friday, September 14, 2007 5:05 PM

Subject: Comments Regarding the Draft 2007 RTP

Michael Bullock
1800 Bayborry Drive
Oceanside, CA 92054
760-754-8925

September 14, 2007

CANDID

Attn: Rachel Kennedy
Assistant Transportation Planner
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101

Subject: Draft 2007 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and its Environmental Impact Report (EIR)

Dear Responsible Parties:

My comments fall into three categories. The first is the need to incorporate the foot of global warming into the documents. The second is to incorporate market-driven need for transportation into the documents. The third is the futility of freeway expansion.

Global Warming

California has a policy of reducing the generation of carbon dioxide. This should not be minimized or ignored in your documents. To reach the required levels, Californians are going to have to drive
SANDAG supports the concept of “Parking Cash Outs” as part of our TDM program efforts. As this financial incentive is an employer-employee negotiation, SANDAG does not directly subsidize. Instead staff members work with employers to educate them on its benefits and the alternative options employees have for commuting. The SANDAG TDM program includes outreach with regional employers to share information on the tax benefits associated with these programs and also provides employers with information on SANDAG subsidized programs such as vanpools. Through SANDAG’s vanpool subsidy, we offer an additional incentive that indirectly supports parking cash outs.
The General Plan cashout recommendation was to amend the city's off-street parking ordinances with two new paragraphs. The first would have been a definition of "Parking Cashout at Places of Employment," as presented above. The second would have been a schedule of reductions in the parking-lot-size requirements as a function of amount paid. For example, a $4 per-day payment would earn a 10% reduction; a $6 per-day payment, a 15% reduction; and an $8 per-day payment, a 20% reduction. It was assumed that the staff would recommend actual values. It was also assumed that the paragraph would be worded so that the numbers could be adjusted on a case-by-case basis. For example, the paragraph might use the phrase, "such as" before listing the reductions.

Companies that wanted to pay cashout would then negotiate with the Cupertino city staff to determine the exact reductions. The agree-to amount paid would then be considered "nominal." The amount paid, on any given day, would then be adjusted so that, for example, the company would not have to pay an excessive amount if too many employees did not drive. The details are in the Power Point Chart included on this web site.

The proposal was inspired by a case-study of cashout published by Patrick Siersman, a transportation analyst at Stanford. It shows that cash payments significantly reduce driving to work. Fewer cars justify less parking. Since land is expensive, companies could earn enough money from the excess land to pay for the cashout. The Cupertino proposal included tables and plots showing 10 examples of cashout, in three groups: one with poor transit, one with fair transit, and one with good transit. They were taken from Siersman's work, which provided a published reference for each example. The work supports two conclusions: first, reductions occur even when transit is poor and second, the overall average reduction is 21%. A table of the 10 examples is shown in the Power Point charts included in this web site.

The Figure below shows a cashout result at what happens to be a poor-transit location. Both bus and "bike/walk" use increased by 1,600 percent. The amount paid was $49/month in 1996 dollars.

Although this case is the best result in the case study, other
cases were nearly as good and the overall results are stunning. Even the worst case showed a 15% reduction in driving. This would easily support a 10% reduction in the size of the parking lot. For a company with 1,200 employees, this would result in 1 acre of land. In Cupertino, an acre of land, zoned industrial is worth $2 million dollars. If the acre were to be rezoned to residential multi-family, it would be worth more than $4 million. Everyone in Cupertino knows that the city needs to mitigate its high cost of housing.

Cashout Results for CH2M Hill, an Engineering Firm in Bellevue, Washington, Near Seattle

During the General Plan discussion, the Chamber of Commerce opposed cashout. Cupertino's Bike/Ped Commission (BPC) offered no comment. Even so, Council Members Dolly Sandoval and Richard Lowenthal wanted to continue the discussion of cashout.

At the GP meeting where I mentioned that the Loma Prieta Chapter of the Sierra Club had sent a letter of support, Dolly stated that cashout was a "fantastic opportunity for the city". Richard Lowenthal stressed that cashout was not being required of companies; it was a new choice. However, Council Members Patrick Kwon, Krie Wong, and Sandra James voted to end the discussion.

In November, 2005, Orrin Mahoney was elected to replace Sandra Jance. I later met with Orrin for just over an hour at Peet's Coffee on Stevens Creek by De Anza College. He was skeptical of the numbers and told me that he would not favor changing the city's ordinance before a company came to the city wanting to do cashout. I showed him the ten references used by the SIEGMAN case study.
I left not sure if he was still skeptical or not. I also left thinking that the city was lucky to have such a great guy on the council.

I finally got to meet with Chris Giusiana, the Chamber of Commerce CEO. The lunch-time meeting started with Chris telling me that the Chamber had dropped its opposition. It was good news but I left the meeting still disappointed. To me, it is clear that the Chamber members should be the greatest advocates of cashout because it allows new flexibility and opportunity for positive growth. I have been unsuccessful in getting to meet with the Chamber Board of Directors. Still, the fact that they dropped their opposition was a great first step and I think it was a key factor in getting the success described below.

Meanwhile, the Bicycle/Ped Commission would not endorse cashout because the Council had killed it in the GF discussion. However, after I attended a meeting asking that they endorse cashout,

Commissioner David Groenstein led them to formally request studying the proposal. His motion passed 4-1, over staff opposition. It resulted in a letter to the Council notifying them that they were asking for permission to study cashout. I left the meeting disappointed, not realizing how important their action was. This action set up the April 18th cashout discussion.

The historic April 18th discussion started with Vice Mayor Kris Wang attempting to re-establish a 3-member opposition to cashout. She ran the meeting because Mayor Lewenthal was out of town.

She stated that she didn't know why they were even discussing cashout, since the council had already voted the concept down in the General Plan. However, Orrin objected, stating that he would welcome a cashout company in Cupertino and would support decreasing their required parking. He mentioned Apple as a candidate. This established a majority of 3 Council Members that supported cashout. Dolly Randoval and Richard Lewenthal had been supportive of the concept in the General Plan discussions and clearly wanted the city to work with any company that might decide to do cashout. After Orrin made his position clear,
Kris softened her opposition. She stated that sure, if Apple wanted to
do cashout who could support that. It was not clear if her
support extended to other companies in the City.

The Bicycle Pedestrian Commission was not granted permission to
study cashout. This hardly mattered since it was clear that the Council,
by at least 3-2, wanted the Staff to give reductions

in the parking requirements if a company paid a sufficient
amount of cashout money.

