TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE AGENDA

Friday, March 21, 2008
9 a.m. to 12 noon
SANDAG Board Room
401 B Street, 7th Floor
San Diego

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

• 2008 CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM UPDATE

• FY 2006/2007 CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY AND REGIONAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM REPORT

PLEASE TURN OFF CELL PHONES DURING THE MEETING

YOU CAN LISTEN TO THE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING BY VISITING OUR WEB SITE AT WWW.SANDAG.ORG

MISSION STATEMENT
The 18 cities and county government are SANDAG serving as the forum for regional decision-making. SANDAG builds consensus, makes strategic plans, obtains and allocates resources, plans, engineers, and builds public transit, and provides information on a broad range of topics pertinent to the region's quality of life.
Welcome to SANDAG. Members of the public may speak to the Transportation Committee on any item at the time the Committee is considering the item. Please complete a Speaker’s Slip, which is located in the rear of the room, and then present the slip to Committee staff. Also, members of the public are invited to address the Committee on any issue under the agenda item entitled Public Comments/Communications/Member Comments. Speakers are limited to three minutes. The Transportation Committee may take action on any item appearing on the agenda.

This agenda and related staff reports can be accessed at www.sandag.org under meetings on SANDAG’s Web site. Public comments regarding the agenda can be forwarded to SANDAG via the e-mail comment form also available on the Web site. E-mail comments should be received no later than noon, two working days prior to the Transportation Committee meeting.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), SANDAG will accommodate persons who require assistance in order to participate in SANDAG meetings. If such assistance is required, please contact SANDAG at (619) 699-1900 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting. To request this document or related reports in an alternative format, please call (619) 699-1900, (619) 699-1904 (TTY), or fax (619) 699-1905.

**SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit.**
Phone 511 or see 511sd.com for route information.
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
Friday, March 21, 2008

ITEM #

+1. APPROVAL OF MARCH 7, 2008, MEETING MINUTES

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

Members of the public will have the opportunity to address the Transportation Committee on any issue within the jurisdiction of the Committee. Speakers are limited to three minutes each and shall reserve time by completing a “Request to Speak” form and giving it to the Clerk prior to speaking. Committee members also may provide information and announcements under this agenda item.

CHAIR’S REPORT (3)

3. STATE ROUTE 905 STATUS UPDATE (Chairman Jim Madaffer, Pedro Orso-Delgado, Caltrans)

Chairman Madaffer and Pedro Orso-Delgado will provide the monthly update of what was discussed by the State Route 905 strike team.

REPORTS (4 through 9)

+4. FY 2008 TransNet MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT AUDIT EXTENSION REQUESTS (Lisa Kondrat-Dauphin)

The Transportation Committee is asked to approve TransNet audit extension requests for the Cities of Escondido, Oceanside, and San Diego, and the County of San Diego through April 30, 2008. This action would allow these cities and the County to continue to receive TransNet funds up until the extension date. If the audit is not completed by the approved extension date, these cities would not receive any additional TransNet funds until the audit is completed or the Transportation Committee approves another extension.

+5. TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT (TDA) REVISION TO FY 2008 ALLOCATIONS (Sookkyung Kim)

At the February 22, 2008, meeting, the SANDAG Board approved to revise the FY 2008 TDA apportionment. Because some of the claims submitted in June 2007 exceed the revised apportionment, action is required to amend these claims. The Transportation Committee is asked to approve Resolution Nos. 2008-17, 2008-18, 2008-19, and 2008-20, revising the TDA claims and direct staff to transmit the appropriate instructions to the County Auditor’s office.
+6. CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM BUDGET TRANSFERS AND ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCE (John Haggerty)

The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend that the Board of Directors: (1) approve of a capital project budget transfer of $2,300,000 from the East County Bus Maintenance Facility CNG Station Project (CIP 1142700) into the South Bay Maintenance Facility Project (CIP 1048500); (2) accept the Final Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (FIS/MND) and Addendum No. 1 from Metropolitan Transit System for the South Bay Maintenance Facility Expansion Project; and (3) approve the adoption of Addendum No. 2 to the FIS/MND.

+7. SPRINTER PROJECT STATUS REPORT AND SANDAG INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT (Jim Linthicum, SANDAG)

This item provides a monthly status report on the SPRINTER rail project, including discussion of implementation and effectiveness of project cost control measures. SANDAG staff will summarize recent progress on the project.

+8. 2008 CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM UPDATE (Heather Werdick)

SANDAG is required by state law to prepare and update a Congestion Management Program (CMP) every two years. The purpose of the CMP is to monitor the region’s transportation system and propose strategies to mitigate congestion. Staff will present the proposed approach for the 2008 CMP Update. The Transportation Committee is asked to confirm the approach for the 2008 CMP Update and direct staff to evaluate alternative means of meeting the CMP requirements for future updates.

+9. FY 2006/2007 CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY AND REGIONAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM REPORT (José A. Nuncio)

As part of the Transportation Committee’s discussion on funding during Summer 2007, a year-end report on Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality and Regional Surface Transportation Program revenues, obligations and use of various tools was committed to by staff. In addition to a summary of these areas, the report provides year-end balance for federal fiscal year 2007/08 and potential opportunities.

10. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next meeting of the Transportation Committee is scheduled for Friday, April 4, 2008, at 9 a.m.

11. ADJOURNMENT

+ next to an agenda item indicates an attachment
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

March 21, 2008

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS
MEETING OF MARCH 7, 2008

The meeting of the Transportation Committee was called to order by Chair Jim Madaffer (City of San Diego) at 9:05 a.m. See the attached attendance sheet for Transportation Committee member attendance.

1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Action: Upon a motion by Chair Pro Tem Bob Emery (Metropolitan Transit System [MTS]) and a second by Chairman Ed Gallo (North County Transit District [NCTD]), the Transportation Committee approved the minutes from the February 15, 2008, meeting.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

Chuck Lungerhausen, a member of the public, submitted written comments and read them into the record requesting donations to support the Multiple Sclerosis Walk 2008.

Albert Phoenix (Southern California Tribal Chairman’s Association [SCTCA]) stated that the Reservation Transportation Authority was awarded a Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Grant from the tribal transportation program for $425,104. Our proposal was based on the Tribal Transportation Feasibility Study conducted in the Tribal Transportation Working Group. This is the largest grant in the U.S. under the program for any tribe however it was only half of what we asked for. We will strategize how best to develop the project. The purpose of the grant is to strengthen transportation connections between reservations and urban transit systems. The grant was made directly to the tribe and as an advisory member we hope to discuss the project in our Working Group and keep SANDAG informed.

Chairman Gallo announced the revenue start date for SPRINTER operations is Sunday, March 9, 2008, at 4:30 a.m. The first train will leave the station at 4:33 a.m.

Charlene Zettel (San Diego County Regional Airport Authority [SDCRAA]) stated that the SDCRAA met with the SANDAG Board and looks forward to working together on the Airport Master Plan. She stated that the SDCRAA hired a consulting team to work with the regional planners to prepare the long-term vision for the master plan.
CONSENT ITEMS

3. MTS AND NCTD SUMMER SERVICE CHANGES (INFORMATION)

This report reviews the service changes proposed for June 2008 by Metropolitan Transit System and North County Transit District. None of the proposed service changes are regionally significant.

Action: Upon a motion by Chairman Gallo and a second by Chair Pro Tem Emery, the Transportation Committee accepted the report under Consent Item 3.

CHAIRS’ REPORTS

4. CALTRANS CONSTRUCTION COST INDEX AND AVERAGE NUMBER OF BIDDERS (INFORMATION)

Chairman Madaffer reported on the latest results of the statewide Caltrans Construction Cost Index and the tracking of the average number of bidders on Caltrans construction projects. He stated that the index has been down two consecutive quarters. This is the first time the index has gone down two consecutive quarters since they started tracking it in 2002. The average number of bidders has gone up due to competition. The index shows that prices have not doubled since 2002 but only increased about 75 percent. The Caltrans index tracks actual bid prices for materials on projects throughout the state. It focuses on materials and construction activities related to transportation infrastructure.

Pedro Orso-Delgado, Caltrans commented that the bids for State Route (SR) 52, SR 905, and Interstate 15 (I-15) all came in below the engineer’s estimates on an average of 22 percent less. The number of bidders has been coming in at an average of five to six bidders per project.

Chair Madaffer stated that the increased competition means more money for other transportation projects in the region.

Action: This item was presented for information only.

REPORTS

5. LOS ANGELES-SAN DIEGO-SAN LUIS OBISPO RAIL CORRIDOR AGENCY BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING REPORT (INFORMATION)

SANDAG Representative to the Los Angeles-San Diego-San Luis Obispo (LOSSAN) Rail Corridor Agency, Mayor Joe Kellejian (Solana Beach) and Linda Culp, Senior Regional Planner, presented the item. The LOSSAN Rail Corridor Agency seeks to increase ridership, revenue, capacity, reliability, and safety on the coastal rail line from San Diego to Los Angeles to San Luis Obispo. Known as Amtrak's Pacific Surfliner corridor, it is the second busiest intercity passenger rail corridor nationwide and Amtrak's fastest growing. Since 1989, LOSSAN has been working to improve rail movement in the region. A record number of riders are using the rail corridor. Current plans include implementing a 20-minute COASTER service, and Amtrak and Metrolink plans to increase their service in the corridor.
These plans will increase rail service to 500 trains per day, double the current number of trains. Commissioner John Chalker, California Transportation Commission (CTC) Chair, is working with the LOSSAN Board to bring express trains from Los Angeles to San Diego and is helping to find the funding sources to not only provide the express service but to fund the improvements to tracks, bridges and stations to support it.

Mayor Kellejian summarized the actions from the LOSSAN Board meeting on February 6, 2008. The LOSSAN Board continues to advocate for passenger rail funds that would benefit projects along the coastal rail corridor, including projects along the San Diego coastal rail corridor. The Board works closely with the other rail operators to advocate for federal funds. The Board of Directors and Technical Advisory Committee will serve as the primary policy and technical stakeholders for an effort currently led by the Orange County Transportation Authority and Caltrans Division of Rail to better integrate passenger rail services in the corridor. The Board provided further input into the scope of work for this effort, which could have direct impacts to rail services in San Diego. Board representatives represented SANDAG and other corridor agencies in Sacramento on February 21 at Intercity Rail Day, which aimed to raise awareness of intercity rail and discuss future improvements. The Board of Directors also approved continuing to provide funds directly to SANDAG to staff LOSSAN in FY 2009.

Mayor Kellejian introduced and presented a recent informational video on the state’s intercity rail program. He stated that since 2001, California’s population grew 11 percent while vehicle miles traveled grew only 8 percent. Ridership on the three rail passenger lines increased 43 percent. Fare box recovery on Amtrak is at 50 percent and the COASTER is over 40 percent. Mayor Kellejian commented that travel on passenger rail emits 70 percent less greenhouse emissions than vehicle travel along the same route.

Mayor Lori Holt Pfeiler (North County Inland) requested clarification regarding the proposed express service and what types of services would be provided such as the number of stops.

Gary Gallegos, Executive Director stated that in discussions with Commissioner Chalker, his goal is to have an express train that cuts the travel time between Los Angeles and San Diego down to two hours with perhaps one stop in Orange County to make it more competitive to the automobile. Orange County on the other hand wants trains to stop at every station along the corridor. Commissioner Chalker has been successful in helping us secure funds for some of our projects such as double tracking.

Chair Madaffer commented that this is an important link for transportation and we need to continue to move toward implementing an express train and finding funding to support the improvements to accommodate it. He commented that we need to work with Orange County Transportation Authority to make Metrolink service more connected in the region.

Mayor Kellejian commented that his personal vision is to have a South Bay stop for Amtrak and that the COASTER should run all the way to the border.

Mr. Gallegos added that SANDAG has been working with state to find a location for a maintenance facility for Amtrak. SANDAG has plans to use Prop 1B Goods Movement funds
to add enhancements the south rail line and an inter-modal facility at the south end in San Ysidro. We suggested that Amtrak also place their maintenance facility in this location with the idea that if they are maintaining their trains so far south, it makes sense for them to provide service to the cities along the southern portion of the line to the border.

Councilmember Phil Monroe (South County) commented in order to support the plans for increased service along the corridor we need to build double tracking. He asked staff what the timeline for double tracking is in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and how it would be implemented.

Mr. Gallegos stated that double tracking is in the RTP but it is a matter of financial resources; not only to support the double tracking but to support tunnels in Del Mar and Sorrento Valley. The TransNet Ordinance included funding for double tracking but we need to identify the required matching funds. We have submitted a proposal for goods movement funding but we don’t expect to receive the full funding request.

Mayor Jerome Stocks (NCTD) stated that the plans for the double tracks are laid out and for the most part environmentally cleared but funding won’t come out of operating budgets. We need to continue to look for grant funding for specific project segments that fit our parameters. We are ready to go we just need to find the funding sources.

Deputy Mayor Jerry Rindone (South County) commented that LOSSAN has two priorities: double tracking and need for equipment.

Action: This item was presented for information only.

6. TransNet MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT (MOE) AUDITS (RECOMMEND)

Renée Wasmund, Finance Director presented the item. Section 8 of the TransNet Extension Ordinance (Attachment 2) prescribes the requirement to develop a new MOE level, based on the level of discretionary funds expended for street and road purposes on average over the fiscal years 2000-01, 2001-02, and 2002-03. The MOE level will then be subject to adjustment every three years based on the Construction Cost Index developed by Caltrans, not to exceed the growth rate in the local jurisdiction’s general fund revenues over the same time period.

Last February, the ITOC reviewed and commented on the set of procedures that were proposed to be used by SANDAG’s auditors, Caporicci & Larson (C&L), to perform the MOE audits. The result of the procedures is a new MOE base that will then be applied in fiscal year 2009, which is the first year the requirements under the TransNet Extension Ordinance will apply.

At the November 14, 2007, ITOC meeting and the December 14, 2007, Transportation Committee meeting, guidance was provided with respect to several issues that arose during the performance of the audits. Both Carlsbad and Encinitas had concerns that the initially calculated MOE level included one-time expenditures that resulted from “banking” general fund monies and that subsequently expending those funds during the base period resulted in an artificially high MOE level. Carlsbad and Encinitas requested that we consider removing those one-time expenditures from the calculation. At the ITOC’s direction, the
auditors performed additional procedures for Carlsbad and Encinitas in order to review and analyze the one-time expenditures. Our General Counsel reviewed the language in the Ordinance and determined that this would be allowed as long as it did not circumvent the intent of the language of the Ordinance. The additional procedures included obtaining discretionary local street and road expenditure information from the cities for the three years preceding the MOE base period for trend analysis, as well as a listing of the one-time expenditures for all six years. The additional information is reported in the audit reports. The City of Oceanside audit does not have any outstanding items and is complete. The City of San Diego audit is still in process and they will provide the final information to the auditors upon issuance of their Fiscal Year 2006 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report. At this time, the recommendation is to proceed with the approval of the MOE base levels for the Cities of Carlsbad, Encinitas, and Oceanside so that they are able to use the information in their FY 2009 budget development process.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Mayor Pfeiler and a second by Chairman Gallo, the Transportation Committee recommended that the SANDAG Board of Directors approve the attached MOE base levels for Encinitas, Carlsbad, and Oceanside based on the completed audits, contingent upon the Board of Directors approving appropriate amendments to Board Policy No. 031, “TransNet Ordinance and Expenditure Plan Rules.”

7. **TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT CLAIM AMENDMENT: THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO LOCAL TRANSPORTATION FUND (RECOMMEND)**

Ms. Wasmund presented the item. Each recipient of Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds is subject to an annual fiscal audit under the provisions of the TDA. The purpose of the audit is to establish the financial position of the claimant, and to determine if the claimant is in compliance with the rules and regulations of the TDA. The original allocations for all claims are based on budget projections for the services to be provided or projects to be completed. The audit identifies any differences between the allocation and the amount of TDA funds that a claimant was eligible to receive based on actual expenditures for the fiscal year. As a result of the FY 2007 audit of the Local Transportation Fund (LTF), it is necessary to adjust a prior claim amendment.

On June 20, 2003, the Transportation Committee approved Resolution No. 2003-41, which authorized a decrease to Claim 250 of $1,617,377 and an increase to Claim 253 of $1,333,951. The increase to Claim 253 should have been $1,617,377. In order to correct this previous action, an amendment of $283,426 is required. This claim amendment corrects the June 20, 2003, action and is consistent with the FY 2002 TDA audit. No additional payment from the County LTF is required, as the appropriate cash transfers have already occurred. As a result, the County LTF is also required to reflect that the cash balance of Claim 253 is reduced by $1,617,377 since Metropolitan Transit System has the funds on hand.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Chair Pro Tem Emery and a second by Supervisor Ron Roberts (County of San Diego), the Transportation Committee approved Resolution No. 2008-15, approving revisions to TDA Article 4.0 claim 253 for Metropolitan Transit System in the County of San Diego LTF.
8. SOUTH ORANGE COUNTY MAJOR INVESTMENT STUDY UPDATE (INFORMATION)

Heather Werdick, Senior Regional Planner presented the item. The Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA) is currently conducting an assessment of various strategic alternatives for improving travel from the San Diego County border to State Route (SR) 55 in south Orange County. This conceptual planning process, which began in early 2006, is called the South Orange County Major Investment Study (SOCMIS). A study team consisting of consultants and OCTA staff is conducting the study. SANDAG staff participates in the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and Mayor David Druker, City of Del Mar, represents SANDAG on the Policy Advisory Committee (PAC). The committees meet regularly to provide feedback and direction to the SOCMIS study team. Additionally, as part of the Borders Planning and Coordination work program, SANDAG meets regularly with staff from OCTA to discuss other items of joint interest.

The SOCMIS is assessing various alternatives for improving north-south travel from the Orange/ San Diego County border to SR 55 and east-west travel from the foothills to the coast. The main transportation corridor in the south Orange County area is Interstate 5 (I-5), an eight-lane freeway with traffic volumes as high as 350,000 vehicle trips per day. Without a long-term strategic vision, the I-5 corridor and surrounding transportation infrastructure will experience increasing levels of congestion.

The study objectives for the SOCMIS are to reduce freeway congestion in the study area, minimize freeway travel times, provide continuity of facilities along south Orange County freeways, improve freeway access at the interchanges, and evaluate public transit options.