If any reader enjoys Council drama, I recommend downloading the
video of the April 16th meeting from the City's website. If that doesn't
work, you can go to Cupertino and purchase the

April 16th DVD for a very small price. The meeting also featured
the Council discussing the OPC's idea to make the City officially
“Bicycle Friendly” and most importantly, Steve Jobs making

Cupertino history, as described below.

Shortly after the meeting, I met with City Manager David Knapp.
He assured me that he recognizes the majority opinion and accepts the
validity and applicability of Siegman's data. He told me

that I needed to talk to Cupertino companies. I am working on
that but I am finding it a difficult task.

The April 16th meeting started with Steve Jobs announcing that
Apple was keeping its 2,500 employee campus and adding a 3,500 employee
compex. This is probably the reason that Orson

mentioned Apple when he stated his cashout position. Subsequent
reports revealed that Apple paid $165 million for 50 acres to support
the expansion. Will Apple use the new cashout opportunity

we have created? I have no crystal ball, but one thing is clear,
if Apple does the math, they will do cashout. The Power Point Charts
have the supporting calculations.

I have also taken the proposal to my own company, Lockheed
Martin, in Sunnyvale, and have been told (in an October 31st Email) that
they are seriously considering it. They did not question
We agree that a new approach is warranted. In response, a major focus of the RTP is that most of the added highway capacity is only as HOV/Managed Lanes, serving carpools, transit, and FasTrak users if there is unused capacity. By maintaining a good level of service on the facilities, transit can offer a competitive choice for commuters.

Cupertino has a fine Council (all 5 members) and city staff, especially City Manager David Knapp and Director of Community Development Steve Plasscki. Years ago, Ex-Council member Don Burnett dramatically improved our proposal. The CP discussion brought about refinements to the proposal to protect all parties. These details are in the Power Point charts, which are essentially how they had evolved by the time I sat down with the City Manager. Please call me at 760-754-8025 or Email me at mike_bulloch@earthlink.net, if you have comments.

******************************************************************************

The point here is that there are ways to reduce automobile use and it is appropriate to take such actions. The regional plan should include this information and tell cities that if they refuse to work with companies that want to implement cashout, they will get no transportation help from the Association of Governments.

Since there must be less driving, there is certainly no reason to waste our money on the further "Los Angelization" of our beautiful area. In fact, in light of the dire consequences of not reducing our consumption of hydrocarbons, it is immoral to expand highway capacity. Future generations of people are people, just as we are. If we believe in the sacredness of human life, we must reform our transportation. What we are doing now is unsustainable and unacceptable.
E-113

C2-3 You are correct in that the full costs for using highways or transit are expressed differently, making it appear that transit users require public subsidies when auto users are paying for the vehicle and operation costs themselves. In terms of charging drivers for freeway use, over time there has been consideration of generating transportation revenues based on how much people drive (vehicle miles traveled, or VMT), instead of paying a gas tax at the pump. Research is looking at how information can be generated for vehicle mileage over a given period of time, and what facilities are used.

Free Market Considerations

Your documentation needs a section devoted to clearing up the confusion about the public subsidy to car use. An option that creates a free market for motorists needs to be developed and described. Under such an option, when I drive my car to San Diego on I-5, I would be charged the full cost of driving on that massively expensive facility.

This new section would also state exactly what we get with a new lane, in terms of capacity. I believe it is around 1,800 cars per hour. You have a responsibility to include the exact figure. Also, you need to
The General Plan recommendation was to amend the city's off-street parking ordinances with two new paragraphs. The first would have been a definition of "Parking Cashout at Places of Employment," as presented above. The second would have been a schedule of reductions in the parking-lot-size requirements as a function of amount paid: for example, a $2 per-day payment would earn a 10% reduction; a $6 per-day payment, a 15% reduction; and an $8 per-day payment, a 20% reduction. It was assumed that the staff would recommend actual values. It was also assumed that the paragraph would be worded so that the numbers could be adjusted on a case-by-case basis. For example, the paragraph might use the phrase, "such as" before listing the reductions.

Companies that wanted to pay cashout would then negotiate with the Cupertino city staff to determine the exact reductions. The agree-to amount paid would then be considered "nominal." The amount paid, on any given day, would then be adjusted so that, for example, the company would not have to pay an excessive amount if too many employees did not drive. The details are in the Power Point Chart included in this web site.

The proposal was inspired by a case-study of cashout published by Patrick Siegman, a transportation analyst at Stanford. It shows that cash payments significantly reduce driving to work. Fewer cars justify less parking. Since land is expensive, companies could earn enough money from the excess land to pay for the cashout. The Cupertino proposal included tables and plots showing 10 examples of cashout, in three groups: one with poor transit, one with fair transit, and one with good transit. They were taken from Siegman's work, which provided a published reference for each example. The work supports two conclusions: first, reductions occur even when transit is poor and second, the overall average reduction is 23%. A table of the 10 examples is shown in the Power Point chart included in this web site.

The figure below shows a cashout result at what happens to be a poor-transit location. Both bus and "bike/walk" use increased by 1,600 percent. The amount paid was $21/month in 1995 dollars.

Although this case is the best result in the case study, other
cases were nearly as good and the overall results are stunning. Even the worst case showed a 15% reduction in driving. This would easily support a 10% reduction in the size of the parking lot. For a company with 1,200 employees, this would result in 1 acre of land. In Cupertino, an acre of land, zoned industrial is worth $3 million dollars. If the acre were to be rezoned to residential multi-family, it would be worth more than $4 million. Everyone in Cupertino knows that the city needs to mitigate its high cost of housing.

Cashout Results for CH2M Hill, an Engineering Firm in
Bellevue, Washington, Near Seattle

During the General Plan discussion, the Chamber of Commerce opposed cashout. Cupertino’s Bike/Ped Commission (BPC) offered no comment. Even so, Council Members Dolly Sandoval and Richard Lowenthal wanted to continue the discussion of cashout.

At the GP meeting where I mentioned that the Loma Prieta Chapter of the Sierra Club had sent a letter of support, Dolly stated that cashout was a “fantastic opportunity for the city”. Richard Lowenthal stressed that cashout was not being required of companies; it was a new choice. However, Council Members Patrick Kwok, Krie Wang, and Sandra James voted to end the discussion.

In November, 2005, Orrin Mahoney was elected to replace Sandra James. I later met with Orrin for just over an hour at Poet’s Cafe’ on Stevens Creek by De Anza College. He was skeptical of the numbers and told me that he would not favor changing the city’s ordinance before a company came to the city wanting to do cashout. I showed him the ten references used by the Siegman case study.
I left not sure if he was still skeptical or not. I also left thinking that the city was lucky to have such a great guy on the council.

I finally got to meet with Chris Giudiana, the Chamber of Commerce CEO. The lunch meet started with Chris telling me that the Chamber had dropped its opposition. It was good news but I left the meeting still disappointed. To me, it is clear that the Chamber members should be the greatest advocates for cashout because it allows new flexibility and opportunity for positive growth. I have been unsuccessful in getting to meet with the Chamber Board of Directors. Still, the fact that they dropped their opposition was a great first step and I think it was a key factor in getting the success described below.

Meanwhile, the Bicycle/Pod Commission would not endorse cashout because the Council had killed it in the GP discussion. However, after I attended a meeting asking that they endorse cashout,

Commissioner David Croonstein led them to formally requests studying the proposal. His motion passed 4-1, over staff opposition. It resulted in a letter to the Council notifying them that they were asking for permission to study cashout. I left the meeting disappointed, not realizing how important their action was. This action set up the April 18th cashout discussion.

The historic April 18th discussion started with Vice Mayor Kris Wang attempting to re-establish a 3-member opposition to cashout. She ran the meeting because Mayor Lewenthal was out of town.

She stated that she didn't know why they were even discussing cashout, since the Council had already voted the concept down in the General Plan. However, Orrin objected, stating that he would welcome a cashout company in Cupertino and would support decreasing their required parking. He mentioned Apple as a candidate. This established a majority of 3 Council Members that supported cashout. Dolly Sandwil and Richard Lewenthal had been supportive of the concept in the General Plan discussions and clearly wanted the City to work with any company that might decide to do cashout. After Orrin made his position clear,
Kris softened her opposition. She stated that sure, if Apple wanted to do cashout she could support that. It was not clear if her support extended to other companies in the City.

The Bicycle Pedestrian Commission was not granted permission to study cashout. This hardly mattered since it was clear that the Council, by at least 3-2, wanted the Staff to give reductions in the parking requirements if a company paid a sufficient amount of cashout money.

If any reader enjoys Council drama, I recommend downloading the video of the April 19th meeting from the City's website. If that doesn't work, you can go to Cupertino and purchase the April 19th DVD for a very small price. The meeting also featured the Council discussing the BPC's idea to make the City officially "Bicycle Friendly" and most importantly, Steve Jobs making Cupertino history, as described below.

Shortly after the meeting, I met with City Manager David Knapp. He assured me that he recognizes the majority opinion and accepts the validity and applicability of Siegman's data. He told me that I needed to talk to Cupertino companies. I am working on that but I am finding it a difficult task.

The April 19th meeting started with Steve Jobs announcing that Apple was keeping its 2,500 employee campus and adding a 3,500 employee campus. This is probably the reason that Orzin mentioned Apple when he stated his cashout position. Subsequent reports revealed that Apple paid $165 million for 50 acres to support the expansion. Will Apple use the new cashout opportunity here at all? I have no crystal ball, but one thing is clear, if Apple does the math, they will do cashout. The Power Point Charts have the supporting calculations.

I have also taken the proposal to my own company, Lockheed Martin, in Sunnyvale, and have been told (in an October 31st Email) that they are seriously considering it. They did not question...
Land use and transportation decisions are often made in synchronization with one another and in an iterative fashion. Local jurisdictions possess land use authority. SANDAG's growth forecasts are based in large part on local land use plans, which generate particular transportation demands. As the regional transportation agency, SANDAG is responsible for creating plans that address local and regional transportation needs. Since the 1990s, SANDAG has been encouraging local jurisdictions to support more smart growth and transit-oriented development, particularly in proximity to existing or planned transit stations in an effort to reduce sprawl, reduce congestion, and provide more mobility choices. The RTP tries to focus its investments to serve existing development while providing incentives for future smart growth development to locate in transit corridors.

Through its Regional Comprehensive Plan and the RTP, SANDAG supports transit-oriented development and smart growth. As you state, transit capacity can be improved in areas with high transit usage. Transit-oriented development, mixed land uses, good urban design, and higher land use intensities generally result in higher levels of transit usage, more walking, and more biking. SANDAG's transportation models take these, as well as other factors, into consideration when projecting average daily trips, mode share, and trip generation rates.

The Futility of Freeway Expansion

Los Angeles has more freeway lanes per square mile than any place on earth. It also has the most air pollution and the most congestion. These facts are not a coincidence. If we want more air pollution and congestion, we should keep building more freeway lanes. There are two reasons that this is true.

1.) More freeway lanes influence people's decision about where they live, where they work, and how much they will drive to meet their non-work needs and desires. More freeway lanes result in a longer average trip length.

2.) More freeway lanes influence government's decision on what developments they will approve. I had to laugh when a proponent of the proposed new football stadium for the Chargers in Oceanside wrote, in a letter to the editor, that the traffic would be OK because we were going to add lanes to Freeway I-5. (1,800 cars per hour is going to help?) Sprawl and car-oriented developments get approved based on freeway expansion.

The congestion never goes away.

Transit oriented development (T00) is different. Transit capacity can be expanded if the transit is used. It can grow to meet needs. T00 is more compact and so it not only promotes transit use, it also promotes walking and bicycle use.
Your documentation's predictions about future traffic do not take into account the way freeways affect development. These types of documents never do. If they were able to paint the true picture, we would give up on freeway expansion and work on TOD and transit, exclusively.

Conclusion

I am afraid that you will ignore my comments because your vested interest in preserving the status quo will overcome your desire to do the right thing. Please prove me wrong.

Sincerely,
Michael Bullock
mike_bullock@earthlink.net
760-754-8025
The Final RTP will be revised to remove I-15 through Mid-City as part of the Goods Movement Network. SANDAG will work with the City of San Diego, Caltrans, and the community to further analyze the goods movement issue in this part of the region. The RTP does not propose to use the I-15 HOV/BRT lane through Mid-City for goods movement.
of mothers of asthmatic children spoke, the tone of that evening took on an immediacy and gravity that calls for redress.

REDRESS:

Who among you has the temerity to sit in a room with any one of those mothers who spoke at that meeting and explain that the term “sensitive receptor” is how you refer to her asthmatic child who is lying on the couch gasping for air and undergoing a breathing treatment?

USC has done a comprehensive 10 year longitudinal study of 5500 children in 13 different communities. The results are overwhelming: lung growth is decreased in children living up to 1,500 feet from a high traffic freeway. The most severe impact is within 350 feet of the center of the freeway and Central Elementary School falls in the “death zone.” The MOU clearly states that there would be environmental monitoring at Central Elementary and when I raised the point at that August meeting, it was clear that monitoring, as stipulated, has never happened and I am enraged.