The SOCMIS is part of OCTA strategic efforts to keep Orange County moving over the next 25 years and beyond. The study includes a comprehensive public participation process and is divided into the following components: identify I-5 corridor deficiencies, develop the purpose and need for the corridor improvements, develop initial transportation alternatives, evaluate initial transportation alternatives, select a reduced set of transportation alternatives, evaluate a reduced set of transportation alternatives, and recommend a locally preferred transportation strategy.

The study began in early 2006 and is expected to be completed in fall 2008. The study team developed 14 initial multimodal transportation alternatives. The evaluation results for the 14 alternatives were presented to the TAC, SWG, and PAC in July/August 2007 for feedback. The PAC recommended that the 14 initial alternatives be reduced to six alternatives for further study. The six alternatives include a mixture of roadway, arterial, and transit/rail improvements at various investment levels. This reduced set of alternatives was approved for further study by the OCTA Board of Directors in October 2007. The OCTA Board recently decided that the Foothill-South project (State Route 241) will be assumed for all alternatives. The reduced set of alternatives will be evaluated in more detail and findings on benefits, impacts, and costs will be developed, leading to a recommendation of a locally preferred strategy for transportation improvements in south Orange County.

Additionally, one of the key areas of interest in this study is weekend congestion. A weekend operational traffic study and an origin and destination study were conducted by OCTA as part of the SOCMIS to better document weekend travel conditions. The results of
this analysis were presented to the PAC in December 2007. The results from the origin and
destination study found about 20-25 percent of the traffic travels the full length of the
corridor and that about 90 percent of the traffic entering the freeway north of
San Clemente exits before reaching the San Diego county line. The operational study found
that the mainline general purpose lanes experience congestion at lower volumes on the
weekends than on weekdays. This is most likely attributed to differences in driving behavior
on the weekends. Additionally, the analysis indicates that the high occupancy vehicle (HOV)
lanes are very heavily used. The results from these studies will be used to help further define
the recommended locally preferred strategy.

Public open houses were held on the reduced set of alternatives in early March 2008. The
TAC met in February to discuss the results of the further analysis on the six primary
alternatives. The PAC is expected to meet later in March. Best performing elements from the
six remaining alternatives can be mixed and matched as needed. A locally preferred
transportation strategy is expected to be recommended in fall 2008.

Mayor Druker (North County Coastal) commented that the OCTA does not support a high
level of transit service but transit continues to be a part of their alternatives. He stated that
our assumption has always been that the traffic congestion problems were a result of traffic
coming south from Orange County but the study results show that this is not valid,
especially on the weekends.

Mayor Stocks asked staff for a status update on toll road extension for SR 241 and Ms.
Werdick said the Coastal Commission denied the consistency finding last month and an
appeal has been filed with the Secretary of Commerce. The appeal process will take about a
year. The other environmental studies and permits are still being processed.

Councilmember Matt Hall (North County Coastal) commented that he drives I-5 every
Saturday southbound and the traffic is very heavy; his observation does not support the
findings from the study.

Action: This item was presented for information only.

9. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next meeting of the Transportation Committee is scheduled for March 21, 2008, at
9 a.m.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Madaffer adjourned the meeting at 9:54 a.m.
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FY 2008 TransNet MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT AUDIT EXTENSION REQUESTS   File Number 1110200

Introduction

Board Policy No. 031, “TransNet Ordinance and Expenditure Plan Policies,” contains several rules specifically dealing with administration of the TransNet Program. Within Board Policy No. 031, TransNet Rule #17 deals with fiscal and compliance audit procedures; requiring that all TransNet audits be completed by March 31 following the end of the previous fiscal year.

The FY 2007 TransNet audits for the Cities of Escondido, Oceanside, and San Diego and the County of San Diego are still in progress. Board Policy No. 031 allows the agencies to submit a request for an extension to be considered by the Transportation Committee, including an explanation of the situation and specific timelines for completion of the audits.

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to approve TransNet audit extension requests for the Cities of Escondido, Oceanside, and San Diego, and the County of San Diego through April 30, 2008. This action would allow these cities and the County to continue to receive TransNet funds up until the extension date. If the audit is not completed by the approved extension date, these cities would not receive any additional TransNet funds until the audit is completed or the Transportation Committee approves another extension.

Discussion

SANDAG, acting as the San Diego County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC), is responsible for the administration of the TransNet Program. Section 13 (87-1) of the TransNet Ordinance authorizes the RTC to establish “rules and take such other actions as may be necessary and appropriate to carry out its responsibilities.” As outlined in the TransNet Rule #17 (part of Board Policy No. 031), which established more detailed guidelines for the TransNet audits, all TransNet audits are required to be completed no later than March. The Cities of Escondido, Oceanside, and San Diego, and the County of San Diego have been cooperative throughout the audit and the audits are in the final stages of completion. It is anticipated that the audit reports will be issued by April 30.

The delay of the completion of the audits requires that SANDAG withhold future TransNet payments (except required debt service payments) until either the Transportation Committee approves the proposed audit extension request, or the audits are completed. The Cities of Escondido, Oceanside, and San Diego, and the County of San Diego have requested that the Transportation Committee consider an extension through April 30, 2008, which would allow them to continue to receive TransNet funds through the extension date. If the audit work is not completed by the extension date, these cities and the County would not receive any additional TransNet funds unless the Transportation Committee approved another extension.

RENEE WASMUND
Director of Finance

Key Staff Contact: Lisa Kondrat-Dauphin, (619) 699-1942, lko@sandag.org
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

March 21, 2008

AGENDA ITEM NO.: 5

Action Requested: APPROVE

TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT (TDA)
REVISION TO FY 2008 ALLOCATIONS

Introduction

At the February 22, 2008, meeting, the SANDAG Board approved a reduction of the FY 2008 TDA apportionment. As a result, certain Metropolitan Transit System (MTS), North County Transit District (NCTD), and SANDAG claims, which were based on the original FY 2008 approved apportionment, must now be revised to reflect that reduction.

Discussion

Sales tax actual receipts for the first six months of the current fiscal year were approximately 2.4 percent less than the same period in the prior year. Based on historical trends and based on the continuing overall negative economic trends, we expect that the second half of the fiscal year will be weaker than the first half, resulting in a revised estimate that is 2.9 percent less than the FY 2007 actual receipts. Given this information, on February 22, 2008, the Board of Directors approved a reduction of the FY 2008 TDA revenue apportionment. Originally approved in June 2007, the total FY 2008 apportionment was $123,962,000 and has now been reduced to $117,157,000.

Consistent with the reduction in the apportionment and pursuant to Public Utilities Code Section 6659, staff provided instructions to the County Auditor to reduce payment on certain claims. These instructions were made on an urgent basis, by letter to the County Auditor, to prevent overpayment to the claimants. Pursuant to Board Policy 1, the Transportation Committee is authorized to approve amendments to TDA claims. The attached resolutions would reduce the actual claim amounts to be consistent with the reduced payment instructions previously submitted. The revised claim amounts are reflected in the attached resolutions.

RENEE WASMUND
Director of Finance

Attachments: 1. Resolution No. 2008-17
2. Resolution No. 2008-18
3. Resolution No. 2008-19
4. Resolution No. 2008-20

Key Staff Contact: Sookyung Kim, (619) 699-6909, ski@sandag.org
RESOLUTION
NO. 2008-17

APPROVING REVISIONS TO
FY 2008 TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT FUNDS
ARTICLE 3 BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES AND PROGRAMS

WHEREAS, the Transportation Development Act (TDA) claims for bicycle and pedestrian projects pursuant to Chapter 4, Article 3, Section 99234 of the California Public Utilities Code (PUC) listed below require revisions; and

WHEREAS, the SANDAG Board of Directors delegated the authority for TDA claim amendments to the SANDAG Transportation Committee; and

WHEREAS, SANDAG has analyzed the allocations and found that the revision is warranted pursuant to Section 6659(c) of Title 21 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR);

NOW THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED by the Transportation Committee as follows:

1. That the Transportation Committee, pursuant to Section 6659(c) does hereby approve a revision to the claim as shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Claim No.</th>
<th>Claimant</th>
<th>Original Allocation</th>
<th>Adjustment (-)</th>
<th>Revised Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0811010</td>
<td>SANDAG (Bayshore Bikeway)</td>
<td>$142,000</td>
<td>($130,813)</td>
<td>$11,187</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. That the $130,813 will be restored to the Bayshore Bikeway project through the FY 2009 claims process and that there is no negative impact to the project schedule; and

3. That the Transportation Committee does hereby authorize the Executive Director to prepare and transmit instructions and payment schedules to the San Diego County Auditor as necessary and legal for adjustment of this claim.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 21st day of March 2008.

__________________________           ATTEST: ________________________
CHAIRPERSON                   SECRETARY

MEMBER AGENCIES: Cities of Carlsbad, Chula Vista, Coronado, Del Mar, El Cajon, Encinitas, Escondido, Imperial Beach, La Mesa, Lemon Grove, National City, Oceanside, Poway, San Diego, San Marcos, Santee, Solana Beach, Vista, and County of San Diego.

ADVISORY MEMBERS: California Department of Transportation, Metropolitan Transit System, North County Transit District, Imperial County, U.S. Department of Defense, San Diego Unified Port District, San Diego County Water Authority, Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association, and Mexico.
RESOLUTION NO. 2008-18

APPROVING REVISIONS TO
FY 2008 TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT FUNDS
ARTICLE 4 FIXED ROUTE GENERAL PUBLIC TRANSIT SERVICE

WHEREAS, the Transportation Development Act (TDA) claims pursuant to Chapter 4, Article 4 of the California Public Utilities Code (PUC) listed below require revisions; and

WHEREAS, the SANDAG Board of Directors delegated the authority for TDA claim amendments to the SANDAG Transportation Committee; and

WHEREAS, SANDAG has analyzed the allocations and found that the revisions are warranted pursuant to Section 6659(c) of Title 21 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR); NOW THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED by the Transportation Committee as follows:

1. That the Transportation Committee, pursuant to Section 6659(c) does hereby approve revisions to the claims as shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Claim No.</th>
<th>Claimant</th>
<th>Original Allocation</th>
<th>Adjustment</th>
<th>Revised Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08031000</td>
<td>Metropolitan Transit System</td>
<td>$78,962,802</td>
<td>($4,584,000)</td>
<td>$74,378,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08041000</td>
<td>North County Transit District</td>
<td>$37,836,676</td>
<td>($1,462,550)</td>
<td>$36,374,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08031006</td>
<td>Admin/Planning Transfer from MTS</td>
<td>$2,329,302</td>
<td>($130,787)</td>
<td>$2,198,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08041002</td>
<td>Admin/Planning Transfer from NCTD</td>
<td>$532,475</td>
<td>($27,191)</td>
<td>$505,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$2,861,777</td>
<td>($157,978)</td>
<td>$2,703,799</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. That the Transportation Committee does hereby authorize the Executive Director to prepare and transmit instructions and payment schedules to the San Diego County Auditor as are necessary and legal for the adjustments of these claims.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 21st day of March 2008.

_____________________________           ________________________________
CHAIRPERSON                   SECRETARY

ATTEST: ________________________________

MEMBER AGENCIES: Cities of Carlsbad, Chula Vista, Coronado, Del Mar, El Cajon, Encinitas, Escondido, Imperial Beach, La Mesa, Lemon Grove, National City, Oceanside, Poway, San Diego, San Marcos, Santee, Solana Beach, Vista, and County of San Diego.

ADVISORY MEMBERS: California Department of Transportation, Metropolitan Transit System, North County Transit District, Imperial County, U.S. Department of Defense, San Diego Unified Port District, San Diego County Water Authority, Southern California Tribal Chairmen's Association, and Mexico.
RESOLUTION NO. 2008-19

APPROVING REVISIONS TO
FY 2008 TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT FUNDS
ARTICLE 4.5 COMMUNITY TRANSIT SERVICE

WHEREAS, the Transportation Development Act (TDA) claims listed below pursuant to Chapter 4, Article 4.5, of the California Public Utilities Code (PUC) require revisions; and

WHEREAS, the SANDAG Board of Directors delegated the authority for TDA claim amendments to the SANDAG Transportation Committee; and

WHEREAS, SANDAG has analyzed the allocations and found that the revisions are warranted pursuant to Section 6659(c) of Title 21 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR);

NOW THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED by the Transportation Committee as follows:

1. That the Transportation Committee, pursuant to Section 6659(c) does hereby approve revisions to the claims as shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Claim No.</th>
<th>Claimant</th>
<th>Original Allocation</th>
<th>Adjustment (+/-)</th>
<th>Revised Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08031001</td>
<td>Metropolitan Transit System</td>
<td>$4,104,593</td>
<td>($225,000)</td>
<td>$3,879,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08041001</td>
<td>North County Transit District</td>
<td>$1,780,000</td>
<td>($223,000)</td>
<td>$1,557,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. That the Transportation Committee does hereby authorize the Executive Director to prepare and transmit instructions and payment schedules to the San Diego County Auditor as are necessary and legal for the adjustments of these claims.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 21st day of March 2008.

________________________________________           ATTEST: ______________________________________
CHAIRPERSON                   SECRETARY

MEMBER AGENCIES: Cities of Carlsbad, Chula Vista, Coronado, Del Mar, El Cajon, Encinitas, Escondido, Imperial Beach, La Mesa, Lemon Grove, National City, Oceanside, Poway, San Diego, San Marcos, Santee, Solana Beach, Vista, and County of San Diego.

ADVISORY MEMBERS: California Department of Transportation, Metropolitan Transit System, North County Transit District, Imperial County, U.S. Department of Defense, San Diego Unified Port District, San Diego County Water Authority, Southern California Tribal Chairmen's Association, and Mexico.
RESOLUTION
NO. 2008-20

APPROVING REVISIONS TO
FY 2008 TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT FUNDS
PLANNING AND ADMINISTRATION

WHEREAS, WHEREAS, the Transportation Development Act (TDA) claims listed below require revisions; and

WHEREAS, the SANDAG Board of Directors delegated the authority for TDA claim amendments to the SANDAG Transportation Committee; and

WHEREAS, SANDAG has analyzed the allocations and found that the revisions are warranted pursuant to Section 6659(c) of Title 21 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR);

NOW THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED by the Transportation Committee as follows:

1. That the Transportation Committee, pursuant to Section 6659(c) does hereby approve revisions to the claims as shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Claim No.</th>
<th>Claimant</th>
<th>Original Allocation</th>
<th>Adjustment</th>
<th>Revised Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08051000</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$496,000</td>
<td>($62,085)</td>
<td>$433,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08051001</td>
<td>Regional Planning</td>
<td>$3,487,720</td>
<td>($202,288)</td>
<td>$3,285,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$3,983,720</td>
<td>($264,373)</td>
<td>$3,719,347</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. That the Transportation Committee does hereby authorize the Executive Director to prepare and transmit instructions and payment schedules to the San Diego County Auditor as are necessary and legal for the adjustments of these claims.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 21st day of March 2008.

CHAIRPERSON

SECRETARY

ATTEST:

MEMBER AGENCIES: Cities of Carlsbad, Chula Vista, Coronado, Del Mar, El Cajon, Encinitas, Escondido, Imperial Beach, La Mesa, Lemon Grove, National City, Oceanside, Poway, San Diego, San Marcos, Santee, Solana Beach, Vista, and County of San Diego.

ADVISORY MEMBERS: California Department of Transportation, Metropolitan Transit System, North County Transit District, Imperial County, U.S. Department of Defense, San Diego Unified Port District, San Diego County Water Authority, Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association, and Mexico.
San Diego Association of Governments

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

March 21, 2008

AGENDA ITEM NO.: 6

Action Requested: RECOMMEND

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM BUDGET TRANSFERS
AND ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCE

File Numbers 1048500, 1142700

Introduction

SANDAG implements projects for the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) for projects that require construction contracting. These projects are included in the SANDAG Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and Program Budget. SANDAG policy requires Board of Directors approval for budget transfers in amounts over $500,000 cumulative. This item recommends an action to the SANDAG Board to transfer $2,300,000 in funds from one CIP project to another. This transfer does not change the total amount of the SANDAG CIP program. Also, the Transportation Committee is asked to accept the Final Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (FIS/MND) and Addendum No. 1 from MTS for the South Bay Maintenance Facility Expansion project and approve Addendum No. 2 to the FIS/MND.

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend that the Board of Directors: (1) approve of a capital project budget transfer of $2,300,000 from the East County Bus Maintenance Facility CNG Station Project (CIP 1142700) into the South Bay Maintenance Facility Project (CIP 1048500); (2) accept the Final Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (FIS/MND) and Addendum No. 1 from Metropolitan Transit System for the South Bay Maintenance Facility Expansion Project; and (3) approve the adoption of Addendum No. 2 to the FIS/MND.

Discussion

The SBMF currently houses 155 buses and approximately 500 employees. The anticipated design capacity of the facility is 160-190 buses based on the facility master plan. When the property was initially purchased, the facility was planned to have a storage capacity of 80 to 90 buses. The addition of two compressed natural gas (CNG) fueling stations, loss of employee parking in the surrounding areas, and additional bus routes operating out of the facility required the expansion of the facility. Approximately four parcels from 2001 to 2003 were purchased adjacent to the original site expanding the facility size from 4 acres to 6 acres. Two additional parcels were considered for acquisitions but were not purchased. One of the parcels had hazardous material contamination and there was insufficient funding in the project budget to purchase the second parcel. The contamination has since been mitigated and the County of San Diego has closed the site cases. Recent studies by MTS regarding the full SBMF expansion plan build support for the acquisition of these two parcels to build out the facility.

Funding Transfer

MTS is requesting SANDAG transfer $2.3 million from the East County Bus Maintenance Facility CNG project (CIP 1142700) to the SBMF Expansion project (CIP 1048500) (see Attachment No. 1) to fund the acquisition of right-of-way adjacent to the SBMF, currently identified as 3630 Main Street. This parcel has been cleared by the County for contamination and will require minor site enhancements...
to comply with environmental mitigation and security lighting, fencing, walls, and other miscellaneous improvements. This parcel is also vacant and under new ownership and provides an opportunity for purchase as part of the master plan and within the proposed budget. The ECBMF CNG Project includes developing CNG fueling and maintenance facilities at the ECBMF. The transfer does not adversely impact the ECBMF Project because MTS has slowed its CNG expansion while it studies alternative fueling scenarios for this site, including natural gas and gasoline-hybrid powered buses. Funds for expanding the ECBMF will be included in future fiscal year budgets. The funding transfer will result in the budget changes as shown in Table 1 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project (CIP #)</th>
<th>FY 08 Budget</th>
<th>Proposed Budget</th>
<th>Budget Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Bay Maintenance Facility Expansion (1048500)</td>
<td>$8,133,000</td>
<td>$10,433,000</td>
<td>$2,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East County Bus Maintenance Facility CNG Project (1142700)</td>
<td>$3,251,000</td>
<td>$951,000</td>
<td>-$2,300,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CEQA Final Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration

The proposed SBMF additional expansion requires an addendum to the approved environmental documents for the expanded site impact and mitigations. The original 2001 Final Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (FIS/MND) and an addendum conducted in 2003 for the SBMF (Attachment No. 2) identified five parcels of which four currently make up the existing SBMF site. SANDAG consultants, Helix Environmental Planning, Inc. (Helix) has determined that approval of an addendum to the current (FIS/MND) is sufficient to expand the facility including the addition of right-of-way within the FIS/MND project limits. Helix determined in its study that there are no new significant environmental impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified environmental impacts as a result of the modifications to the SBMF Expansion project. A second Addendum (Attachment No. 3) has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requirements to provide the required environmental clearance of the revised project.

In addition, MTS in 2001 provided to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) documents to support a Categorical Exclusion for the SBMF Expansion project. No official action is required by the Transportation Committee to modify the National Environmental Protection Agency (NEPA) documents. The documents from 2001 include five of the six parcels originally targeted for acquisition. The sixth parcel is being added to the project’s NEPA Categorical Exclusion via letter to the FTA regional office.

JACK BODA
Director of Mobility Management and Implementation

Attachments: 1. MTS Board Item No. 8, March 13, 2008
3. Second Addendum to the Final Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration dated February 25, 2008

Key Staff Contact: Pete d’Ablaing, (619) 699-1906, pda@sandag.org
Agenda

JOINT MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
for the
Metropolitan Transit System,
San Diego Transit Corporation, and
San Diego Trolley, Inc.

March 13, 2008

SUBJECT:

MTS: SOUTH BAY MAINTENANCE FACILITY EXPANSION PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL DECLARATION ADDENDUM

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Board of Directors:

1. declare that the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) is now the lead agency for the project pursuant to Senate Bill 1703 and receive the Final Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration Second Addendum (Attachment A);

2. approve the revised South Bay Maintenance Facility (SBMF) Expansion Project; and

3. transfer funding from East County Bus Maintenance Facility CNG Project to the SBMF Expansion Project.

Budget Impact

The SBMF Expansion Project (CIP 1048500) budget would increase from $8,132,922 to $10,432,922 and the East County Bus Maintenance Facility CNG Project (CIP 1142700) would decrease from $3,251,260 to $951,260.

DISCUSSION:

The purpose of this agenda item is to provide an update on the SBMF Expansion Project (Attachment B) and amend the environmental documents so that they include the full build-out of the project. There are two parcels of the SBMF that have not yet been
purchased—one of the parcels (at 3630 Main Street in El Cajon) was previously removed from the project due to environmental concerns in 2003. The environmental concerns have all been mitigated, and the County of San Diego has deemed the site’s hazardous issues to be closed. Further studies were conducted by MTS in 2005-2006 regarding the full SBMF expansion plan, and both the 3630 Main Street parcel and the parcel not acquired to date at 3650 Main Street (the north parcel of SAVON Self-Storage) need to be acquired to meet the full build-out goal to accommodate a fleet of 160 to 190 buses.

Background

MTS purchased the South Bay Maintenance Facility in December 1992, and it became operational in January 1993. The facility (four acres) was originally planned for a storage capacity of 80 to 90 buses. As a result of the addition of two compressed natural gas (CNG) fueling stations, loss of employee parking in the surrounding area, and additional routes operating out of the facility, the ideal design capacity is now 160 to 190 buses. Property was acquired from 2001 to 2003 to increase the site size to approximately six acres as part of the SBMF Expansion Project, which would comfortably accommodate 130 to 140 buses. However, the South Bay facility currently houses 155 buses and approximately 500 employees and is extremely crowded. The property expansion has not been completed due to funding limitations and environmental issues.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration

MTS has been successful in acquiring four of the six parcels. The two parcels remaining will not adversely affect the environmental impacts and mitigations previously identified in the original 2001 Final Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration and in the addendum conducted in 2003. MTS, via the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG), contracted with Helix Environmental Planning, Inc. to review the study and prepare an addendum that ensures that both remaining parcels are fully covered in the study. A second addendum (Attachment A) has been prepared in accordance with CEQA requirements. Review of the previous studies indicates that there are no new significant environmental impacts or substantial increases in the severity of previously identified significant environmental impacts as a result of the modifications to the SBMF Expansion Project. The second addendum has been prepared to provide the environmental clearance of the revised project under CEQA. SANDAG’s Board of Directors will also be taking action to adopt the findings of the second addendum.

National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) Categorical Exclusion for SBMF Modifications

In 2001, MTS provided the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) with documents to support a categorical exclusion for the SBMF Expansion Project—no official action is required by SANDAG or MTS to modify those documents. The documents from 2001 include five of the six parcels originally targeted for acquisition, including the 3630 Main Street parcel. The sixth parcel to be added to the NEPA categorical exclusion project description is the parcel at 3650 Main Street (the north parcel of SAVON Self-Storage). The change in project description for the SBMF Expansion Project categorical exclusion will be handled via letter to the FTA’s regional office.
Transfer of Project Funds

The East County Maintenance Facility is being reconsidered for possible alternative fueling scenarios, including natural gas and gasoline-hybrid power sources. A capital project exists with $3.25 million in funding for the future East County Facility CNG fuel station. There is no urgent need to move forward with the CNG station work at this time as the use of alternative fuel buses at the East County facility is a few years away. As a result, staff is recommending that $2.3 million of that funding be shifted to the South Bay Maintenance Facility for right-of-way acquisition in order to purchase the 3630 Main Street parcel. The funding shift would also allow for some minor projects at that parcel for security lighting, fencing/walls, and site improvements to comply with the environmental mitigation.

Paul C. Jablonski
Chief Executive Officer

Key Staff Contact: Susan Hafner, 619.595.3084, Susan.Hafner@sdmts.com

Attachments: A. Final Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration Second Addendum (Board Only)  
B. SBMF Expansion Project Acquisition Status
## SOUTH BAY MAINTENANCE FACILITY EXPANSION PROJECT ACQUISITION STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARCEL NUMBER</th>
<th>CURRENT OWNER</th>
<th>PRIOR OWNER</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>SIZE ACRES</th>
<th>CEQA ORIGINAL FIS/MND</th>
<th>CEQA ADDENDUM ONE</th>
<th>CEQA ADDENDUM TWO</th>
<th>NEPA CAT. EXCLUSION</th>
<th>PURCHASE DATE</th>
<th>FUNDING AVAILABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT MTS PROPERTY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623-250-20</td>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Duk</td>
<td>3620 Main</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623-250-19</td>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Wells</td>
<td>3610 Main</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623-250-26</td>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Wells</td>
<td>3620 Main</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623-250-24</td>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>H&amp;T USA, Ltd.</td>
<td>3648 Main</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT SIZE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUTURE ACQUISITIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623-250-23</td>
<td>Luciani</td>
<td>Luciani</td>
<td>3650 Main</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>Not Included</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL BUILD-OUT SIZE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
South Bay Maintenance Facility Expansion Project

FINAL INITIAL STUDY / MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

April 13, 2001

Prepared for:

METROPOLITAN TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT BOARD
1255 Imperial Avenue, Suite 1000
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Prepared by:

HELIX ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING, INC.
8100 La Mesa Boulevard, Suite 150
La Mesa, California 91941-6476
South Bay Maintenance Facility Expansion Project  
Final Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration
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SAN DIEGO METROPOLITAN TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT BOARD  
CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT  

FINAL MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

**LEAD AGENCY:** San Diego Metropolitan Transit Development Board

**PROJECT TITLE:** South Bay Maintenance Facility Expansion Project

**PROJECT LOCATION:** Chula Vista, California. The project is partially located in the Southwest Redevelopment Agency in the 3600 block of Main Street.

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** The proposed project involves expansion of the existing South Bay Maintenance Facility. Proposed expansion activities include acquisition of five parcels totaling 3.72 acres, demolition of three buildings, addition of a compressor at the compressed natural gas (CNG) fueling station, and resurfacing the site to accommodate additional bus and employee vehicle parking.

**FINDINGS:**

It is believed that this project will not have a significant effect on the environment for the following reasons:

a. Due to the urbanized nature of the project area, the proposed project would have little potential to degrade the quality of the environment.

b. The proposed project could contribute to cumulative impacts associated with light and glare, air quality, and noise. However, none of these potential impacts would be considered significant due to their incremental and/or short-term nature. Implementation of the project-specific mitigation measures would also ensure that any potential impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance.

c. The proposed project could potentially impact the human environment resulting from short-term, construction-related air quality and noise impacts. Implementation of the project-specific mitigation measures would reduce potential impacts to below a level of significance.

d. The proposed project would not directly or indirectly induce population growth. Also, the project site consists of commercial and industrial land uses and thus, would not displace any residences.

e. The project would result in an increase in buses and employee vehicles to and from the project site, but this would be offset by a reduction of employee and delivery trucks associated with the businesses now occupying the sites. Also, the proposed project would not involve changes to the existing circulation system and is consistent with respect to land use and applicable land use policies.

**MITIGATION MEASURES:**

Implementation of these project-specific mitigation measures would reduce potential impacts to below a level of significance:
• **Light and Glare.** All exterior lighting sources shall incorporate the use of 25-foot or less (where possible) light standards, and shall be directed downward or otherwise shielded so as to minimize spillover into the adjacent residential areas.

• **Air Quality.** Contract specifications will require construction contractors to implement specific measures during demolition and construction activities to minimize fugitive dust and construction equipment exhaust emissions. These measures include, but are not limited to, application of water to exposed soils; application of water to and/or provision of effective cover of all materials transported off-site; encouragement of the use of low emission construction equipment; minimization of simultaneous use of construction equipment; and limitation of construction equipment running and idling time.

• **Hazards and Hazardous Materials.** Prior to commencement of demolition or construction activities, research shall be conducted to determine whether previous studies addressing potential soil contamination at the location of the former USTs have been completed within the last three years. If research concludes that no previous studies have been completed within the last three years, an assessment shall be conducted to determine the extent of soil contamination and potential impacts to groundwater at the location of the former USTs on the property currently operated by Mosier Roofing so as to ensure the health and safety of construction workers. Any potential soil or groundwater contamination shall be remediated prior to project construction.

Prior to commencement of demolition or construction activities, research shall be conducted to determine whether previous soil sampling and analysis on the Hot Lunch Truck M.F.G. property have been completed within the last three years. If research concludes that no previous testing has been completed within the last three years, surface soil sampling and analysis shall be conducted to assess potential risks to construction workers. Areas of sampling shall include, but are not limited to, subsurface soil beneath the documented surface soil staining and truck wash area at the Hot Lunch M.F.G. facility. Any potential soil contamination shall be remediated prior to project construction.

Prior to commencement of demolition activities, a comprehensive asbestos-containing building materials (ACBM) and lead-based paint sampling program shall be conducted. Existing buildings that are to be demolished shall be thoroughly inspected by a qualified inspector for the presence of ACBM and lead-based paint. Should the inspection reveal ACBM or lead-based paint, appropriate abatement activities shall be implemented and shall comply with all federal and state occupational safety and health requirements.

Prior to commencement of demolition or construction activities, sampling and analysis for polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) shall be conducted at the location where a transformer was identified on the property associated with Hot Lunch Truck M.F.G.

• **Noise.** Contract specifications will require construction contractors to implement noise abatement measures during demolition and construction activities to minimize short-term, construction-related noise impacts. These measures include, but are not limited to, notifying the neighboring residences, schools, and businesses of the construction schedule; limiting construction operation hours; requiring all construction equipment to be equipped with properly operating and maintained mufflers; and limiting the number and types of construction equipment on the site at any given time.
THE INITIAL STUDY PREPARED FOR THIS PROJECT IS ATTACHED.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF PERSON PREPARING THIS FORM</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>TELEPHONE NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thomas F. Larwin</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>(619) 231-1466</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1255 Imperial Avenue, Suite 1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, CA 92101-7490</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VIA FACSIMILE & U.S. MAIL

Thomas F. Larwin
General Manager
Metropolitan Transit Development Board
1255 Imperial Avenue, Suite 1000
San Diego, CA 92101-7490

RE: Mitigated Negative Declaration for the MTDB South Bay Maintenance Facility Expansion Project

Dear Mr. Larwin:

The City of Chula Vista offers the following comments regarding the proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration:

SOILS/WATER CONTAMINATION

The MND defers research and technical studies to determine if previous studies addressing potential soil contamination have been completed on the project site, yet the attached Initial Study Checklist identifies HAZARDS as “Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.” Project impacts cannot be determined without this information. A Phase II Environmental Site Assessment should be conducted to determine the extent of water and soil contamination and if necessary a remediation work plan should be prepared prior to the adoption of the MND.

AIR QUALITY

A qualified air quality expert should be consulted during the preparation of the MND not prior to commencement of construction activities. In compliance with CEQA, specific mitigation measures should be identified in the MND.

NOISE

Potential noise impacts are not adequately addressed. An acoustical analysis should be conducted to address potential noise impacts to the adjacent residential land uses, Otay Recreation Center, the City park and elementary school. A The noise analysis should be
conducted to assure that noise pollution associated with the operation of the facility (engine start-up of the buses) and the noise from the three compressors complies with the City of Chula Vista Noise Standards. As a result of the acoustical analysis, the IS/MND should contain specific mitigation measures to reduce potential noise impacts to below a level of significance.

Noise abatement measures for short-term construction-related impacts should also be addressed in the acoustical analysis and identified in the IS/MND not prior to demolition and construction activity.

TRAFFIC

A traffic analysis should be conducted to determine the actual number of daily vehicle and bus trips and their corresponding peak hour traffic volumes. There is a contradiction in the IS and MND. The IS determines the traffic impacts are “Less than Significant” and the MND contains mitigation to reduce potential impacts to below a level of significance.

The City welcomes the opportunity to discuss these comments with you and your staff. Please inform us when we may review the revised Initial Study Checklist and MND which address the above-noted concerns. If you have any questions regarding these comments please contact me at (619) 585-5707.

Sincerely,

Marilyn R.F. Ponsaggi
Environmental Review Coordinator

cc: Bob Leiter, Director of Planning & Building
George Krempel, Assistant City Manager
Chris Salomone, Director of Community Development
Cliff Swanson, Public Works Deputy Director
Duane Bazzel, Principal Planner
Ben Guerrero, Environmental Projects Manager
Edalia Olivo-Gomez, Environmental Projects Manager
Comments to the Draft Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration

A letter was received from the City of Chula Vista Planning and Building Department on April 6, 2001. The letter commented on four issues addressed in the Draft Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) including soils/water contamination, air quality, noise, and traffic. The following responses address the issues raised by the City. No changes to the conclusions of the IS/MND are warranted based on the comments from the City.

Soils/Water Contamination

A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Report was prepared by Earth Tech in February 2001 and is referenced in the Draft IS/MND [page 18, (d)]. This is the standard level of review during the CEQA process. The Phase I report identified potential environmental concerns and made recommendations to mitigate potential impacts. Prior to construction, the mitigation recommendations identified in the report will be implemented by the property owner and/or MTDB.

Air Quality

We agree with the comment that specific mitigation measures should be identified in the MND in compliance with CEQA. Specific measures were identified in the Initial Study and will be identified in the Final MND. Contract specifications will require construction contractors to implement the following measures to minimize fugitive dust and construction equipment exhaust emissions:

- All areas with exposed soils shall be regularly watered;
- When materials are transported off site, all material shall be covered or effectively wetted;
- The use of low emission construction equipment shall be encouraged;
- Simultaneous use of construction equipment shall be minimized to the extent feasible; and
- Construction equipment running and idling time shall be limited to the extent feasible.

Noise

We agree with the City's position that potential noise impacts to adjacent sensitive noise receptors, including the residential land uses to the north, as well as the Chula Vista Recreation Center, Otay Elementary School, and Otay Park to the west, should be analyzed. Accordingly, a noise analysis was conducted by Ogdens in 1993 and is referenced in the Initial Study. The noise analysis measured ambient noise levels at the adjacent residential neighborhood prior to and after the opening of the existing bus maintenance facility. The analysis concluded that the change in ambient noise levels resulting from facility operations did not result in a significant increase. The proposed area of expansion would be utilized for parking only and not for active maintenance functions. Maintenance operations will continue where they are
currently occurring on site. As discussed in the Initial Study, buses would not be parked in the northernmost portion of expanded facility, closest to the adjacent residences. This area would be utilized for employee parking only. Furthermore, the proposed project would eliminate existing nuisance noises associated with Hot Lunch Truck, M.F.G. Therefore, the adjacent residential land uses would not be exposed to a substantial increase in noise levels resulting from the expanded facility. Potential noise impacts to the Recreation Center, park, and elementary school would also be less than significant. Operation of the expanded maintenance facility would generally occur outside of normal operating hours of the school, park, and Recreation Center. Buses leave the facility between 4 a.m. and 6 a.m. and return between 6 p.m. and 2 a.m. Therefore, these adjacent land uses would not be exposed to a substantial increase in noise levels. As stated earlier, maintenance would continue at its current location on site; therefore, the project would not result in a change in operational noise at the facility.