Is SANDAG truly presenting a recommendation in which moving goods takes precedence over the good of our children? Our elderly? Our sick? This is worse than poor planning: it is depravity; it is shameful. Do you assume that your plan trump our MOU, which I am perhaps under the misguided notion of believing is a legal contract? There needs to be a time out called here, an oversight committee established that includes members of the City Heights community. And those monitors need to be installed not only at Central Elementary School but all the other elementary schools in City Heights to clearly determine the extent of environmental impacts.

SANDAG is an association of governments, and I maintain that quixotic notion that the people who govern us are charged with making decisions that are for the good of all of the people—not to decide what is “good enough” for some of the people, or simply what can be gotten away with.

I also want to recognize in a public way the constant vigilance and efforts of the City Heights Community Development Corporation, its past and present board members and executive director Jay Powell in maintaining a vision of what is just, what is possible.

Anna G. Daniels
4084 45th Street
San Diego CA 92015

Cc: Mayor and City Council Members, City of San Diego
Christine Kehoe, California Assembly Senate District 39
Dr. Rich Crandall, Superintendent Area 3, San Diego School District
Jay Powell, City Heights Community Development Corporation
Alex Sachs, Attorney’s Office, City of San Diego
September 24, 2007
5041 Guava Avenue, Apt. 320
La Mesa, CA 91941-3654
(619) 589-0204
rncott@cox.net

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

Dear Ms. Tucker,

Regarding the Draft 2007 RTP, like everything else SANDAG publishes, the English is superb. But the substance is lacking. Grand sounding words with no material considerations. While the following is confined to transit matters, the above statement could be applied to the entire document.

The most serious flaw throughout government operations is the lack of marketability. Government's attitude is that services offered are blessings bestowed from above, and that citizens should happily fall in line. Yet any businessman recognizes that their success—or failure—is a result of their understanding of market. Regarding transportation, Henry Ford II recognized this in the 1960's when he observed that the success of the automobile was a result of speed, comfort, convenience, privacy and economy and nothing had managed to compete with that. Later Andras Duseney reported that the automobile offered the customer independence. And that may well be the most important feature of all. There are another dozen market considerations I've observed for a total of eighteen. Curiously none have been reported by government operations. Their features are those that appeal to bureaucrats and politicians.

The transit operations date back to the 1850's, when the stagecoach was in its heyday. The quality of service is still the same. Travelers walk to a station and wait for the coach. Their trip is shared with others. They leave the coach when it is nearest to their destination and walk the rest of the way. Having luggage is no consideration.

Government's goal is to make the operation profitable by serving only high volume stations. It never has recognized that a most successful service is the telephone where both high volume centers and suburban sparseness has made it an outstanding example of understanding market desires.

Using modern technology rather than the 1850's makes such a transit system that is perfectly feasible. And it is no more expensive, using modern methods, than other transportation schemes. Regardless, those responsible for transportation methods consider only existing methods. New approaches are anathema. Likely this is a result of seeking political solutions rather than practical. Clearly a major goal in today's choices is securing longevity in office.

Comment noted.
This is good for the politician and the bureaucrat. Shame on the citizen who complains about the quality of service.

Robert J. Hoffman

[Signature]
October 3, 2007

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

Re: Comments on the Draft EIR report for the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan

Dear Ms. Tucker,

As someone that participated in the SR-15 oversight process during the early 1990's I'm writing today to urge that the commitments made during that process and documented in the subsequent MOA/MOU be honored. I'm particularly concerned that the promised mitigations, including an HOV center lane and the monitoring of air quality appear to be in jeopardy in the plan that you have presented.

A regional transportation plan must acknowledge and strengthen those mitigations, not diminish them. The plan you are presenting is in a "vacuum" that ignores what we perceive as a legal contract with our community.

Richard Kacmar
4084 45th Street
City Heights, CA 92105

The referenced commitments are contained in the SR 15 MOA/MOU, to which SANDAG is not a party. SANDAG has the ability to amend the RTP to implement at a later date changes to the MOU agreed to by the parties.
My name is Dagmar Lanzel, from Cardiff-by-the-Sea, Encinitas, California.

Honorable Chairman and Members of the Board,

I support the freeway expansion as outlined in the Draft 2007 RTP. However, I am concerned about the noise impacts, particularly through Cardiff and Encinitas. In particular, I would like to express my desire to ensure that the noise impacts of the expansion of the I-5 corridor through Encinitas are classified as MM-NOI-1c and mitigated through the use of Rubberized Asphalt Concrete.

The area under discussion here (that is, Cardiff and Encinitas) has several sensitive noise receptors in close proximity to the project segment, including biological resources such as the San Elijo Lagoon, open space such as the planned Half property park, and schools and hospitals (including San Dieguito Academy and Scripps Encinitas), all of which abut or are immediately adjacent to the freeway. In addition, this segment of freeway has an incline which transitions the pavement from below grade to at-grade to above grade, further exacerbating the noise problem.

The 2007 draft Environmental Impact Report, or EIR, states that this segment of the route improvement will have a (quote) "Potential increase in noise levels [that] would impact sensitive noise receptors, including recreational users" (end-quote). In addition the EIR states (quote) "Increases in traffic speeds and volumes would increase traffic noise levels" (end-quote).

The residential noise standard for Encinitas is set at 60dBA. However, according to the 2007 draft EIR, the noise levels of the current I-5 freeway segment from SR 56 to Manchester is 73 to 78 dBA as measured in 2003. The estimated peak hour noise levels of the segment after completion of the widening project as described in the draft RTP will be 81 dBA.
Caltrans' own noise abatement criteria for the school, hospital, residential and recreational areas is 70 dBA.

The 2007 draft EIR states that (quote) "Noise standards would be considered significant if... exposure or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the applicable local general plan or noise ordinance" and that "the standards of the local jurisdiction shall apply" (end-quote).

The noise currently generated, and expected to be generated by the widening project as proposed in the 2007 draft RTP are clearly significantly above the standards set by the community of Encinitas and by Caltrans. Such significance criteria as outlined in the EIR is classified as SC-NOI-1.

Therefore, as directed by the 2007 draft EIR, (quote) "the following mitigation measures shall be required of all such projects.

"MM-NOI-1b Where significant noise impacts are anticipated, noise abatement shall be accomplished by the addition of berms, walls or other barrier.

"MM-NOI-1c Low noise pavements shall be used in areas where a substantial noise reduction could be achieved." (end quote)

According to the Rubber Pave Association, traffic noise studies conducted on all types of pavement surfaces have shown that Rubberized Asphalt Concrete, or RAC, has been proven to reduce the decibel level substantially as much as 85% compared to concrete.

RAC has been used in other roadway applications in the county, including the 101 corridor in Solana Beach, in the city of Encinitas, as well as other cities throughout the region.
In addition to its noise-reduction attributes, RAC can be less expensive, due to its the long life cycle, decreased maintenance, and the potential to use of less material due to its flexibility and strength.

According to the California Integrated Waste Management Board, studies have shown RAC to be a long-lasting replacement over conventional asphalt concrete. A two-inch layer of the material can save up to $50,000 per lane mile compared to a four-inch thick layer of conventional asphalt and uses more than 2,000 waste tires over that distance. Moreover, RAC resists cracking, retains its original color so that road markings are more clearly visible and has the potential to reduce the number and size of illegal waste tire piles in California.

The potential cost savings to the project by using RAC over conventional concrete is further bolstered by additional funding that can be provided to the RTP: The California Integrated Waste Management Board has approved a list of over $1.6 million in incentive grants that support and promote the use of rubberized asphalt concrete.

It is my belief that Rubberized Asphalt Concrete should be specified by the Regional Transportation Plan. When used for the I-5 segment from Lomas Santa Fe to Leucadia Blvd., it will result in

- Significant and substantial reduction in noise, mitigating noise by as much as 85% and reducing the noise level to below the levels set by both local and Caltrans standards
- Reduced cost due to reduced use of materials and improved wear and maintenance characteristics
- The potential to bring additional funds to the project through the grants administered by the California Integrated Waste Management Board.

Thank you for your consideration.
The different mitigation requirements for uplands versus wetlands are acknowledged. As are specified in the next sentence of MM-LU-1e, mitigation ratios will be determined through "consultation with resource agencies and reference to applicable habitat conservation plan (HCP) subarea plans."

The RTP 2007 EIR is a program-level document providing guidance for agencies implementing future transportation projects. MM-LU-1f, and the equivalent MM-Bio-2a, is intended as a requirement imposed upon these implementing agencies as they develop project-level design information. Conformance with federal and state regulations protecting wetlands translates to an implicit stricture on the design process, and an explicit focus of project-level environmental analysis, aimed at first avoiding, secondly minimizing, and thirdly mitigating for wetland impacts. This mitigation measure requires that avoidance be the highest priority. If avoidance is not possible, project-level environmental analysis will provide adequate detail concerning impacts to make mitigation possible at the appropriately determined ratio.

SANDAG is responsible for a program-level environmental impact analysis concerning the 2030 RTP. Mitigation measures included in this EIR are intended as legal requirements upon a Project Implementation Agency (PIA). The PIA must perform project design and project-level environmental analysis pursuant to CEQA and, possibly, NEPA. Unavoidable impacts to wetlands would be identified at that time, as would appropriate mitigation. Wetland resources are of course also afforded regulatory protection enforced by federal and state agencies with jurisdiction over these resources. The PIA would be responsible for complying with these regulations.

Reclaimed water is not in short supply in San Diego County. According to the City of San Diego Water Reuse Study Final Draft Report (March 2006), current recycled water facilities have the ability to produce 37.5 MGD (million gallons per day) of recycled water. Existing usage is 7.25 MGD, and Total Planned Reuse by 2010 with completion of ongoing reuse projects (distribution system expansion Phases I & II) is 16.25 MGD. This leaves a surplus 21.25 MGD that could be produced if the demand was created (from dust control measures or other activities in the region). This surplus is triple the amount of recycled water currently being used.
Air Quality

C7-5 CO2 hotspots analyses are performed in instances where modeled traffic conditions reveal extreme congestion at intersections or interchanges. Under these congestion conditions, unhealthy levels of CO2 can accumulate in a localized area. The need for such analysis, however, can only be determined at the project level once preliminary design of a specific intersection or interchange, as well as a projected completion date, is available.

Global Climate Change

C7-6 Action #2 in Chapter 8 of the Draft 2030 RTP on page 8-5, sets a goal of 20% increase in vanpools.

C7-7 In the RTP the region is investing in other means in addition to vanpools to shift SOVs to other modes and to slow the growth of VMT. The Smart Growth Incentive Program includes $206 million in TransNet funds to implement and leverage other funds for smart growth plans and projects. Additionally, the Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Program includes another $206 million in TransNet funds to leverage other funds to plan and build bicycle and pedestrian facilities. There also is a strong emphasis on increased transit projects and services in the existing urban core and in conjunction with new smart growth developments. Over 1/3 of the nearly $18 billion in transit dollars in the Plan go toward improved and more frequent service in existing service areas where transit has the best opportunity to attract more riders.

Water Resources

C7-8 The first sentence of the comment correctly points out that “reducing the amount of GHG emissions is a key element of the Governor’s Executive Order and AB 32.” The second and third sentences of the comment imply that the 2030 RTP and Draft EIR lack specific goals, programs, and mitigation measures that address global warming in violation of state law. To the contrary, the Draft EIR includes a detailed discussion of the transportation-related GHG emissions reduction measures incorporated into the 2030 RTP (pp. 4.7-31 through 4.7-34). As also discussed in the Final EIR, “these actions are consistent with the recommendations of the California Climate Action Team to significantly reduce GHG emissions by incorporating Measures to Improve Transportation Energy Efficiency, Smart Land Use, and Intelligent Transportation into regional transportation planning activities…” (p. 4.7-32). In addition to the transportation-related GHG emissions reduction measures incorporated into the 2030 RTP, the Draft EIR also identifies 11 feasible mitigation measures that would reduce the cumulatively considerable increase in GHG emissions associated with Project implementation. MM-GCC-1a requires SANDAG to adopt a Regional Climate Change Action Plan within 3 years of adopting the 2030 RTP. In general, this Action Plan would include a baseline emission of total and per capita GHG emissions associated with RTP activities for the year 2006 and development of enforceable, feasible GHG emissions reduction measures to achieve reduction in total RTP GHG emissions per capita. This Action Plan mirrors the GHG reduction plan that will be established by the County of San Bernardino per the settlement of the lawsuit filed against the County’s general plan by the state Attorney General in part for failure to adequately analyze the adverse effects of general plan implementation on climate change and failure to adopt feasible mitigation measures to minimize these adverse effects. Thus, SANDAG has met its obligations under CEQA to propose and evaluate mitigation measures that avoid or minimize the GHG emissions generated by the 2030 RTP, and thereby reduce its cumulatively considerable contribution to global climate change, to the extent feasible.
MM-Water-1f is only applicable in instances where streambank alteration is unavoidable. The measure requires maximum use of native revegetation in instances where "bioengineering stabilization" is necessary.