Likewise, noise generated by the addition of a compressor at the CNG fueling station would not result in significant noise impacts to surrounding noise sensitive land uses. An acoustical study was prepared by Wilson, Ithig, and Associates, Inc. in 1997, which measured noise levels generated by the two compressors at the existing facility. The two existing compressors are located on the southeastern portion of the existing facility, farthest from the sensitive noise receptors and are housed in a block wall enclosure. The study identified a noise level of 72 dB(A) when measured five feet above the ground and 50 feet from the block wall. Point sources of noise emissions are attenuated by a factor of six dB(A) per doubling of distance. Therefore, the closest residence, located approximately 650 feet to the north, would be exposed to noise levels generated by the compressors of approximately 50 dB(A), which, according to the Ogden study, would not exceed ambient noise levels. Similarly, the school, park, and Recreation Center would be exposed to noise levels generated by the compressors of approximately 51 dB(A), 47 dB(A), and 50 dB(A), respectively, which would not exceed ambient noise levels according to the Ogden study. The addition of a third compressor would not result in a substantial increase in noise levels beyond the current level generated by the existing compressors. As stated in the Initial Study, the additional compressor would be located adjacent to the existing compressors and it would also be housed in a block wall to attenuate sound.

We agree with the City comment that specific noise abatement measures for short-term construction noise should be identified in the MND. Specific measures were identified in the Initial Study and will be identified in the Final MND. Contract specifications will require construction contractors to implement the following noise abatement measures:

- Adjacent businesses, residences, and schools shall be surveyed and a reasonable construction schedule shall be determined;
- Construction activities shall be limited to reasonable hours (typically between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m., Monday through Saturday);
- Construction equipment shall be equipped with properly operating and maintained mufflers; and
- The number and types of construction equipment on site shall be limited to the extent feasible.
Traffic

The Initial Study concluded that although the proposed project would result in an increase in buses and employee vehicles travelling to and from the project site, the project would not result in a substantial increase in the number of trips on local roadways. The increase in daily trips would be offset by the elimination of vehicular trips associated with the businesses that would be relocated. On April 12, 2001, MTDB conducted an analysis of existing daily trips generated by the current businesses on site and compared those numbers with the number of trips expected to be generated by the expanded maintenance facility. Information was obtained by MTDB through correspondence with the existing tenants. The analysis concluded that the proposed project would result in a net decrease in daily vehicle trips. Furthermore, bus and employee vehicle trips generated by the expanded facility would not occur during peak travel periods. The analysis prepared by MTDB also concluded that the proposed project would result in a net decrease in peak hour vehicle trips. Therefore, traffic impacts resulting from the project would be less than significant.

The Draft MND inadvertently identified mitigation measures for transportation/traffic and population and housing, when in fact, no mitigation measures regarding these issues were identified in the Initial Study because the impacts would not be significant. These issue statements have been transferred to the “Findings” portion of the Final MND.
## SOUTH BAY MAINTENANCE FACILITY EXPANSION
### DAILY VEHICLE TRIP SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours of Activity</th>
<th>MTDB Expansion</th>
<th>San Diego Caterers 3630 Main St.</th>
<th>Air Liquide 3620 Main St.</th>
<th>Mosier Roofing 3610 Main St.</th>
<th>H &amp; T Office 3648 Main St.</th>
<th>Net Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12:00 a.m - 3:00 a.m.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 a.m. - 6:00 a.m.</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00 a.m. - 9:00 a.m.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(56)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>(77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 p.m. - 3:00 p.m.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(42)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(30)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>(69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00 p.m. - 12:00 a.m.</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Daily Trips</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>(158)</td>
<td>(34)</td>
<td>(50)</td>
<td>(50)</td>
<td>(56)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1. Data for MTDB expansion based upon full expansion from 80 to 130 buses.
2. H & T Office based upon building at full occupancy.
3. Information prepared by MTDB with input obtained from tenants of each site except H & T Office.
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

I. PROJECT INFORMATION

1. Project title: South Bay Maintenance Facility Expansion Project

2. Lead Agency name and address: Metropolitan Transit Development Board
   1255 Imperial Avenue, Suite 1000
   San Diego, California 92101
   Elliot P. Hurwitz, P.E.

3. Contact person and phone number: 3650A Main Street
   Contract Services Administrator
   619-231-1466

4. Project location: same as Lead Agency
   Chula Vista, California 91911
   City of Chula Vista Limited Industrial

5. Project sponsor’s name and address: I-L (Limited Industrial)

6. General Plan designation:

7. Zoning:

II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Project Characteristics

The proposed project consists of the purchase of five parcels totaling 3.72 acres to accommodate the expansion of the existing South Bay Maintenance Facility (SBMF). The SBMF, located in the City of Chula Vista, is owned by the Metropolitan Transit Development Board (MTDB) and consists of 4.07 acres with approximately 17,000 square feet of buildings used for administration, bus and automobile parking, bus maintenance, and parts storage (see Figures 1 and 2). MTDB contracts with a bus provider to operate the facility, maintain and service the buses, and to provide drivers to operate the buses on routes in the San Diego metropolitan area. All structures on the acquired parcels, including those associated with Mosier Roofing, Hot Lunch Truck M.F.G., and H&T USA office building would be demolished in conjunction with the proposed project with the exception of one 8,000 square-foot building, currently housing Air Liquide welding supplies and gas. This structure would be retained for use as a training facility and for parts storage. The remainder of the site would be resurfaced with either asphalt or concrete and would be utilized for both bus and employee parking. It is anticipated that the bus parking capacity could increase from 80 buses to approximately 125-130 buses upon completion of the expansion project. The existing SBMF includes a compressed natural gas (CNG) fueling station consisting of two compressors. As part of the proposed expansion, an additional compressor would be added to accommodate the addition of buses to the fleet.

Landscaping, fencing, and lighting improvements would also be included in the proposed expansion project to enhance visual quality, ensure architectural compatibility, and promote safety within the project area. The existing trees and shrubs associated with the project site and fronting Main Street would be retained and some additional street trees may be planted if space permits. Landscape improvements are also proposed for the area between the expanded facility and the adjacent residences to the north, as
space and property permits. Proposed fencing along the frontage of Main Street would be designed and constructed to be architecturally compatible with the existing block wall associated with the existing SBMF. Additional fencing on the west perimeter between the project site and the City of Chula Vista Recreation Center and the elementary school may potentially be provided to ensure safety. Installation of additional lighting along the perimeter of the expanded facility would also be necessary to ensure security. Demolition and construction of the proposed project would take approximately four months.

Environmental Setting and Surrounding Land Uses

The proposed project site consists of five parcels totaling 3.72 acres and is located in a developed, urban area in the southwest portion of the City of Chula Vista. Onsite land uses consist of commercial and light industrial including the existing SBMF, Air Liquide, Mosier Roofing, Hot Lunch Truck M.F.G., and H&T USA office building. The project site is accessible from Main Street and several street trees and shrubbery exist along the Main Street frontage. A 32-foot easement is located between Air Liquide and the existing SBMF and provides access to the adjoining storage business.

Surrounding land uses include commercial, industrial, and residential. Sav-On Storage is located immediately north and east of the facility; the City of Chula Vista Recreation Center is located immediately west of Mosier Roofing; Otay Elementary School and Otay Park is located on Albany Avenue immediately west of Hot Lunch Truck M.F.G.; and a San Diego Gas and Electric electrical substation is located at the corner of Albany Avenue and Main Street, west of the Recreation Center and immediately south of Otay Elementary. Several single-family residences are located atop a small slope immediately north of Hot Lunch Truck M.F.G. and Sav-On Storage. Land uses south of Main Street include open space, currently designated as the future site of a gas station and mini-mart, located at the corner of Main Street and Mace Street, and several storage/parts/junk yards located on Main Street, Reed Street, and Center Street.

Project Background

The existing facility was built in 1960 and was initially used by San Diego Gas and Electric as a heavy truck repair and service facility until the mid 1970s. The property was sold and used by Mission City Auto Auction as an automobile auction facility until approximately 1990. Subsequently, MTDB purchased the site in 1992 to be used as a bus maintenance facility. The existing facility underwent construction improvements between 1992 and 1995 consisting of earthquake retrofit, installation of natural gas detection systems, and electrical and mechanical systems upgrades. Additionally, a compressed natural gas (CNG) fuel station was constructed on the south side of the existing site near Main Street in 1995, and all buildings were rehabilitated with new roofs in 1997. Currently 80 buses operate out of the existing facility.

Project Approval

MTDB is the Lead Agency under CEQA, and is responsible for reviewing and certifying this Initial Study.
Future Land Use
SOUTH BAY MAINTENANCE FACILITY EXPANSION PROJECT
Figure 4
III. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

| ☐ | Aesthetics | ☐ | Agriculture Resources | ☐ | Air Quality |
| ☐ | Biological Resources | ☐ | Cultural Resources | ☐ | Geology/Soils |
| ☐ | Hazards & Hazardous Materials | ☐ | Hydrology/Water Quality | ☐ | Land Use/Planning |
| ☐ | Mineral Resources | ☐ | Noise | ☐ | Population/Housing |
| ☐ | Public Services | ☐ | Recreation | ☐ | Transportation/Traffic |
| ☐ | Utilities/Service Systems | ☐ | Mandatory Findings of Significance |

IV. DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of the initial evaluation that follows:

☐ The proposed project is exempt from CEQA pursuant to the general exemption (CEQA Guidelines, 15061 (b)(3)), a statutory exemption, and/or a categorical exemption, and that if a categorical exemption, none of the exceptions to the exemption apply. A NOTICE OF EXEMPTION will be prepared.

☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, no further environmental document is required. FINDINGS consistent with this determination will be prepared.

______________________________  ________________________
Signature  Date

______________________________  Metropolitan Transit Development Board
Printed Name  For

South Bay Maintenance Facility Expansion Project
Final Initial Study
April 13, 2001
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V. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

This section evaluates the potential environmental effects of the proposed project using the environmental checklist from the CEQA Guidelines as amended March 1999. The definitions of the response column headings include:

A) "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

B) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from earlier analyses may be cross-referenced).

C) "Less Than Significant Impact" applies where the project creates no significant impacts, only Less than Significant impacts.

D) "No Impact" applies where a project does not create an impact in that category. "No Impact" answers do not require an explanation if they are adequately supported by the information sources cited by the lead agency which show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project specific screening analysis).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

a) The proposed project would not involve construction of any structures that would obstruct views. In fact, the proposed project would demolish three existing structures that would enhance scenic views within the project area. Therefore, scenic vistas would not be adversely impacted.

b) The site currently includes a variety of commercial and industrial land uses with no scenic resources onsite. The existing landscaping consisting of trees and shrubbery would remain along the Main Street frontage. No scenic highways or historical buildings are located in the vicinity of the project.

c) The proposed project would result in a positive impact on the visual quality of the area by removing dilapidated buildings and providing landscape and hardscape improvements. Furthermore, the proposed project would be subject to a design review process by MTDB to assure conformance with plans, policies, goals, and surrounding character. Conformance would assure that the project would not have a significant adverse impact on the visual character of the area.

d) The proposed project is located in a highly urbanized, developed area which currently includes lighting associated with the onsite and offsite land uses. Exterior lighting exists at the SBMF additional lighting would be necessary to ensure safety and security of the bus maintenance facility. The addition of lighting would contribute incrementally to urban light sources, but would not create a new source of substantial light or glare. Although impacts would be considered less than significant, implementation of the mitigation measure regarding light and glare in Section VI would ensure that all proposed lighting would be designed to minimize spillover of light and glare into surrounding land uses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?

Discussion

a) The proposed project site is located in a highly urbanized, developed, largely commercial/light industrial area and does not contain agricultural resources. Issue 2.a is therefore not applicable to the project.

b) The proposed project site does not contain agricultural resources, is not zoned for agricultural uses, and is not the subject of a Williamson Act contract. Issue 2.b is therefore not applicable to the project.

c) The proposed project site does not contain agricultural resources. Issue 2.c is therefore not applicable to the project.

3. AIR QUALITY – Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

a) The proposed project would not involve any substantial change in land use and would be consistent with adopted land use plans and policies including the Chula Vista Community Plan and the Southwest Redevelopment Area Plan. Thus, the project would not conflict with the Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) or the State Implementation Plan (SIP).

b) The project area is within the San Diego Air Basin (SDAD), which is a non-attainment area for federal and state air quality standards. The proposed project would provide parking for the addition of 20 to 47 new buses and additional employee vehicles. Most of the existing buses (approximately 80%) are offsite during the day providing transit service in the San Diego metropolitan area. New buses would also be utilized throughout the day offsite and thus, a significant increase in bus traffic would not occur in the area. The increase in employee vehicles would be offset by the elimination of employee and patron vehicles and delivery trucks associated with the small businesses that would be relocated. Therefore, the proposed project would not generate a substantial increase in automobile or bus traffic. The majority of the existing bus fleet is fueled by compressed natural gas (CNG), and all new buses would use natural gas as well. Emissions from Series 50 CNG buses and Cummins CNG buses at the existing SBMF do not exceed applicable emission standards regarding carbon monoxide, nitrogen oxides, non-methane hydrocarbons, and particulate matter. All new buses would also not exceed applicable emission standards. Therefore, emissions of carbon monoxide and other pollutants would be minimal and less than significant. The proposed project would result in potentially significant short-term construction-related air quality impacts. Short-term impacts resulting from fugitive dust and construction vehicle exhaust emissions would potentially occur during demolition and construction activities. Implementation of the mitigation measure regarding air quality in Section VI, however, would ensure that these impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance.

c) Expansion of the existing facility would potentially increase transit opportunities and encourage shared ridership in the region, which has the potential to decrease roadway traffic, thus reducing emissions of criteria pollutants. Most of the buses at the facility are powered by natural gas and all new buses would also use natural gas as fuel. Use of natural gas, as opposed to diesel, would result in minimal emissions of criteria pollutants. As discussed in Issue 3.b, construction activities would result in short-term air quality impacts from fugitive dust and construction equipment exhaust emissions. However, project-specific mitigation measures would reduce these short-term impacts to below a level of significance. Hence, the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria pollutants.

d) Existing land uses would not substantially change as a result of the proposed project, which consists of the expansion of the existing bus maintenance facility. The addition of buses to the existing fleet would not generate substantial pollutant concentrations, as all of the new buses would be fueled by natural gas and would not emit significant amounts of carbon monoxide or other pollutants into the air. The increase in employee vehicles would be offset by the elimination of employee vehicles.
associated with the relocated businesses. Thus, the proposed project would not generate or expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

e) During construction of the project, odors associated with exhaust emissions from construction machinery and equipment would occur. Such odors would be temporary, occurring for relatively short periods of time, and would be less than significant. As stated earlier, most of the buses operating out of the facility would be fueled by natural gas, as opposed to diesel fuel, thus minimizing odorous exhaust emissions. The relocation of Hot Lunch Truck M.F.G., a food preparation/catering business, would eliminate a local source of exhaust emissions from delivery trucks and employee vehicles and would also eliminate the odors associated with its food preparation operation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

a) The project site is located in a highly urbanized, developed, largely commercial/light industrial area. No sensitive plant or animal species occur on or adjacent to the project site.

b) The project site does not contain any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community.

c) The project site is fully developed and covered by impervious surfaces. No wetlands exist on the project site.

d) The project site is located in a developed area consisting of commercial and industrial uses and does not connect with any wildlife migration corridor. No wildlife corridors or native habitats exist on or near the project site.

e) There are no local policies or conservation policies that apply to the project site.

f) The project site is not part of the Multiple Species Conservation Plan (MSCP) preserve; therefore Issue 4.f. is not applicable to the proposed project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

a) The project site does not contain any historical resources; therefore Issue 5.a is not applicable to the project.

b) The project site is located in a highly, urbanized, developed, largely commercial/light industrial area. The land has been previously graded and disturbed and the entire site has been paved. Minimal grading would be required for implementation of the proposed project. The existing paved surfaces, consisting of asphalt, may require removal and the site would be resurfaced. Thus, given the developed nature of the project site and the limited extent of grading activities, impacts to archeological resources would not likely occur.

c) The site is underlain by the Bay Point Formation and unnamed, nearshore, marine sandstone undifferentiated, which has moderate paleontological resource potential (Tan and Kennedy, 1977). However, as discussed in Issue 5.b, the limited extent of grading activities would not impact previously undisturbed portions of the formation.

d) As discussed in Issue 5.b, the site has been previously graded and disturbed and grading would be minimal. Therefore, the potential to uncover human remains during construction would be extremely low.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Landslides?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

a.i.) Southern California is a seismically active region; however, there are no known active faults within or adjacent to the project site. The closest major fault zone, the La Nacion Fault Zone, traverses the City of Chula Vista and is located approximately two miles east of the project site (Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, 2001; Kennedy, 1994). Thus, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects resulting from an earthquake.

a.ii.) An earthquake along a major regional fault zone, including the La Nacion and Rose Canyon Faults, the closest major fault zones, could result in severe ground shaking and cause injury and property damage within the project site. The proposed project consists of demolition, clearance, and resurfacing to provide vehicular parking and does not include construction of any structures. Therefore, the project would not increase the potential for substantial adverse effects resulting from seismic ground shaking.

a.iii.) The project site is underlain by sandstone of the Eocene-age Mission Valley Formation with overlying stream terrace deposits. The depth of the groundwater is approximately 30 feet below the surface; however, shallower perched water may be locally present. An earthquake along a major regional fault zone could result in ground failure, including liquefaction.

a.iv.) The project site is relatively flat and covered with impervious surfaces. Completion of the proposed project would result in impermeable surfaces as well. There is a small slope of loose, friable conglomerate adjacent to and north of the site between the project site and adjacent residences. However, no landslides have been reported in the immediate area of the project site. Therefore, there is little potential for landslides to occur.

b) A majority of the site is covered by impervious surfaces. The proposed project would similarly cover most of the site with impervious surfaces; therefore no increase in erosion or siltation is
anticipated. Minimal erosion could occur during construction activities, but would be less than significant.

c) The project site is underlain by the Mission Valley Formation with overlying stream terrace deposits. The Mission Valley Formation is typically composed of marine lagoonal and non-marine light olive gray, and mostly fine-grained sandstone, which is characteristically soft and friable. The Mission Valley Formation can also contain clay minerals some of which are highly expandable during prolonged periods of rainfall with a relatively high susceptibility to cause landslides. Onsite soils consist of Huerero loam characterized by a surface layer of gravelly clay loam to loamy fine sand that have a subsoil of heavy clay. These soils are moderately well drained and have a slowly permeable subsoil and moderate water holding capacity. As discussed in Issue 6.a.iv, the site is currently impervious and would remain impervious. The proposed project would not induce landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse.

d) As discussed in Issue 6.c, onsite soils are moderately well drained with a slowly permeable subsoil and moderate water holding capacity. Therefore, the project would not create a substantial risk to life or property.