This is not correct. Caltrans now routinely employs appropriate native plant species in portions of their right-of-way disturbed through project construction or expansion. These revegetation efforts are typically in addition to any off-site mitigation requirements. In a recent instance along I-5 (the Lomas Santa Fe Drive interchange expansion), precisely the mitigation strategy recommended by the commenter was implemented via project-level environmental review. Coastal sage scrub habitat to be disturbed through project implementation will be replaced off-site at a 1:1 replacement ratio. In addition, disturbed areas on-site are to be revegetated with a coastal sage scrub seed mix with the proviso that displacement of such areas through future transportation facility improvements will not require mitigation.
value to adjacent habitat, address water quality issues, and reduce long term
maintenance costs. Several of the proposed Water MM recommend the use of
natives- but this will not happen unless this administrative issue is addressed. It
would seem that a simple solution is to identify areas of created native habitat that
are in addition to any required native habitat mitigation and to exempt these from
such future additional mitigation requirements.

The proposed mitigation measures provide essentially no guidance regarding
when water bodies need to be bridged versus the standard method of putting creeks
in culverts for hundreds of feet. In the absence of clear guidelines bridges are
routinely rejected as not being the least environmentally damaging "practicable"
alternative simply because they cost more. This is a critical issue for protecting the
health of our local creeks- and the downstream impaired coastal lagoons. The
general requirement should be that any road crossing of streams requires a bridge -
any exceptions should require justification and additional mitigation to address the
water quality and biological resources impacts.

Water -3bc and d don't specifically address the interface between wildlife
movement corridors and design of facilities to address flooding and storm water
flows. Culvert design and location needs to be coordinated with wildlife movement
corridor design and crossings. Old style designs often included water flows and
wildlife in same culvert. Better designs at a minimum must provide a channel for
water that separates this from the area used by wildlife. Incidental water in wildlife
undercrossings needs to be provided for, but storm water flows and creeks need to
be planned in coordination with planning to address wildlife movement with a
completely separate system for transport of storm water.

Biological Resources

MM -Bio-1a does not provide sufficient protection for wildlife crossings. It is not
just the size of wildlife undercrossings that are of concern, but also: the "openness" ratio;
provisions for natural light - especially on very long crossings (such as by using
skylights in the median of the overhead road); adequate control on access to both
ends of the crossing so that there is cover; soft bottoms; barriers to direct wildlife to
the undercrossing and restrict access to the road; and to address other site specific
conditions that would restrict wildlife use. The MM needs to be expanded to better
address these important design issues.

MM- Bio -2a and 2c See comments on LU 1e and 1f re wetlands designation and
avoidance

Habitat fragmentation is often a consequence of roadway building. Fragmentation doesn't just cause direct impacts from the road itself, it contributes to
degradation of the entire associated natural habitat area. The EIR did not adequately
address habitat fragmentation. Bio-4b does not address this as it is limited to
hardline preserves and PAMAS. Since only one of 7 cities in North County has

A program-level environmental document is not the appropriate place for such a
requirement. The DEIR identifies significant impacts to water bodies in the
instance where such impacts would clearly occur, i.e., the widening of I-5 bridges
across coastal lagoons. Despite any required mitigation, this impact is identified
as a residual significant impact. The potential effects of other transportation
improvements contained in the 2030 RTP on water bodies can only be
determined through project-level review. It is incorrect to state that bridges are
routinely rejected on the basis of cost. There are many factors that affect
crossing design. Potential impacts to wetlands, and the relationship of these
effects to the jurisdiction exercised by agencies such as the US Army Corps of
Engineers and the California Department of Fish and Game, are key components
in project design decision making. Other factors, such as hydrology, water
quality, and visual aesthetics, are also important.

The potential effects of transportation improvements contained in the 2030 RTP
upon wildlife movement are analyzed in Section 4.10 of the DEIR. Mitigation for
these effects is also included in that section.

MM-Bio-1a sufficiently addresses wildlife crossing issues at the program level.
MM-Bio-1a requires that wildlife movement studies "provide for continued
movement of wildlife across rights-of-way… …where there is evidence of wildlife
movement," and that the crossings be adequately sized. The level of specificity
concerning crossing facilities desired by the commenter can only be provided
during project-level analysis.

See response to comment C7-3.

The commenter is correct in stating that MM-Bio-4b references hardline
preserves and PAMAs. MM-Bio-4a, however, requires avoidance of all lands
identified for conservation in HCPs. Alternatives analysis is at the core of both
CEQA- and NEPA-mandated environmental review. As alternatives are
developed as part of project-level design and environmental review avoidance of
sensitive resources would undoubtedly be a key factor. The fact that only one of
the North County cities has formally adopted their hardline preserves does not
preclude the areas identified in draft plans from being used in project planning
and impact analysis. The DEIR acknowledges that, despite these required
efforts to avoid encroachment on conserved lands, such impacts are likely to
occur. These impacts are identified as significant.

A mitigation measure requiring alternate or parallel roadway alignments would
not usually be an effective mechanism for reducing habitat fragmentation.
Almost all RTP improvements consist of widenings of, or other improvements to,
existing roadway corridors. This is preferable to new roadways, which would
result in further division of habitat and additional "edge" effects.
C7-15

established hardline boundaries that leaves the majority of north county with no protection from the impacts of habitat fragmentation.

This could be done by adding a MM to require alternative roadway alignments, or parallel roadway improvements as alternatives to extending roads where they will cause habitat fragmentation—particularly roads through core areas as identified in the MSCP/MHCP.

Throughout the analysis of impacts on biological resources there are statements that impacts would be reduced below a level of significance because of the opportunity afforded by the Transnet EMP program. Having money that could be used to address an impact is not the same as actually addressing the impact. Since the Transnet EMP funding is tied to roadbuilding there needs to be a better tie to project mitigation.

Furthermore acquiring land for mitigation is dependent upon willing sellers—some sellers must be willing at or before the time that there is an impact. This could be a huge barrier—particularly since payments to sellers are limited by law to appraised price and sellers can hold out for better offers from developers. The process of prioritizing land for acquisition and starting the acquisition process to assure that enough land of the right type/location is acquired needs to be underway now. Land needs to be acquired well in advance of the need.

There needs to be a MM added that where there are habitat impacts, acquisition of mitigation lands must occur prior to the initiation of construction. The land must actually be acquired—not just identified, funded, or talked about.

Significant Irreversible Changes

Much of the analysis is based on the conclusion that growth will be directed to the 200 or so smart growth sites. This is a pretty huge assumption—given that many of these sites are only identified as “potential” and have not been through any project specific analysis. It would be more realistic to assume that only a portion of the planned smart growth sites will be implemented—and many will not end up with the target number of residential units identified.