e) No wastewater disposal systems involving the use of septic tanks, leach fields, or alternative sewage disposal systems that depend upon appropriate soil regimes are currently in use at the project site. Issue 6.a. is therefore not applicable to the proposed project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

a) Waste associated with routine bus repair and maintenance would be generated as a result of the proposed project. However, the amount of waste generated would not be substantially greater than that currently generated by the existing operation of the bus maintenance facility. Any new additional waste would be transported and disposed of according to federal, state, and local regulations and standards. Thus, the proposed project would not create a significant hazard due to transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.

b) The operation of the existing bus maintenance facility does not involve the release of hazardous materials. As discussed in Issue 7.a, all wastes would be disposed of according to federal, state, and local regulations and not released into the environment creating significant hazards. Expansion of the existing facility would not result in hazardous material discharges. Issue 7.b is therefore not applicable to the project.

c) Otay Elementary School is located immediately adjacent to and west of the proposed project site. As discussed in Issues 7.a, and 7.b, the proposed project would not release hazardous emissions and all transportation, use, and disposal of vehicle maintenance and repair wastes would be in conformance with federal, state, and local regulations and standards. Therefore, significant impacts associated with hazardous materials would not occur as a result of the proposed project.
d) A regulatory agency database review was conducted by VISTA Information Systems, Inc. and concluded that there are no unresolved environmental concerns for the project site. The San Diego County Department of Health, Hazardous Materials Management Division was contacted for information concerning underground storage tanks (USTs), contaminant releases, and hazardous materials on the project site. This inquiry concluded that no continuing contamination or hazardous materials permitting/handling issues were identified on the project site. However, past operations conducted at the project site involved the use of hazardous materials or regulated non-hazardous materials including waste oil, solvents, diesel, gasoline, propane, and several other chemicals. Observations based on a site reconnaissance conducted by Earth Tech on February 2, 2001 indicated that onsite hazardous and regulated materials are most likely limited to compressed gases stored at the facility operated by Air Liquide, and potentially waste oil and solvents associated with the operations at Hot Lunch Truck M.F.G. The project site formerly housed three underground storage tanks (USTs). Two of these tanks, formerly located at 3610 Main Street (currently Mosier Roofing), contained diesel and gasoline and were removed in January 1999. Gasoline and diesel were detected in subsurface confirmation samples collected from the excavation area of these two former USTs. Site assessment activities proposed for this portion of the site in the approved workplan prepared by Don Environmental Services, Inc. in April 1999 have not yet been implemented. However, these remediation activities, pursuant to the approved workplan, will be implemented prior to transfer of land ownership. Potential health and safety impacts may occur during demolition and construction activities. Additionally, based on the age of the existing onsite buildings, it likely that asbestos-containing building materials (ACBM) and lead-based paint were used in the construction of these buildings. Potential impacts resulting from exposure to ACBM and lead-based paint may occur during demolition activities. A transformer was observed on the parcel utilized by Hot Lunch Truck M.F.G. and potentially contains polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs). Implementation of the project-specific mitigation measures regarding Hazards and Hazardous Materials in Section VI would reduce these potential impacts to below a level of significance.

e) The project site is not located within an airport land use planning area, nor is it within two miles of a public airport; therefore, Issue 7.e is not applicable to the proposed project.

f) There are no private airstrips located within the vicinity of the proposed project site; therefore Issue 7.f is not applicable to the proposed project.

g) The proposed project would not involve alteration of an emergency response or evacuation plan. Issue 7.g. is therefore not applicable to the proposed project.

h) The proposed project is located in a developed, urban area with no open fields containing substantial areas of brush and grass. Consequently, there would be no risk from wildland fires.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or silting on- or off-site?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

a) The project would generate minor quantities of urban contaminants including petroleum and other types of contaminants associated with bus maintenance and repair. The generation of such contaminants would not result in a violation of water quality standards, as the project would be subject to regulatory controls for the use and disposal of potential contaminants. The project is also governed by the water quality objectives of the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin, which address general quality of surface and groundwater in the region. In addition, the existing bus maintenance facility has water clarifiers that filter water before it enters the sanitary sewer system. These clarifiers would also filter additional runoff generated by routine bus maintenance operations before entering the sewer system. Prior to construction, an evaluation would be made to determine the adequacy of the existing water clarifiers. If a determination were made that the existing water clarifiers would not adequately serve the project, then an additional water clarifier would be installed. MTDB also has a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan that involves annual testing and regularly scheduled lot sweeping. Thus, the project would not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.

b) The proposed project would not use groundwater, nor would it result in a substantial decrease in infiltration of surface water into the water table since the majority of the project site is impermeable.

c) The proposed project would not alter local drainage patterns. The site is fully developed and covered with impervious surfaces and development of the project would also result in predominantly impermeable surfaces. Existing storm and sewer drains would remain and accept runoff and wastewater from the site.

d) As discussed above, the project site is currently covered with impervious surfaces and would remain so after development of the project. There would be no substantial change to the drainage pattern. The proposed project would result in an increase in buses operating out of the facility along with an increase in employee vehicles. Routine maintenance of additional buses would result in additional runoff, but would not substantially increase the rate or amount to cause flooding.

e) The project site is relatively flat and would not generate excessive runoff that would exceed the capacity of the onsite storm drains. Moreover, the project site is not subject to flooding, as it is not located within a 500-year floodplain (FEMA Flood Insurance rate Map, Panel 06073C2156F). Prior to construction of the project, an evaluation of existing drainage patterns and facilities would be made to ensure minimization of polluted runoff. As stated in Issue 8.a, a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) has been prepared and implemented by MTDB for its existing operations. Best Management Practices (BMPs) associated with the existing SWPPP would also be implemented for
operations at the expanded facility. Therefore, the project would not provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.

f) No additional water quality impacts are applicable to the proposed project other than those discussed.

g) The proposed project does not involve construction of residential units, nor is it located within a 500-year floodplain. Therefore, Issue 8.g is not applicable to the proposed project.

h) The proposed project does not involve development of structures, nor is it located within a 500-year floodplain. Issue 8.h is therefore not applicable to the project.

i) As discussed in Issues 8.e, 8.g, and 8.h, the project site is not subject to flooding. The project site is also not located near any dam, levee, or other structure with the potential to fail resulting in inundation.

j) The project site is not at risk from seiche, tsunami, or mudflow due to its urbanized inland location on relatively flat land.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

a) The proposed project would not physically divide an established community. Therefore, Issue 9.a is not applicable to the project.

b) The proposed project is consistent in land use with the Chula Vista Community Plan, Chula Vista Zoning Ordinance, and Southwest Redevelopment Area Plan. The project site has a zoning designation of Limited Industrial and the project would consist of light industrial uses.

c) There are no conservation policies that apply to the project site; therefore, Issue 9.c is not applicable to the proposed project.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. MINERAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

a) Mineral resources do not occur on the project site. Therefore, Issue 10.a is not applicable to the proposed project.

b) The project site has not been used for mineral resource recovery and is not delineated as a mineral resource recovery site on any land use plans; therefore, Issue 10.b is not applicable to the proposed project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. NOISE -- Would the project result in:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

a) The proposed project would not significantly increase noise levels, as noise associated with commercial and industrial land uses currently exists on the project site and in the project vicinity. Existing noise sources contributing to ambient noise levels include vehicular traffic on Main Street, aircraft overflights, trash pickup, and industrial and commercial activity, such as forklifts, compressors, and motor vehicles on the site. Potentially sensitive noise receptors located in the immediate vicinity of the project site include a limited number of residences to the north, Otay Elementary School to the west, and Otay Park to the west. The proposed project could potentially place buses closer to these sensitive receptors. An acoustical assessment was completed in 1993 by Ogden to evaluate potential noise impacts to the adjacent residences resulting from routine operations of the bus maintenance facility. A series of sound level measurements were recorded at the adjacent residences during a 9-hour period on three separate nights. The study concluded that the change in ambient noise levels resulting from facility operations ranged from −3dB(A) to +3dB(A), which is not a perceptible increase. Moreover, the study evaluated noise levels generated by older, diesel buses. Most of the existing buses at SBMF are now fueled by CNG and all new buses also would be fueled by CNG, which are quieter than diesel engines associated with the older buses.

The addition of buses to the fleet would not significantly increase ambient noise levels so as to impact the adjacent residences because the proposed area of expansion would be utilized for parking only and not for any active maintenance functions. Furthermore, the northernmost portion of the expanded facility, adjacent to residences, would be utilized for employee parking only. Buses would not be parked in the very north portion of the expanded facility where Hot Lunch Truck M.F.G. currently operates, and buses parked closest to the residences would not be scheduled to leave until 6:00 a.m. Landscaping would also be provided in this area. Any increase in noise generated by the additional buses would more than likely be offset by the elimination of noise generated by the existing businesses that are to be relocated and/or purchased, especially operations associated with Hot Lunch Truck M.F.G., a food preparation and catering truck business. Thus, the nearby residential area would not be exposed to a substantial increase in noise levels. The expanded facility would have some nocturnal operations, and daytime operations would not substantially increase existing noise levels, as most of the buses are offsite during hours of daylight (approximately 80%). Buses are started between 4 a.m. and 6 a.m. and typically idle for only one to two minutes before they leave the facility and return between 6 p.m. and 2 a.m. Therefore, noise levels associated with bus operations would not impact the school and park.
Noise levels generated by the proposed compressor at the existing CNG fueling station would not result in significant noise impacts. The compressor would be housed in a concrete block wall enclosure at the existing fueling station located in the southeast portion of the existing facility, which is not adjacent to noise sensitive receptors. The addition of one compressor would not significantly increase existing noise levels generated by the two existing compressors.

Although the proposed project would not result in any long-term noise impacts, short-term noise impacts would potentially occur during demolition and construction activities. Sensitive receptors would be exposed to noise generated during demolition and construction activities between the hours of 7 a.m. and 7 p.m. Monday through Saturday for approximately four months. Implementation of the mitigation measure regarding noise in Section VI would reduce these short-term noise impacts to below a level of significance.

b) The proposed project would not generate excessive groundborne vibration or noise levels resulting from the addition of buses to the existing fleet and the increase of employee vehicles. Approximately 80 buses currently operate out of the existing facility. Twenty additional buses would be added to the fleet in fall 2001 and up to 27 could be added in 2002. As stated earlier, bus idling time is limited to only one to two minutes before leaving the facility. Moreover, most of the buses are fueled by natural gas and are quieter than diesel-fueled engines. As discussed in Issue 11a, short-term noise impacts may occur during construction activities. Temporary increases in groundborne vibration and/or groundborne noise levels caused by construction equipment and machinery would potentially occur. However, implementation of the project-specific mitigation measure regarding noise would reduce these short-term noise impacts to below a level of significance.

c) The proposed project is located in an urban area characterized by commercial and industrial land uses. The minimal increase in noise generated by the project would not substantially increase ambient noise levels in the vicinity because noise associated with commercial and industrial land uses currently exists in the area and existing land uses would not change (see the discussion in Issue 11a). Therefore, the project would not result in a substantial, permanent increase in ambient noise levels.

d) Demolition and construction of the proposed project would result in short-term elevations in ambient noise levels. The demolition and construction activities would occur between 7 a.m. and 7 p.m. Monday through Saturday and would last approximately four months. As discussed in Issue 11a, implementation of the project-specific mitigation measure regarding noise would reduce these short-term construction-related noise impacts to a level below significance.

e) The proposed project is not located within an airport land use plan and there are no public airports within two miles of the project site. Issue 11d is therefore not applicable to the project.

f) The proposed project is not in close proximity to a private airstrip; therefore, Issue 11f is not applicable to the project.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Induce substantial population growth in an area,</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>either directly (for example, by proposing new homes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extension of roads or other infrastructure)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing,</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>necessitating the construction of replacement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>housing elsewhere?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Displace substantial numbers of people,</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>necessitating the construction of replacement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>housing elsewhere?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

a) The proposed project consists of expansion of an existing bus maintenance facility that would provide parking for additional buses and employee vehicles. Thus, the proposed project would not directly or indirectly induce population growth. Issue 12.a is therefore not applicable to the project.

b) The project site consists of commercial and industrial land uses and thus, would not displace any residences.

c) No residences would be affected. Thus, Issue 12.c is not applicable to the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. PUBLIC SERVICES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Would the project result in substantial</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adverse physical impacts associated with the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provision of new or physically altered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>governmental facilities, need for new or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physically altered governmental facilities,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the construction of which could cause significant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environmental impacts, in order to maintain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acceptable service ratios, response times or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other performance objectives for any of the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public services:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire protection?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police protection?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other public facilities?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

a) The proposed project would not impact public services including fire and police protection, schools, parks, and other public facilities. The proposed project involves expansion of an existing bus maintenance facility and therefore, would not increase the demand for emergency services, including fire and police protection; schools; or parks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. RECREATION --</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

a) The proposed project would not impact existing recreational resources including the adjacent park, elementary school playground, and Chula Vista Recreation Center. The project consists of expansion of the existing bus storage and maintenance facility to provide for additional bus and employee parking. Therefore, no increase in the use of recreational resources would occur as a result of the project.

b) The proposed project does not include, nor does it require construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Issue 14.b is therefore not applicable to the project.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

a) The proposed project would result in an increase in buses and employee vehicles travelling to and from the project site. This increase, however, would not result in a substantial increase in traffic due to the nature of bus operations and maintenance, as most bus and bus driver arrivals and departures occur outside of the peak travel periods. Drivers arrive at the facility between 4 a.m. and 6 a.m. and also between 12 noon and 2 p.m. and leave between 1 p.m. and 2 p.m. and also between 7 p.m. and 2 a.m. Buses leave the facility between 4 a.m. and 6 a.m. and return between 6 p.m. and 2 a.m. Most buses operating out the facility are offsite a majority of the day (approximately 80%). The increase in employee vehicles would be offset by the elimination of employee and patron vehicles, delivery trucks, and food catering trucks associated with the small businesses that would be relocated.
Therefore, the proposed project would not generate a substantial increase in automobile or bus traffic. During construction of the project, there would be a minor increase in local traffic volumes resulting from construction personnel traffic, the delivery and retrieval of materials, and construction equipment. However, construction-related traffic would be short-term (approximately four months) and would not induce a substantial number of trips on local roadways; therefore this impact would be considered less than significant.

b) Any additional traffic generated by the proposed project would be considered minor and would not result in a decrease in the level of service in the project area.

c) The proposed project would not affect air traffic patterns. Issue 15.c is therefore not applicable to the project.

d) The proposed project would not involve changes to the existing circulation system and is consistent with respect to land use with applicable land use policies. Therefore, Issue 15.c is not applicable to the project.

e) The proposed project would not change the existing circulation system; therefore, emergency access routes to and from the project site would not be impacted.

f) The proposed project would result in an increase in parking for both buses and employee vehicles. Thus, the project would not result in any parking capacity impacts.

g) The proposed project would promote the use of alternative modes of transportation by increasing transit service to the metropolitan San Diego area. In addition, the project is consistent with applicable City of Chula Vista land use plans and policies supporting the reduction of traffic congestion through the use of mass transit. Thus, the project would not conflict with any policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation modes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS -- Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

a) The proposed project may minimally increase the amount of wastewater generated by the routine maintenance of additional buses. Any minor increase would more than likely be offset by the elimination of wastewater generated by the existing businesses that would be relocated and/or purchased. If, however, the proposed project did result in a net increase in wastewater, the increase would be minimal and would not exceed wastewater requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board.

b) The proposed project would not require the construction or expansion of water or wastewater treatment facilities; therefore, Issue 16.b is not applicable to the project.

c) Storm drains are located on the east side of the existing bus maintenance facility. The proposed project would result in a minor increase of surface runoff amounts, but would not substantially increase runoff rates because the site is currently approximately 95% impervious. Therefore, it is anticipated that the existing storm drains would adequately serve the proposed project. Prior to construction, an evaluation would be made to determine the adequacy of the existing storm drains. If a determination were made that construction or expansion of storm water drainage facilities is necessary, the construction would not result in significant impacts.

d) The addition of buses to the existing fleet would result in an increased demand in water associated with routine bus maintenance including washing and steaming. This increase would not be substantial and would not require expansion of existing water supply facilities or entitlements. Therefore, this impact would be considered less than significant.
e) The proposed project would not generate substantial amounts of wastewater which would affect the wastewater treatment provider’s ability to service the project. Acquisition of the parcels currently containing the adjacent businesses would eliminate a source of wastewater and would, for the most part, offset the minimal increase of wastewater generated by the proposed project.

f) The proposed project would not substantially change existing land uses. The project would require the relocation of the adjacent small businesses to accommodate bus and employee vehicle parking, which in general, would not generate solid waste. Relocation of these businesses would eliminate existing sources of solid waste generators and would offset any increase in the amount of solid waste generated by the proposed project. Therefore, the project would not result in a substantial increase in solid waste and thus, would not impact regional landfills.

g) The proposed project would comply with all applicable federal, state, and local statutes and regulations governing the disposal of solid waste.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE --</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (&quot;Cumulatively considerable&quot; means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

a) Due to the highly urbanized nature of the project area, the proposed project would have little potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. As discussed earlier, impacts associated with light and glare, air quality, hazardous materials, and noise would potentially occur. Implementation of the mitigation measures identified in Section VI would reduce these potential impacts to below a level of significance.

b) The proposed project could contribute to cumulative impacts associated with light and glare, air quality, and noise. However, none of these potential impacts would be considered significant due to their incremental and/or short-term nature. Implementation of the project-specific mitigation measures would also ensure they would be reduced to below a level significance.

c) The proposed project could potentially impact the human environment resulting from short-term, construction-related air quality and noise impacts. Implementation of the project-specific mitigation measures would reduce potential impacts to below a level significance.

VI. MITIGATION MEASURES

Implementation of these project-specific mitigation measures would reduce potential impacts to below a level of significance.

Light and Glare

All exterior lighting sources shall incorporate the use of 25-foot or less, where possible, light standards and shall be directed downwards or otherwise shielded so as to minimize spillover into the adjacent residential areas.

Air Quality

Prior to commencement of construction activities, MTDB, with the assistance of a qualified consultant, shall adopt and implement a Construction Management Plan to mitigate potential air quality impacts occurring during construction activities. The Construction Management Plan shall require the use of specific techniques during construction to minimize fugitive dust and construction equipment exhaust emissions including, but not limited to, application of water to exposed soils; application of water to and/or provision of effective cover of all materials transported offsite; encouragement of the use of low emission construction equipment; minimization of simultaneous use of construction equipment; and limitation of construction equipment running and idling time.