In other cases there are opportunities for smart growth projects that have not been identified as one of the 200 smart growth sites. There should be a MM that provides better incentives/disincentives for building consistent with the smart growth guidelines. This should include provisions for withholding transportation funds as a necessary disincentive to poor project planning. Many local cities approve whatever project a developer proposes—regardless of conflicts between land use and transportation planning. Withholding funds is the only real incentive SANDAG can control. Since the RTP requires better interface between land use and transportation planning there needs to be a method to assure that this really happens.
E-133

**Growth Inducing Impacts**

C7-18 A key issue is that this amount of transportation infrastructure is growth inducing with or without smart growth. There needs to be more assurances that growth will be "smart"- and if not, there will be less transportation infrastructure to add to more dumb growth. The DEIR talks about the $206 m for smart growth incentives- but that will effect very few of the 20+ smart growth locations. MM needs to be added to provide more disincentive to dumb growth- like further controls on transportation funding if key criteria are not met in land use planning.

Of the 1m more people to be added how many will be added at smart growth sites?

C7-19 The analysis of secondary impacts of economic or population growth, housing growth, and removal of impediments to growth are all deferred to the secondary CEQA analysis that will occur as an individual project moves forward. This really defers mitigation for these impacts which is not allowed under CEGA. This DEIR should establish guidelines for how this analysis should take place and what would be appropriate mitigation. If left to local jurisdictions this just will not happen.

**Cumulative Analysis**

C7-20 The critical factor of population and housing growth is based on SANDAG growth forecasts and not on the adopted General Plans of each of the jurisdictions in the project area. The DEIR needs to clearly identify this disparity, (between city General Plan and the forecast) and explain how this could effect the analysis of impacts. Since SANDAG has no direct ability to control local land use this disparity invalidates much of the DEIR analysis.

C7-21 The analysis of water supply is based on the 2005 update of the 2002 SDCWA Regional Water Facilities Master Plan draft report. Recent court decisions have made it clear that key assumptions in this report are not valid (particularly the availability of water from the delta). A critical flaw of the DEIR is the failure to consider the combination of reduced water supply, plus the growth inducing impacts of improved transportation infrastructure. This needs to be addressed before moving forward with this growth inducing plan.

C7-22 The DEIR states on page 6-18 that "The proposed project would result in cumulatively considerable impacts to visual resources, air quality, noise, water quality, biological resources, land use and global climate change as disclosed in Section 6.0 1 of this FIP." The cited section discusses analysis and mitigation for direct and indirect impacts but does not address cumulative impacts. Additional mitigation measures must be provided to at least reduce the cumulative impacts that have been identified.
( ) It is a stretch of credibility to characterize the Revenue Constrained as the Environmentally Superior alternative, and then to reject it for not meeting project objectives. Of the 15 measures evaluated it was comparable on 5, more favorable on 7 and less favorable on 3. If one weighted the evaluations with comparable worth 0 points, much more favorable +2, more favorable +1, less favorable -1, and much less favorable as -2, the point totals would be:

No Project + 5
Transit Emphasis + 3
Revenue Constrained + 4

The fact is that all of the alternatives were slightly better than the preferred project - and none could really be characterized as really being a substantial improvement. This should really say we need to go back to the drawing board- and come up with some alternatives that really are better. This is a huge public investment- in infrastructure that will likely outlive us all. This is too important to not do it right.

Complete the climate change study, come up with better project goals that address mobility within the context of new requirements to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and then do an RTP Update that will result in real changes. A true environmentally preferred alternative should result from this process.

( ) In their comment letter of June 25, 2007 on the RTP scope the County of San Diego requested an alternative that provided a job/housing balance emphasis. They indicated the reason for this is: "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." Given the long list of significant irreversible adverse impacts from the proposed RTP it is critical to explore further alternatives that could reduce these impacts. This alternative, or some variation that puts much more emphasis on land use needs to be analyzed.

Thank you for considering these comments.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Diane Nygaard
5020 Nighthawk Way
Oceanside, CA 92056

rtp der comments 9-U/
Regional arterials are shown in Figure 6.6 of the RTP. SANDAG's transportation networks include all of the facilities adopted in local jurisdiction circulation elements, including new freeway interchanges. Lead agencies decide what background assumptions are appropriate for analysis of projects and alternatives, and typically confer with SANDAG planners and modelers if using SANDAG's databases.

That a time lag sometimes exists between the approval of land development and transportation improvements is acknowledged. It must be recognized that the local jurisdiction approving a development project may not be the entity implementing the roadway improvement, however, and that the roadway project requires its own lengthy engineering design and environmental review process. The need for a better linkage between these two processes is acknowledged. SANDAG has no land use regulatory authority.

The traffic impact analyses performed in support of environmental documents are not typically focused only on traffic conditions in 2030 or some other "build-out" conditions. It is typically the case that a project needs to demonstrate improved traffic operational conditions immediately upon completion. In projects receiving federal funding, which constitute the majority of RTP 2030 improvements, it is necessary through analysis to establish that a given project will satisfy an existing transportation need, and that the improvement to transportation will result in improved conditions through 2030.
In the habitat conservation area, permits are granted only roughly in proportion to achieving key implementation milestones. A similar kind of link needs to be established for the transportation system.

For starters, a MM could be added that any project with adverse traffic impacts that is approved by a local jurisdiction using overriding considerations requires SANDAG review for schedule/funding of the related transportation system improvement. Other projects on the schedule could be delayed, or have funds withdrawn until those with greater cumulative impacts have been addressed. At some point where it is clear there are insufficient funds to address the traffic impacts, then development needs to stop.

Thank you for considering these comments.

Diane Nygaard
Figure 2.0-6 in the final RTP EIR will be revised to remove I-15 through Mid-City as part of the Goods Movement Network. SANDAG will work with the City of San Diego, Caltrans, and the community to further analyze the goods movement issue in this part of the region. In addition, due to operational safety issues, SANDAG, Caltrans, and the City Heights community will be developing a design for bus rapid transit stations in conjunction with community planning for transit-oriented development, with a goal of implementation in coordination with the startup of I-15 BRT service in 2012.

Re: Response to Draft EIR for 2007 RTP

Dear Ms. Tucker:

Please find below my comments on the EIR for the 2007 RTP.

On the Goods Movement Plan —

The EIR does not consider all of the relevant facts.

The 2007 RTP lists the prioritized projects that will occur to accommodate goods movement. In the top ten of that list is the widening of the center median of the I-15 through City Heights for Goods Movement vehicles.