Hazardous and Hazardous Materials

Prior to commencement of demolition or construction activities, research shall be conducted to determine whether previous studies addressing potential soil contamination at the location of the former USTs have been completed within the last three years. If research concludes that no previous studies have been completed within the last three years, an assessment shall be conducted to determine the extent of soil contamination and potential impacts to groundwater at the location of the former USTs on the property.
currently operated by Mosier Roofing so as to ensure the health and safety of construction workers. Any potential soil or groundwater contamination shall be remediated prior to project construction.

Prior to commencement of demolition or construction activities, research shall be conducted to determine whether previous soil sampling and analysis on the Hot lunch Truck M.F.G. property have been completed within the last three years. If research concludes that no previous testing has been completed within the last three years, surface soil sampling and analysis shall be conducted to assess potential risks to construction workers. Areas of sampling shall include, but are not limited to, subsurface soil beneath the documented surface soil staining and truck wash area at the Hot Lunch M.F.G. facility. Any potential soil contamination shall be remediated prior to project construction.

Prior to commencement of demolition activities, a comprehensive asbestos-containing building materials (ACBM) and lead-based paint sampling program shall be conducted. Existing buildings that are to be demolished shall be thoroughly inspected by a qualified inspector for the presence of ACBM and lead-based paint. Should the inspection reveal ACBM or lead-based paint, appropriate abatement activities shall be implemented and shall comply with all federal and state occupational safety and health requirements.

Prior to commencement of demolition or construction activities, sampling and analysis for polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) shall be conducted at the location where a transformer was identified on the property associated with Hot Lunch Truck M.F.G.

Noise

Prior to demolition and construction activities, noise abatement measures shall be adopted, as appropriate, to minimize short-term construction-related noise impacts. These measures include, but are not limited to, notifying the neighboring residences, school, and businesses of the construction schedule; limiting construction operations to the hours between 7 a.m. and 7 p.m., Monday through Saturday; requiring all construction equipment to be equipped with properly operating and maintained mufflers; and limiting the number and types of construction equipment onsite at any given time.
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The Metropolitan Transit Development Board (MTDB) proposes to modify plans for the implementation of the South Bay Maintenance Facility (SBMF) Expansion Project, as described in the South Bay Maintenance Facility Expansion Project Final Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (Final IS/MND) certified in April 2001. The purpose of this Addendum is to provide environmental clearance by MTDB for the proposed project modifications to the SBMF Expansion Project under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (California Public Resources Code Section 21000 et. seq.). This Addendum describes the proposed project, summarizes existing CEQA documentation, discusses proposed modifications to the SBMF Expansion Project, addresses appropriate CEQA documentation for the proposed project, evaluates project-specific environmental impacts, and makes a determination that an addendum is the appropriate level of CEQA documentation for the proposed project modifications.

Project Description

The proposed project consists of the acquisition of five parcels totaling 5.06 acres and expansion of the existing South Bay Maintenance Facility (SBMF) located in the southwestern portion of the City of Chula Vista (Figure 1). The project site is located at 3650 Main Street in a developed area generally bound by Main Street on the south; the Chula Vista Recreation Center, Otay Elementary School and a catering truck business on the west; residential uses and Conoley Circle to the north; and commercial/industrial uses and Hilltop Drive to the east (Figure 2). The SBMF currently encompasses 4.07 acres and is developed with an approximate aggregate total of 17,000 gross square feet of buildings utilized for administration, bus and automobile parking, bus maintenance and parts storage. The proposed expansion area consists of five parcels totaling 5.06 acres and is developed with commercial/light industrial and office uses, including Air Liquide, Mosier Roofing (aka ALL Roofing), H&T USA Office Building and SavOn Self Storage. In addition, a 32-foot easement is located between Air Liquide and H&T USA office building that extends northerly from Main Street to provide access to the adjoining catering truck business to the northwest, as well as the self-storage buildings. The project site is relatively level at an elevation of approximately 100 feet above mean sea level (ASML). Due to its developed nature and virtually complete coverage with impervious surfaces, no biological resources occur on site. Existing access to the site is provided via curb cuts along Main Street.

Surrounding uses in the project vicinity include commercial, industrial, residential, recreational and institutional uses. Commercial/light industrial uses are located to the east and south; the Chula Vista Recreation Center, Otay Elementary School, an SDG&E electrical substation, a catering truck business and residential uses are located to west; residential uses are located to the north; and Otay Park is located approximately 350 feet to the northwest. In addition, Interstate 805 is located approximately one mile to the east, Interstate 5 is located approximately two miles to the west, State Route 905 is located approximately two miles to the south and Otay River is located approximately 2,000 feet to the south.
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Existing structures on the acquired parcels, including those associated with Mosier Roofing (aka ALL Roofing), and SavOn Storage, would be demolished except for the H&T USA office building, a concrete block building (approximately 8,000 gsf) currently housing Air Liquide welding supplies and gas, and the northernmost self-storage building. The 8,000-gsf building would be retained for use as a training facility and/or parts storage and bus service bays, and the northern row of units of the self-storage building would be used primarily for parts storage. The remainder of the site would be resurfaced with either asphalt or concrete and would be utilized for bus and employee parking. In addition, an easement would be retained to allow access to the catering truck business, Hot Lunch Truck M.F.G., to the northwest. It is anticipated that bus parking capacity would increase from approximately 80 buses to approximately 140-160 buses upon project implementation.

The proposed project also would include landscaping, fencing and lighting improvements. The existing trees and shrubs along the Main Street frontage would be preserved and additional street trees would be planted, if space permits. Proposed fencing would be installed along the Main Street frontage and would consist of block wall or other material architecturally compatible with the existing block wall fencing associated with the SBMF. Additional fencing along the western perimeter between the site and the Chula Vista Recreation Center and the elementary school may be installed. Proposed exterior lighting would be installed along the perimeter of the expanded facility to ensure security and would be shielded and/or directional to minimize spillover into adjacent properties. Additional service bays may be constructed on site, as needed in the next several years, adjacent to or near existing buildings. Demolition and construction of the proposed project would take approximately four months to complete.

Summary of Existing CEQA Documentation

In March 2001, MTDB completed a Draft IS/MND for the SBMF Expansion Project and adopted the Final IS/MND in April 2001 to fulfill the project requirements under CEQA. The Final IS/MND addressed potential environmental effects of the project with regard to the following issues: (1) aesthetics; (2) agriculture resources; (3) air quality; (4) biological resources; (5) cultural resources; (6) geology and soils; (7) hazards and hazardous materials; (8) hydrology and water quality; (9) land use and planning; (10) mineral resources; (11) noise; (12) population and housing; (13) public services; (14) recreation; (15) transportation/traffic; and (16) utilities and service systems.

Potentially significant impacts were identified in the Final IS/MND for the SBMF Expansion Project relating to the following issues: air quality, hazards and hazardous materials and noise. All potentially significant impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels with the implementation of mitigation measures identified in the Final IS/MND.

Proposed Modifications to the SBMF Expansion Project

This addendum addresses proposed modifications to the SBMF Expansion Project. The proposed modifications consist of the reconfiguration of the SBMF expansion area. One parcel within the expansion area identified in the Final IS/MND would be removed, and an additional adjacent parcel would be included in the proposed expansion area.

The expansion area described in the Final IS/MND consists of five parcels encompassing 3.72 acres (Figure 3). These parcels are currently developed with commercial/light industrial and office uses,
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including: (1) the H&T USA office park building (Assessor's Parcel Number [APN] 623-250-24, 0.69 acre) located immediately southwest of the existing SBMF; (2) Air Liquide (APN 623-250-20, 0.55 acre) located immediately west of the existing SBMF; (3) Mosier Roofing and service yard (aka ALL Roofing) (APN 623-250-19, 0.42 acre and 623-250-26, 0.57 acre) located immediately west and north of Air Liquide; and (4) Hot Lunch Truck M.F.G. (APN 623-250-25, 1.49 acres) located northwest of the existing SBMF. MTDB is no longer pursuing acquisition of the parcel occupied by Hot Lunch Truck M.F.G. and thus, this 1.49-acre parcel is no longer included in the proposed expansion area. A 2.83-acre parcel (APN 623-250-23) immediately adjacent to and north of the existing SBMF is proposed to be included in the expansion area (Figure 4). This parcel is currently occupied by SavOn Storage and is developed with several self-storage buildings. The other four parcels would remain part of the proposed expansion area. All other project characteristics, as described above under Project Description, are consistent with those described in the Final IS/MND.

Appropriate CEQA Documentation for the Proposed Project

In accordance with Section 15164(b) of the State CEQA Guidelines, "An addendum to an adopted negative declaration may be prepared if only minor technical changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR or negative declaration have occurred." Specifically, these conditions include: (1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; (2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or (3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the negative declaration was adopted such that, the project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the negative declaration, significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the negative declaration, mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative, or mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the negative declaration would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

In order to determine that an addendum is the appropriate CEQA document for the proposed project, MTDB, as lead agency, must make a finding that changes to the Final IS/MND are necessary, but the proposed project would not result in any new significant adverse effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.

Environmental Analysis

As stated above, potentially significant impacts were identified in the Final IS/MND with respect to air quality, hazards and hazardous materials, and noise. Implementation of the mitigation measures identified in the Final IS/MND would reduce these potentially significant impacts below a level of significance. These mitigation measures, as applicable, would be incorporated into the proposed project. The proposed modifications to the SBMF Expansion Project would not result in any new
Proposed Project Site Boundary
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significant impacts, nor would it substantially increase the severity of previously identified impacts. This determination is based, in part, on the following analysis.

Air Quality

The Final IS/MND concluded that the SBMF Expansion Project would result in potentially significant short-term construction-related air quality impacts. Throughout the duration of the approximate four-month demolition and construction period, fugitive dust and construction equipment exhaust emissions generated during structure removal and construction activities would occur. Although removal of the parcel containing the catering truck business and the addition of the parcel occupied by the self-storage facility would increase the gross area of the site from 7.79 acres to 9.13 acres, the quantity of fugitive dust and construction equipment emissions would not substantially increase. Proposed uses within the expansion area would remain the same, as existing structures within the proposed expansion area would be removed except for the Air Liquide, H&T USA office building and the northernmost self-storage building, and would be resurfaced to accommodate employee vehicle and bus parking. Because the quantity of emissions generated would not substantially increase over those anticipated in the Final IS/MND, the associated impacts and mitigation identified in the Final IS/MND would not change as a result of the proposed modifications. Mitigation identified in the Final IS/MND would require preparation of a Construction Management Plan prior to commencement of demolition and construction activities. The noted plan would require incorporation of specific techniques to minimize emissions, including, but not limited to, application of water to exposed soils; application of water to and/or provision of effective cover of all materials transported off site; encouragement of the use of low emission construction equipment; minimization of simultaneous use of construction equipment; and limitation of construction equipment running and idling times. Implementation of the mitigation measure regarding air quality identified in the Final IS/MND would reduce potentially significant air quality impacts to below a level of significance. Therefore, construction and operation of the proposed project would not result in any new significant air quality impacts, nor would it substantially increase the severity of air quality impacts previously identified in the Final IS/MND.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The Final IS/MND concluded the SBMF Expansion Project would result in potentially significant hazards/hazardous materials impacts associated with soil contamination and the presence of asbestos-containing building materials (ACBM), lead-based paint and polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs). According to the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) completed for the SBMF Expansion Project (Earth Tech 2001), the expansion area (as identified in the Final IS/MND) formerly housed three underground storage tanks (USTs). Two of these tanks, formerly located on the Mosier Roofing (aka ALL Roofing) parcel, stored diesel and gasoline and were removed in 1999. Subsurface soil samples collected from the excavation area of the tanks, however, indicated the presence of diesel and gasoline. Site assessment activities proposed for this portion of the site in an approved workplan (prepared by Donan Environmental Services, Inc. 1999) have not yet been implemented; however, monitoring wells have been completed. The other UST was located on the parcel occupied by the catering truck business. Surface soil staining was observed on this parcel and extensive handling of hazardous substances (waste oil and solvents) has occurred over time. Therefore, the Final IS/MND concluded that the SBMF Expansion Project could result in a potentially significant hazards/hazardous materials impact due to petroleum hydrocarbon soil contamination. Mitigation identified in the Final IS/MND would require MTDB to work with the owners of properties to be acquired to ensure that
potential hazardous materials issues are resolved prior to demolition or construction activities. Although the catering truck parcel is no longer included in the proposed expansion area, the parcel occupied by Mosier Roofing would remain part of the proposed expansion area. Thus, this impact and associated mitigation would not change as a result of the proposed modifications. Implementation of the mitigation measure regarding soil remediation would reduce this potentially significant hazards/hazardous materials impact to below a level of significance.

The Final IS/MND concluded that due to the age of the existing buildings on site, it is likely that ACBM and lead-based paint were used in their construction. Since several existing structures would be removed, potentially significant impact related to release of hazardous materials would occur. Mitigation identified in the Final IS/MND would require completion of a comprehensive ACBM and lead-based paint sampling program prior to demolition activities and implementation of appropriate abatement activities, if applicable. The proposed project would result in a net increase in the number of structures to be removed due to the presence of the self-storage units on the parcel proposed as part of the expansion area. The number of buildings to be removed, however, would not be substantially greater than anticipated in the Final IS/MND and thus, the proposed modifications would not substantially increase the severity of this impact. Therefore, this impact and associated mitigation would not change as a result of the proposed modifications. Implementation of the mitigation measure identified in the Final IS/MND would reduce potentially significant impacts related to ACBM and/or lead-based paint exposure to a level below significance.

The Final IS/MND indicates that an electrical transformer was observed on the catering truck parcel. Electrical transformers could potentially contain PCBs, exposure to which can cause adverse health effects (i.e., cancer, liver damage, immune system suppression). The Final IS/MND concluded that demolition activities associated with the removal of the electrical transformer could result in a potentially significant impact related to the release of PCBs and required mitigation consisting of sampling and analysis for presence of PCBs prior to demolition activities. Because the catering truck parcel is no longer proposed to be included in the proposed expansion area, this impact and associated mitigation is not applicable to the proposed project.

Based on the foregoing analysis, construction and operation of the proposed project would not result in any new significant hazards/hazardous materials impacts, nor would it substantially increase the severity of hazards/hazardous materials impacts previously identified in the Final IS/MND.

Noise

The Final IS/MND concluded that the SBMF Expansion Project would result in potentially significant noise impacts related to short-term construction-related noise. During the approximate four-month demolition and construction period, temporary increases in noise levels would be expected. The mitigation identified in the Final IS/MND would be implemented during the demolition and construction period to minimize construction noise.

The Final IS/MND concluded that noise levels generated by an additional compressor at the compressed natural gas (CNG) fueling station would not result in significant noise impacts. The Final IS/MND required demonstration that noise levels would not substantially increase as a result of the additional compressor. This requirement was satisfied through preparation of the project-specific noise analysis, as described below.
The Final IS/MND concluded that the project would not substantially increase ambient noise levels and thus, noise impacts to the adjacent residences to the north would be less than significant. The proposed modifications would, however, increase the project interface between the project site and the residences adjacent to the northern project boundary. Whereas previously only a limited number of residences (two or three) would be adjacent to the project site, the addition of the parcel occupied by the self-storage facility to the expansion area would place approximately nine to ten residences adjacent to the northern project boundary. Consequently, a project-specific noise analysis was conducted to evaluate potential noise impacts resulting from the revised expansion area (Orion Environmental Associates 2003). This noise analysis is contained in Attachment A. The results and conclusions are summarized herein.

The noise analysis concluded that the proposed modification to the expansion area could potentially impact the adjacent residences to the north through generation of increased noise levels resulting from temporary construction activities, operation of the compressors at the CNG fueling station, and bus operations (i.e., arrivals, departures and idling).

Construction Noise

Short-term construction noise impacts tend to occur in phases dominated initially by large earth moving machinery followed by foundation/parking lot construction and finish construction. Based upon measurements at other major construction areas, a worst-case noise level of 89 dBA at a 50-foot reference distance is typically used in assessing construction noise impacts. Because point sources of noise emissions are attenuated by a factor of six dB per doubling of distance, quieter noise sources will reduce to a 65-dBA noise level at approximately 160 feet from the source, while the loudest noise source could require a distance over 800 feet. The presence of any intervening structural barrier would substantially reduce noise propagation. As stated above, the mitigation identified in the Final IS/MND would be implemented during the demolition and construction period to minimize construction noise. Specific noise abatement measures, as appropriate, would be implemented, including (but not limited to) notifying the neighboring residences, school and businesses of the construction schedule; limiting construction operations to between the hours of 7 a.m. and 7 p.m., Monday through Saturday; requiring all construction equipment to be equipped with properly operating and maintained mufflers; and limiting the number and types of construction equipment on site at any given time. Implementation of these measures would ensure that short-term construction-related noise impacts would be less than significant.

Compressor Operational Noise

The addition of a third and fourth compressor to the existing CNG fueling station would not substantially increase existing noise levels generated by the two existing compressors. The CNG fueling station is located in the southeast portion of the site near Main Street away from any noise sensitive receptors and enclosed in masonry concrete block walls to minimize noise emissions. Noise measurements were taken on December 23, 2002 at various distances from the fueling station during operation of the expanded fueling station, as shown in Table 1 below.
The City of Chula Vista has established noise standards within Chapter 19.68 of the Chula Vista Municipal Code, which identifies compatible exterior noise levels for various land use types. Specifically, the daytime noise standard is 55 dBA $L_{eq}$ at residential uses, 65 dBA $L_{eq}$ at commercial uses and 70 dBA $L_{eq}$ at any light industrial use. As shown in Table 1, compressor noise was not audible at a distance of 300 feet when intervening structures are present. The residences to the north are located approximately 600 feet from the compressors and structures located between them. Although the project proposes to remove several of these intervening structures, the buildings associated with the existing SBMF and the northernmost self-storage building would be retained. Given the distance to the compressors and the presence of intervening structures, compressor operational noise would not be audible at these residences. The nearest commercial use lies across Main Street approximately 100 feet from the fueling station. The data in Table 1 shows that the noise level at a distance of 100 feet is 67 dBA $L_{eq}$ both with and without the compressor running, as compressor noise is masked by prevailing vehicular traffic noise along Main Street. Thus, the addition of the third and fourth compressor would not cause existing noise levels to increase at neighboring commercial uses. Industrial uses are located predominantly east and south of the project site with the nearest approximately 150 feet to the east. As shown in Table 1, the noise level at a distance of 100 feet is 67 dBA $L_{eq}$ which does not exceed the 70-dBA $L_{eq}$ standard. Therefore, compressor operational noise would not exceed applicable noise standards and associated impacts would be less than significant.

### Bus Operations Noise

The modification of the proposed expansion area would place buses in closer proximity to the adjacent residences to the north. In addition, the removal of several self-storage structures would create a more direct line-of-sight between the SBMF and the homes by eliminating noise propagation barriers. As a result, noise generated by bus start-ups and idling during late night and early morning hours could potentially affect residents at these adjacent homes. Bus noise measurements conducted as part of a maintenance facility relocation environmental study used to evaluate potential noise impacts resulting from bus operations. Data were obtained using an older diesel-fueled model without recent major maintenance. The majority of the buses within the SBMF fleet are CNG buses, which are slightly quieter than diesel engines, but diesel noise data were used to represent worst-case conditions.
Measurements were taken at a distance of 25 feet from the rear of the bus simultaneously with measurements 90 degrees off the bus axis in direct view of the exhaust pipe. These measurements are shown below in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Behind (dB)</th>
<th>Side (dB)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start-up ($L_{eq}$)</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slow idle ($L_{eq}$)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The measurements were used to extrapolate the noise level generated from multiple buses idling in the expansion area adjacent to the residences. A 30-minute idling time was assumed to occur under direct line-of-sight conditions with an assumed source-to-receiver distance of 100 feet to the nearest residential property line. Based on these assumptions, the noise level would be 53 dB without noise barriers. Existing ambient noise levels at 6 a.m. are approximately 48 dBA $L_{eq}$. An additional reduction of 5 dB from the calculated 53 dB would be required to reduce bus idling noise levels to existing ambient levels. Interruption of the direct line-of-sight with a barrier, or relocation of bus idling activity to no more than 200 feet from any residential property line would effectively reduce bus idling noise to acceptable standards. Because bus exhaust stacks extend to the roof of the coach, the minimum barrier height to achieve the needed line-of-sight break would be eight feet.

The noise analysis states that potentially significant impacts related to bus operations noise could be avoided through implementation of one of the following: (1) Allow only employee vehicle parking within 200 feet of the northern property line; (2) Retain the northernmost self-storage building as a noise barrier; or (3) Construct an eight-foot-high solid masonry wall along the northern project boundary adjacent to any residence. Alternatively, provision of dual-paned replacement windows on south-facing building facades at the nearest homes to the north also would avoid potentially significant impacts related to bus operations noise. As proposed, the northernmost self-storage building would be retained and thus, the proposed project would not result in potentially significant impacts related to bus idling noise.

Based on the foregoing analysis, construction and operation of the proposed project would not result in any new significant noise impacts, nor would it substantially increase the severity of noise impacts previously identified in the Final IS/MND.

**Determination of Appropriate CEQA Documentation**

The following discussion lists the appropriate subsections of Sections 15162 and 15164 of the State CEQA Guidelines and provides justification for MTDB to make a determination, based on the environmental analysis above, of the appropriate CEQA document for the proposed project.

**Section 15162-Subsequent EIRs and Negative Declarations**

(a) "When an EIR has been certified or a negative declaration adopted for a project, no subsequent EIR shall be prepared for that project unless the lead agency determines, on the basis of substantial evidence in light of the whole record, one of more of the following:"
(1) "Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;"

MTDB proposes to modify the expansion area of the SBMF, as described in the Final IS/MND, by eliminating a 1.49-acre parcel and adding a 2.83-acre parcel. The parcel to be added is immediately adjacent to and north of the existing SBMF and therefore, the existing conditions discussions contained in the Final IS/MND continue to apply and the impacts assessed are substantially similar. No new significant impacts, nor substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts, are identified in comparison to those described in the Final IS/MND.

(2) "Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or"

Circumstantial changes have occurred to the project with respect to the proposed expansion area of the SBMF. MTDB is no longer pursuing acquisition of a 1.49-acre parcel occupied by a catering truck business, but proposes to purchase an adjacent 2.83-acre parcel. Proposed uses within the modified expansion area (employee vehicle and bus parking) would be the same as those evaluated in the Final IS/MND. Thus, changes in the project’s circumstances would not be considered substantial. The proposed project would not result in new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.

(3) "New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the negative declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:

(A) "The project will have one or more significant environmental effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;"

No new significant environmental effects were identified compared to those identified in the adopted Final IS/MND.

(B) "Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;"

Significant project-related effects previously examined would not be substantially more severe as a result of the proposed modifications than were disclosed in the Final IS/MND. All impacts associated with air quality, hazards/hazardous material and noise assessed in the Final IS/MND could be mitigated to less than significant levels through the implementation of proposed mitigation measures identified in the Final IS/MND. Implementation of the proposed project would not substantially increase the severity of these impacts.

(C) "Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or"
No mitigation measures or alternative were previously found to be infeasible in the adopted Final IS/MND.

(D) "Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative."

This situation does not apply to the proposed modifications. No mitigation measures or alternatives considerably different from those analyzed in the Final IS/MND have been identified.

(b) "If changes to a project or its circumstances occur or new information becomes available after adoption of a negative declaration, the lead agency shall prepare a subsequent EIR if required under subsection (a). Otherwise, the lead agency shall determine whether to prepare a subsequent negative declaration, an addendum, or no further documentation."

Subsequent to adoption of the Final IS/MND for the SBMF Expansion Project in April 2001, minor revisions were made to the project regarding the proposed expansion area. This minor modification would not result in any new significant environmental effects, nor would it increase the severity of significant effects previously identified in the Final IS/MND. None of the conditions listed under subsection (a) would occur that would require preparation of a subsequent EIR.

(c) "Once a project has been approved, the lead agency's role in project approval is completed, unless further discretionary approval on that project is required. Information appearing after an approval does not require reopening of that approval. If after the project is approved, any of the conditions described in subsection (a) occurs, a subsequent EIR or negative declaration shall only be prepared by the public agency which grants the next discretionary approval for the project, if any. In this situation no other Responsible Agency shall grant an approval for the project until the subsequent EIR has been certified or subsequent negative declaration adopted."

None of the conditions listed in subsection (a) would occur under the proposed project.

Section 15164-Addendum to an EIR or Negative Declaration

(a) "The lead agency or responsible agency shall prepare an addendum to a previously certified EIR if some changes or additions are necessary, but none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR have occurred."

This section of the State CEQA Guidelines does not apply to the proposed project, as an EIR was not prepared for the SBMF Expansion Project.

(b) "An addendum to an adopted negative declaration may be prepared if only minor technical changes or additions are necessary or none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for the preparation of a subsequent EIR or negative declaration have occurred."
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Minor changes and additions to the adopted Final IS/MND are necessary; however, none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR would occur as a result of the proposed modifications. Therefore, an addendum to the adopted Final IS/MND is the appropriate CEQA document for the proposed project modifications.

(c) "An addendum need not be circulated for public review but can be included in or attached to the final EIR or adopted negative declaration."

The information is noted. This Addendum shall be attached to the Final EIR.

(d) "The decision-making body shall consider the addendum with the final EIR or adopted negative declaration prior to making a decision on the project."

MTDB will consider this Addendum with the Final IS/MND prior to making a decision on the proposed project.

(e) "A brief explanation of the decision not to prepare a subsequent EIR pursuant to Section 15162 should be included in an addendum to an EIR, the lead agency’s required findings on the project, or elsewhere in the record. The explanation must be supported by substantial evidence."

This document provides substantial evidence for MTDB records to support the preparation of this Addendum for the proposed project.

Conclusion

This Addendum has been prepared in accordance with the provisions of the State CEQA Guidelines and documents that none of the conditions or circumstances that would require preparation of a subsequent EIR or negative declaration, pursuant to Sections 15162 and 15164 of the State CEQA Guidelines exists in connection with the proposed project. No major revisions would be required to the Final IS/MND as a result of the proposed modifications. No new significant environmental impacts have been identified; neither was a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified impacts assessed. Therefore, preparation of a subsequent EIR or negative declaration is not required and the appropriate CEQA document for the proposed project is this Addendum to the South Bay Maintenance Facility Expansion Project Final IS/MND. No additional environmental analysis or review is required for the proposed project. This document will be maintained in the administrative record files at MTDB offices.
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NOISE SETTING

Sound is mechanical energy transmitted by pressure waves in a compressible medium such as air. Noise is generally defined as unwanted sound. Sound is characterized by various parameters that describe the rate of oscillation of sound waves, the distance between successive troughs or crests, the speed of propagation, and the pressure level or energy content of a given sound. In particular, the sound pressure level has become the most common descriptor used to characterize the loudness of an ambient sound level. The decibel (dB) scale is used to quantify sound intensity.

Zero decibels is the threshold of sound presumed detectable by a young person with good auditory acuity. Table 1 shows the range of common exterior and interior noise levels. Because hearing sensitivity covers a wide threshold of sound strength, the decibel scale is a logarithmic progression where each 10 dB increase represents a ten-fold change in sound level. Auditory response is not linearly related to pressure. Each 10 dB increase in sound is subjectively perceived by people to be approximately a doubling of loudness.

Since the human ear is not equally sensitive to all sound frequencies within the entire spectrum, human response is factored into sound descriptions by weighting sounds within the range of maximum human auditory sensitivity more heavily in a process called “A-weighting,” written as dB(A). Any additional reference to decibels in this report written as “dB” should be understood to be “dB(A)” unless otherwise noted.

Time variations in noise exposure are typically expressed in terms of a steady-state energy level equal to the energy content of the time varying period (called Leq), or alternately, as a statistical description of the sound level that is exceeded over some stated fraction of a given observation period. Finally, because community receptors are more sensitive to unwanted noise intrusion during the evening and at night, state law requires that, for planning purposes, an artificial dB increment be added to quiet time noise levels in a 24-hour noise metric called the Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL).

An interior CNEL of 45 dB is mandated for multiple family dwellings, and is considered a desirable noise exposure for single family dwelling units as well. Since typical noise attenuation within structures is about 15-20 dB, an exterior noise exposure of 65 dBA CNEL is typically the design exterior noise exposure for new residential dwellings, schools, or other noise-sensitive land uses in California. Because commercial or industrial uses are not occupied on a 24-hour basis, a less stringent noise/land use compatibility criterion is generally specified for these less noise sensitive land uses.

The CNEL metric generally is used as a land-use decision guideline in approving a given type of land use within an existing or predicted future noise environment. It is most often applied to noise exposures from vehicular traffic, trains or other sources whose control is pre-empted by state or federal agencies. A generating source of non-mobile noise sources such as a bus maintenance facility, however, may be regulated by the municipal code in its originating jurisdiction. This regulation is typically called the "Noise Ordinance."
### Table 1

**Typical A-Weighted Sound Levels**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Indoor Noise Levels</th>
<th>Noise Level (dBA)</th>
<th>Common Outdoor Noise Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rock Band</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Jet Flyover @ 1000 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inside Subway Train</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Gas Lawnmower @ 3 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Blender @ 3 ft.</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Diesel Truck @ 50 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garbage Disposal @ 3 ft.</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Noisy Urban Daytime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shouting @ 3 ft.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gas Lawnmower @ 100 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacuum Cleaner @ 10 ft.</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Commercial Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal Speech @ 3 ft.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Heavy Traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Business Office</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quiet Urban Daytime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dishwasher Next Door</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Quiet Urban Daytime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Theater Conference</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Quiet Urban Nighttime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room (Background)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quiet Suburban Nighttime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedroom @ Night</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quiet Rural Nighttime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concert Hall (Background)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcast and Recording</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshold of Hearing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Chula Vista, a noise ordinance was adopted in 1985 as Ordinance No. 2101 adding Section 19.68 to the municipal code entitled "Performance Standards and Noise Control." In "Noise Sensitive Zones," the City standards are very stringent for noise generating sources.

The City of Chula Vista exterior noise limits are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receiving Land Use Category</th>
<th>Noise Level dB(A)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 p.m. - 7 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All residential except MFU</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Family Residential</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Industry</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Industry</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the ambient level already exceeds any of these standards, the allowable level is equal to the ambient.

City standards distinguish between "environmental noise" versus "nuisance noise". Environmental noise results from land use activities normally permitted under the land use code. Nuisance noise is considered to be an unusual presence that is "annoying, obnoxious and unpleasant". The above standards are for one-hour averages (LEQ) if the noise is environmental, but are never to be exceeded (Lmax) if the source is a nuisance source. For purposes of evaluating standards compliance, the proposed facility expansion would be considered environmental since a maintenance facility already exists at the project site. Relocation of uses around the site would not be considered "new" sources considered to be an "unusual presence."

Existing noise levels near the project site derive from a variety of sources. Vehicular traffic on Main Street, occasional helicopter overflights, bus maintenance operations, bus idling, and commercial operations on Main Street (auto body shops, upholstery shops, refuse trucks, etc.). The residential uses on Connoley Circle north of the maintenance facility are the closest noise-sensitive receivers. A noise study was previously conducted along Connoley Circle (1993) to assess before and after noise levels associated with initial South Bay Maintenance Facility startup. The noise levels measured on three evenings and nights ranged from 47-53 dBA Leq. There was minimal difference between pre- and post-facility operational startup.

A short-term daytime noise measurement was made on December 23, 2002, at the same Connoley Circle residence. The mid-morning noise level was as follows (dBA):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Leq} &= 49 \\
\text{L}_{\text{max}} &= 65 \\
\text{L}_{\text{min}} &= 40 \\
\text{L}_{10} &= 51 \\
\text{L}_{50} &= 43 \\
\text{L}_{90} &= 41
\end{align*}
\]
The levels in 2002 were very similar to those recorded 9 years earlier. Because decibels are logarithmically related to the level of source activity, it takes a large change in activity levels to produce even a small change in decibel levels. The fact that the 2002 data was similar to 1993 suggests that changes in the numbers or intensities of any surrounding noise generation have been small over the last decade.
NOISE IMPACTS

Three types of noise impacts are expected to possibly occur from project implementation. These include:

1. Temporary construction activity noise impacts. The primary concern would be for noise-sensitive residences north of the project site.

2. Maintenance and bus warm-up activities during noise-sensitive nocturnal periods.

3. Bus access/egress traffic noise, especially in the late evening or early morning when traffic would occur during noise-sensitive time periods.

Standards of Significance

A project will have a potentially significant noise impact if it substantially increases the noise levels near the site. A "substantial increase" is not defined in any guidelines with any uniformity. For purposes of this CEQA analysis, a substantial increase is defined as:

1. An increase that creates a potential violation of noise standards where standards are currently met.

2. A project increment equal to the baseline conditions if the baseline already exceeds standards.

Construction Noise Impacts

Temporary construction noise impacts from additional site development will vary markedly because the noise strength of construction equipment ranges widely as a function of the equipment used and its activity level. Short-term construction noise impacts tend to occur in discrete phases dominated initially by large earth-moving sources, then by foundation and parking lot construction, and finally for finish construction. The large earth-moving sources are the noisiest with equipment noise typically ranging from 75 to 90 dBA at 50 feet from the source. Figure 1 shows the typical noise emissions associated with specific construction equipment. Based upon measurements at other major construction areas, a worst-case level of 89 dBA at a 50-foot reference distance is typically used in assessing construction activity noise impacts.

Point sources of noise emissions are atmospherically attenuated by a factor of 6 dB per doubling of distance through geometrical spreading. The quieter noise sources will, drop to a 65 dBA noise level by about 160 feet from the source while the loudest could require over 800 feet from the source to reduce the 89 dBA source strength to a 65 dBA level considered as unobtrusive during daytime background conditions at the nearest residences. With any intervening structural barriers, the noise impact "footprint" would be substantially reduced.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>70</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compactors (Rollers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Loaders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backhoes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tractors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scrapers, Graders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trucks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Mixers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Pumps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranes (Moveable)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranes (Derrick)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pumps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compressors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pneumatic Wrenches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackhammers and Rock Drills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pile Drivers (Piles)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vibrator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saws</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Construction noise sources are not strictly relatable to a community noise standard because they occur only during selected times and the source strength varies sharply with time. The penalty associated with noise disturbance during quiet hours and the nuisance factor accompanying such disturbance usually leads to time limits on construction activities imposed as conditions on construction and use permits. Although construction noise is specifically exempt from the noise standards in the Chula Vista municipal noise ordinance, grading/construction permits are generally conditioned by city staff to allow heavy equipment operations only during hours of lesser sensitivity. Weekday hours are typically the allowed times for construction activities if there are occupied dwellings within a reasonable exposure zone surrounding the construction site. Given the distance between any site improvements and any off-site sensitive receivers, construction activities will have a less-than-significant noise impact when conditioned to occur during less noise-sensitive hours.

**Natural Gas Fueling Noise**

An important site noise issue is from compressed natural gas (CNG) generators that are noisy because the gas is compressed to high pressures for bus fueling. A new CNG refueling compressor has been added to the facility. The refueling station is located near Main Street, and includes masonry concrete block walls for noise protection.

Noise measurement of the new station were made on December 23, 2002. Measurement results are summarized in Table 2.

The City of Chula Vista daytime noise standard is 55 dBA Leq at the nearest residential properties, 65 dBA Leq at the commercial uses on the south side of Main Street, and 70 dBA at any light industry zone. Existing noise levels due to the compressor operation are 67 dBA Leq at the nearest commercial uses both with and without the compressor running. Across Main Street, the compressor contribution is masked by prevailing background traffic noise. The compressor noise is inaudible at 300 feet from the source when intervening structures are present. The new compressor station does not cause the City of Chula Vista noise standard to be exceeded. Location of any additional compressor within 300 feet of any residence would require the construction of a suitable barrier that blocks the direct line-of-sight to the closest residences.