During the Notice of Preparation of Environmental Impact Report period, SANDAG received correspondence from Mr. Jay Powell of the City Heights Community Development Corporation. Attached to his comments were the signed MOU between the City of San Diego and Caltrans dated May 14 and 21, 1985, and the MOU between the City of San Diego and Caltrans dated August 5, 1993. The documents are incorporated by reference here.

The May 14, 1985 MOU was a contract which discussed some of the required mitigation for the completion of the Interstate 15. The final sentence of the contract reads:

"It is also understood that the freeway project will not proceed if for any reason the mitigation measures by Caltrans as outlined above in items 1 through 9 inclusive cannot be implemented."

Item 9 reads:

"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."

The EIR for the 2007 RTP does not, at any time, discuss this legal contract, even though it was part of the documentation provided to SANDAG. It needs to be discussed. By including the project to widen the
C9-1 The RTP is not overriding the mitigations for I-15 through Mid-City. SANDAG has removed I-15 in Mid-City from the regional freight network and will work with the City of San Diego, Caltrans, and the community to further analyze the goods movement issue in this part of the region. In addition, due to operational safety issues, SANDAG, Caltrans, and the City Heights community will be developing a design for bus rapid transit stations in conjunction with community planning for transit-oriented development, with a goal of implementation in coordination with the startup of I-15 BRT service in 2012.

C9-2 Figure 2.0-6 in the final RTP EIR will be revised to remove I-15 through Mid-City as part of the Goods Movement Network. SANDAG will work with the City of San Diego, Caltrans, and the community to further analyze the goods movement issue in this part of the region. In addition, due to operational safety issues, SANDAG, Caltrans, and the City Heights community will be developing a design for bus rapid transit stations in conjunction with community planning for transit-oriented development, with a goal of implementation in coordination with the startup of I-15 BRT service in 2012.

C9-3 The EIR states repeatedly that, “The proposed 2007 RTP was developed using existing plans and policies being implemented by local jurisdictions.” (Page 4.1-23)

C9-4 Obviously, that is an error. The existing policy of both the City of San Diego and Caltrans is that Goods Movement Vehicles will be signed and directed to the I-805 facility as an alternative to Route 15 through Mid-City. A copy of that policy was given to SANDAG by Mr. Jay Powell during the NOP period for the EIR, and is included as an attachment to the EIR. The 2007 RTP and its EIR both ignore the effect of that policy in their development.

C9-5 The EIR is in error when it states (Page ES-35) that there will be no disproportionate adverse effects on the low-income and minority populations.

Contrary to the statement regarding Environmental Justice on page ES-35, by ignoring the required mitigations put in place to protect the health, safety and welfare of the majority low-income and minority residents of City Heights, the 2007 RTP does indeed significantly, adversely and disproportionately affect the low-income and minority populations. They will be affected twice by the same plan - first by the unmitigated effects stated in the report that will affect everyone, and then again by the inability to complete, or abide by, the required mitigations for the construction of the I-15, which has now been in operation for almost ten years. I contend that forcing the residents of City Heights to endure twice the adverse impacts that will be endured by other citizens is a significant adverse impact to the low-income and minority residents of the plan area. Such an impact cannot be reified by a statement of overriding interest.
Figure 2.0-6 in the final RTP EIR will be revised to remove I-15 through Mid-City as part of the Goods Movement Network. SANDAG will work with the City of San Diego, Caltrans, and the community to further analyze the goods movement issue in this part of the region. In addition, due to operational safety issues, SANDAG, Caltrans, and the City Heights community will be developing a design for bus rapid transit stations in conjunction with community planning for transit oriented development, with a goal of implementation in coordination with the startup of I-15 BRT service in 2012.

The 2030 RTP is in conflict with significant, legally-binding policies of the City of San Diego and Caltrans and cannot be implemented as written. The EIR ignores that fact. ... By signing the MOU, Caltrans committed to accommodating the Centerline Project in the I-15 median as soon as the project began to be implemented. Since the HOV/GM lanes referred to in the 2030 RTP have been committed by Caltrans as express bus lanes, they cannot be used by other vehicles, for other purposes, especially if those vehicles would slow the buses to the point of negating the “express” description. The HOV/GM Lanes are an integral part of the transportation system in the 2030 RTP, and the EIR needs to show that reasonably expected alternative in its review.

The 2030 RTP is not in conflict with the MOU. It does not propose any use of the HOV/BRT lanes on I-15 through Mid-City for goods movement. To clarify this issue, Figure 2.0-6 in the final RTP EIR will be revised to remove I-15 through Mid-City as part of the Goods Movement Network. In terms of transit stations, due to operational safety issues of centerline crossover stations, SANDAG, Caltrans, and the City Heights community will be developing a design for bus rapid transit stations in conjunction with community planning for transit oriented development, with a goal of implementation in coordination with the startup of I-15 BRT service in 2012.
The EIR did not complete an adequate discussion of cumulative impacts.

The EIR states, "The following elements are necessary to an adequate discussion of cumulative impacts (VCCA Guideline 151.15(h)): Either (a) a list of past, present and reasonably anticipated future projects, producing related or cumulative impacts, including those projects outside the control of the agency..."

Documents were provided to SANDAG during the NOP period which proved that it could be reasonably anticipated that the center median of the I-15 through City Heights would be an exclusive, express bus lane, and that UM vehicles were to be discouraged from using that route. It could be reasonably assumed that the center median could not be used as either an HOV lane or a Goods Movement Lane. The use of the I-15 as both an HOV and GM lane is an integral part of the overall plan. As such, the EIR is inadequate as a basis on which to determine the impact each alternative will have on the environment.

Thank you for allowing me to comment on the adequacy of this document.

Sincerely,

Theresa Cifrus
The carpool/Managed Lane network provides capacity that relieves congestion on the general purpose lanes, can move more people per hour, and provides competitive travel times to appeal to choice transit riders. Additional data will be included in the final RTP that documents the poor result if all new lanes were built as general purpose lanes.

Please come down to the level of the every man and realize that we cannot use your toll roads and car-pool lanes. We cannot afford to pay for access to the host lanes.

I don’t know anyone at my place of employ who can car-pool with co-workers without significant inconvenience and added expense in time & money. Working in the golden triangle (Ft Tolly). I know people who come from Chula Vista, Sun City and I myself drive in from Ramona.

Just who uses these lanes? Are you trying to achieve some attractive model? Or are you trying to plan for the over increasing number of commuters on the roads?

Please lose the notion that we can car-pool to work - or that the wealthy are entitled to roads the rest of us should be denied.

More lanes for everyone please!

Thanks,

Denise Steen
eplcor@denise@cox.net
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