**Bus Idling Noise**

Proposed expansion of the maintenance facility would create an area of idling buses during their morning warm-up in closer proximity to existing residences than from current operations. The removal of the self-storage facility will also increase the line-of-sight for existing activities. Although CNG-fueled buses have shorter warm-up times, vehicle starting and idling noise may be audibly sleep-disturbing at the nearest bedroom windows. Spark-ignited CNG engines may be slightly quieter than compression-ignition diesel engines, but the more conservative diesel noise data was used to establish a small margin of safety. However, the noise level difference between spark versus compression ignition engines is relatively small. Off-site receivers would not perceive any major noise difference between either type of engine warm-up except that diesel engines require a much longer warm-up period.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance to Unit (ft)</th>
<th>Intervening Barrier</th>
<th>Leq</th>
<th>L_{Max}</th>
<th>L_{Min}</th>
<th>L_{10}</th>
<th>L_{50}</th>
<th>L_{90}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Block Wall</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>90^a</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Block Wall</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>Structures</td>
<td>72^b</td>
<td>86^a</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Block Wall</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Block Wall</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^a Main Street truck traffic.

^b Technician reports compressor not audible.
Bus noise was monitored at a “bus barn” as part of a maintenance facility relocation environmental study (Culver City Municipal Bus Lines, 1999). The bus monitored was an older diesel-fueled model without recent major maintenance. Measurements were made at a 25-foot distance to the rear of the bus simultaneously with measurements 90 degrees off the bus axis in direct view of the exhaust pipe (to the left when facing forward). These measurements of one event were combined into a theoretical noise generation from multiple buses during warm-up idling.

The single bus start-up/warm-up noise sequence was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Behind (dB)</th>
<th>Side (dB)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start-up ($L_{max}$)</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slow idle ($Leq$)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These measurement data were used to extrapolate the noise level from multiple buses idling in the parking and warm-up area. Because the majority of coaches at SBMF are CNG-fueled, and because CNG engines have shorter warm-up periods, a total of 30 minutes of idling time from all buses combined was assumed to occur under direct line-of-sight conditions with an assumed average source-to-receiver distance of 100 feet to the nearest residential property line. The net idling noise in the absence of noise barriers is 53 dB. Background noise levels at 6 a.m. are around 48 dBA $Leq$. It would require an additional reduction of 5 dB from the calculated 53 dBA $Leq$ noise exposure to reduce bus idling noise levels to background levels.

Interruption of the direct line-of-sight with a barrier, or relocation of the idling activity to no closer than 200 feet from any residential property line, would meet the City of Chula Vista noise ordinance standard. Because bus exhaust stacks are elevated to the roof of the coach, the necessary barrier height is eight (8) feet in order to achieve the needed line-of-sight break.

**MITIGATION**

Noise mitigation can be achieved by either avoiding staging/idling of buses within 200 feet of the northern property line, or by erecting or maintaining a noise propagation barrier. The hierarchy of potential mitigation is as follows:

1. Allow only employee parking within 200 feet of the northern property line.
2. Retain the northernmost self-storage building as a noise propagation barrier.
3. Construct an 8-foot-high solid masonry wall along the northern site property line shared with any residence.

Selection of any of these measures will reduce idling noise impact potential to a less-than-significant level.
These mitigation measures are designed to achieve an acceptable property line exterior noise exposure in adjacent residential yard areas. Few residents would be using their backyards for relaxation at 6:00 a.m. They would, however, possibly be sleeping with partly open bedroom windows and be disturbed by bus start-up and idling. Provision of dual-paned replacement windows to south-facing building facades at the nearest homes north of the site may be a more meaningful mitigation measure. Interior noise standards will not be violated without window replacement such that there is no clear nexus between impact and mitigation. Post-relocation activity noise, however, could be perceived as a sleep-disturbing nuisance for maximally sensitive people, and justify window replacement as an alternative noise mitigation measure.
DOCUMENTATION FOR THE FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION REGARDING THE
NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION FOR
THE SOUTH BAY MAINTENANCE FACILITY EXPANSION PROJECT

Introduction

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) is providing funding for a proposed project that would aid the Metropolitan Transit Development Board (MTDB) in the expansion of the existing South Bay Maintenance Facility (SBMF) in the City of Chula Vista (Figures 1 and 2). Specifically, MTDB would purchase 3.72-5.06 acres of property, which includes five parcels, immediately west and north of the existing SBMF for expansion of its existing 4.07-acre facility.

Under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), a federal agency must complete an Environmental Assessment (EA) or Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for those actions or projects it undertakes that individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the human environment. A categorical exclusion (CE), may be obtained, however, for those actions "which do not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the human environment and which have been found to have no such effect and for which neither an EA or an EIS is required" (40 C.F.R. 1508.4).

Research indicates the proposed project is exempt from the requirements of the completion of a NEPA EA or EIS. Thus, FTA must prepare documentation that demonstrates specific conditions or criteria are satisfied and that no significant environmental impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project. This document has been prepared specifically for FTA and describes MTDB's proposed project and purpose, outlines the applicable law, and explains the justification for the preparation of a NEPA CE.

Project Description

The proposed project consists of the purchase of 3.72 acres of property immediately west of the existing SBMF. The existing facility at 3650 Main Street, within the City of Chula Vista, is owned by MTDB. The existing facility consists of 4.07 acres with approximately 17,000 square feet of buildings used for administration, bus and automobile parking, bus maintenance, and parts storage (Figure 3). MTDB contracts with a bus provider to operate the facility, maintain and service the buses, and to provide drivers to operate the buses on routes in the San Diego metropolitan area. MTDB is proposing to purchase five lots in order to accommodate the expansion of its existing facilities (Figure 4). One existing 8,000 square foot building, currently housing Air Liquide welding supplies and gas, would be retained for use as a training facility and for parts storage. Other buildings on site including Mosier Roofing, Hot Lunch Truck M.F.G., and the H&T USA two-story office building would be demolished and the remainder of the site would be utilized for both bus and employee parking. Parking surfaces (asphalt or concrete) would be constructed for parking. It is anticipated that the existing bus parking facility capacity could increase from 80 buses to approximately 125-130 buses upon completion of the expansion project. The existing SBMF includes a compressed natural gas (CNG) fueling station consisting of two compressors. As part of the proposed expansion, an additional compressor would be added to the fueling station to accommodate the addition of buses to the fleet.
Project Vicinity Map
SOUTH BAY MAINTENANCE FACILITY EXPANSION PROJECT
Figure 2
The proposed project consists of the acquisition of five parcels totaling 5.06 acres and expansion of the existing South Bay Maintenance Facility (SBMF) located in the southwestern portion of the City of Chula Vista. The project site is located at 3650 Main Street in a developed area generally bound by Main Street on the south; the Chula Vista Recreation Center, Otay Elementary School and a catering truck business on the west; residential uses and Connelly Circle to the north; and commercial/industrial uses and Hilltop Drive to the east (Figure 3). The SBMF currently encompasses 4.07 acres and is developed with an approximate aggregate total of 17,000 gross square feet of buildings utilized for administration, bus and automobile parking, bus maintenance and parts storage. The proposed expansion area consists of five parcels totaling 5.06 acres and is developed with commercial/light industrial and office uses, including Air Liquide, Mosier Roofing (aka ALL Roofing), H&T USA Office Building and SavOn Self Storage. In addition, a 32-foot easement is located between Air Liquide and H&T USA office building that extends northerly from Main Street to provide access to the adjoining catering truck business to the northwest, as well as the self-storage buildings. The project site is relatively level at an elevation of approximately 100 feet above mean sea level (ASML). Due to its developed nature and virtually complete coverage with impervious surfaces, no biological resources occur on site. Existing access to the site is provided via curb cuts along Main Street.

Surrounding uses in the project vicinity include commercial, industrial, residential, recreational and institutional uses. Commercial/light industrial uses are located to the east and south; the Chula Vista Recreation Center, Otay Elementary School, an SDG&E electrical substation, a catering truck business and residential uses are located to west; residential uses are located to the north; and Otay Park is located approximately 350 feet to the northwest. In addition, Interstate 805 is located approximately one mile to the east, Interstate 5 is located approximately two miles to the west, State Route 905 is located approximately two miles to the south and Otay River is located approximately 2,000 feet to the south.

Existing structures on the acquired parcels, including those associated with Mosier Roofing and SavOn Storage, would be demolished except for the H&T USA office building, a concrete block building (approximately 8,000 gsf) currently housing Air Liquide welding supplies and gas, and the northernmost self-storage building. The 8,000-gsf building would be retained for use as a training facility and/or parts storage and service bays, and the self-storage building would be used primarily for parts storage. The remainder of the site would be resurfaced with either asphalt or concrete and would be utilized for bus and employee parking. In addition, an easement would be retained to allow access to the catering truck business, Hot Lunch Truck M.F.G. to the northwest. It is anticipated that bus parking capacity would increase from approximately 80 buses to approximately 140-160 buses upon project implementation. Two additional compressors would be added to the existing compressed natural gas fueling station to accommodate the additional buses to the fleet.

The proposed project also would include landscaping, fencing and lighting improvements. The existing trees and shrubs along the Main Street frontage would be preserved and additional street trees would be planted, if space permits. Proposed fencing would be installed along the Main Street frontage and would consist of block wall or other material architecturally compatible with the existing block wall fencing associated with the SBMF. Additional fencing along the western perimeter between the site and the Chula Vista Recreation Center and the elementary school may be installed. Proposed exterior lighting would be installed along the perimeter of the expanded facility to ensure security and would be shielded and/or directional to minimize spillover into adjacent properties. Additional service bays may be constructed on site, as needed in the next several years, adjacent to or
near existing buildings. Demolition and construction of the proposed project would take approximately four months to complete.

Project Purpose

The purpose of the proposed project is to expand and enhance the SBMF both functionally and aesthetically.

Applicable Law

The FTA has promulgated regulations for the implementation of the requirements for obtaining a NEPA CE. Pursuant to 23 C.F.R. 771.117(a), CEs are actions that meet the definition contained in 40 C.F.R. 1508.4, and, based on past experience with similar actions, do not involve significant impacts. A CE is applicable to those actions that do not:

- Induce significant impacts to planned growth or land use;
- Require the relocation of significant numbers of people;
- Have a significant impact on any natural, cultural, recreational, historic, or other resource;
- Involve significant air, noise or water quality impacts;
- Have significant impacts on travel patterns; or
- Otherwise, either individually or cumulatively, have any significant environmental impacts.

Additional actions which meet the criteria listed above may be designated as CEs only after FTA approval. In particular, 23 C.F.R. 771.117(d)(8) states that, "[c]onstruction of new bus storage and maintenance facilities in areas used predominantly for industrial or transportation purposes where such construction is not inconsistent with existing zoning and located on or near a street with adequate capacity to handle anticipated bus and support vehicle traffic," will qualify for a NEPA CE following FTA approval. Thus, the proposed project must meet the criteria listed in subsection (a) and qualify as a CE under subsection (d)(8). Research indicates the proposed project fulfills the criteria listed in both subsections of 23 C.F.R. 771.117.

Justification for a NEPA CE

In order to qualify for a NEPA CE, it must be demonstrated that the proposed project meets the criteria listed above in 23 C.F.R. 771.177(a) and (d)(8). The criteria are discussed below.

23 C.F.R. 771.117(a) Criteria

Induce Significant Impacts to Planned Growth or Land Use

The project is located in a developed, urban area. Primary land uses include commercial, industrial, and residential. The project site is zoned for limited industrial. The existing bus storage and
maintenance facility lies on 4.07 acres. The proposed project area lies immediately west and north of the existing site and consists of Air Liquide; Mosier Roofing (aka ALL Roofing), located on Main Street immediately west of Air Liquide; Hot Lunch Truck M.F.G., located behind the storage yard of Air Liquide, approximately 150 feet northwest of the existing bus storage and maintenance facilities; and H&T USA office building immediately west of and adjacent to the existing SBMF on Main Street; and SavOn Storage, located immediately north of the existing SBMF. MTDB would preserve the 8,000-square foot Air Liquide building and utilize it for training, and-service bays, as well as the northernmost self-storage building for storage purposes. The dilapidated Existing on-site buildings associated with Mosier Roofing, Hot Lunch Truck M.F.G., and H&T USA office building would be demolished and the space would be used for employee vehicle and bus parking.

Additional structures located near the project site, but not included in the project itself, include Sav-On Storage, located immediately north and east of the facility; the City of Chula Vista Recreation Center, located immediately west of Mosier Roofing on Main Street; Otay Elementary School and Otay Park, located on Albany Avenue immediately west of the Hot Lunch Truck M.F.G.; and a San Diego Gas & Electric (SDG&E) electrical substation, located at the corner of Albany Avenue and Main Street, west of the Recreation Center and immediately south of Otay Elementary. Several single-family residences are located atop a small slope immediately north of Hot Lunch Truck M.F.G. and Sav-On Storage. Land uses south of Main Street include open space (currently designated as the future site of a gas station and mini-mart) at the corner of Main Street and Mace Street and several storage/parts/junk yards on Main Street, Reed Street, and Center Street.

The proposed construction would not involve any substantial change in land use. The proposed improvements would not involve a significant increase in transit capacity or routes in the area, but would improve employee vehicle and bus parking as well as pedestrian safety within the facility. The proposed project is not in conflict with any habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan or any applicable land use plan, policy or regulation, including the Chula Vista Community Plan and Southwest Redevelopment Area Plan. Therefore, the proposed activity would be consistent with planned uses for the site, it would not divide or disrupt the community, and it is not in conflict with any applicable land use plans.

Require the Relocation of Significant Numbers of People

The proposed improvements would require the purchase of Air Liquide, H&T USA office building; and SavOn Storage, and the purchase or relocation of both Mosier Roofing (including their associated storage yard) and Hot Lunch Truck M.F.G., both small businesses. MTDB would provide relocation assistance and/or compensation to affected businesses pursuant to the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act. The adjacent residences, school, recreation center, small business offices, and self-storage units company—would not be disturbed. Thus, the proposed project would not require the relocation of significant numbers of people.
Have a Significant Impact on Any Natural, Cultural, Recreational, Historic, or Other Resource

Visual Quality

The site currently includes a variety of commercial and industrial land uses. A site visit revealed no scenic resources. The improvements would not involve any new structures that would obstruct views. In fact, the proposed improvements would have a positive impact on the visual quality of this area. Three—Several dilapidated buildings, including Mosier Roofing (aka ALL Roofing) and portions of SavOn Storage, Hot Lunch Truck M.F.G., and H&T USA office building—would be demolished. Mosier Roofing (aka ALL Roofing) is clearly visible from Main Street and the City of Chula Vista Recreation Center while Hot Lunch Truck M.F.G. is clearly visible from Otay Elementary, Otay Park, and several of the residences located to the immediate north. H&T USA office building is visible from Main Street as well. Once demolished, these areas would be paved and used for employee vehicle and bus parking.

Fencing/walls along the frontage of the proposed project on Main Street would be constructed to be architecturally compatible with the block wall located in front of the existing SBMF. It is also anticipated that the fencing/wall on the west perimeter between the project site and the adjacent recreation center and elementary school would be replaced to further reduce visual impacts and to ensure a more secure environment around the facility. It is also likely that the fencing/wall would continue around the north side of the expanded property to improve visual quality for the nearby residences.

The existing landscaping that fronts Main Street, including trees and shrubs, would be retained, and some additional trees may be planted, space permitting. Landscaping is also proposed at the north end of the project site near the adjacent residences. Additional project landscaping may be necessary provided, but is dependent, in part, on the location of the property line. Furthermore, the proposed project would be subject to a design review process by MTDD to assure conformance with plans, policies, goals, and surrounding character to ensure the proposed project would not have a negative impact on visual quality.

Additional exterior lighting may need to be installed around the perimeter of the expanded facility for improved safety. All additional lighting would be directional and/or shielded to minimize spillover into adjacent properties designed to ensure that potential impacts would be below a level of significance.

Recreational Resources

The proposed activity would not change existing recreational land uses. Expansion of the bus storage and maintenance facility would not have an adverse effect on the park or elementary school playground because parking would be the only predominant activity within the newly acquired area. The new bus facilities would improve an area in need of redevelopment by removing deteriorated buildings and providing hardscape/landscape. This would ensure the entire area would be civic in nature (by adding a City-maintained bus facility adjacent to a City recreation center, City elementary school, and City park).
Historic, Cultural, Archaeological and Paleontological Resources

No historic buildings exist on site. The project site is in a highly urbanized, developed area. The land has been previously graded and disturbed, foundations for structures have been laid, and the entire site has been paved. No significant grading is planned for this project. Three—Approximately five buildings would be demolished and removed off site. Old asphalt may have to be removed and replaced with new asphalt or concrete. Thus, given the disturbed nature of the project site, the developed area in which it is located, and the lack of any significant grading, it is unlikely any cultural or archaeological resources would be discovered or any previously undisturbed soils would be disturbed.

The project site is underlain by the Bay Point Formation and unnamed nearshore marine sandstone undifferentiated, which has a medium to high paleontological resource potential. However, as previously discussed, it is unlikely that grading would impact previously undisturbed portions of the formation.

Involve Significant Air, Noise or Water Quality Impacts

Air Quality

The proposed activity consists of the expansion of the existing SBMF. The expanded facility would serve the same purpose as the existing facility: bus maintenance, parking and storage. It is anticipated the expanded facilities would accommodate 20—approximately 50 new buses, to the facility by the end of 2002. Depending on the outcome of future bidding of bus contracts, an additional 27 buses could be transferred to SBMF by July 2002. The proposed project, however, would not generate substantial air pollutant concentrations. An overwhelming majority of the buses that occupy the facility use natural gas, as opposed to diesel fuel, and thus would not emit significant amounts of carbon monoxide or other pollutants into the air. Employee vehicles would emit exhaust; however, it is not anticipated that significant increases in exhaust emissions over current emissions would occur as a result of the expansion. Currently, fuel-burning vehicles, including employee and customer vehicles and delivery trucks, associated with Hot Lunch Truck M.F.G. and Mosier Roofing, Air Liquide, H&T USA office building and Sav-On Storage, occupy the site. The relocation of Hot Lunch Truck M.F.G. would eliminate a source of exhaust emissions from the site and would also eliminate the odors associated with its food preparation business. These sources of exhaust emissions would be eliminated upon project implementation.

The improvements would not generate significantly more automobile or bus traffic. The addition of new buses to the fleet would not significantly increase traffic associated with the expanded facilities. Furthermore, a main purpose of the buses is to reduce the amount of vehicles currently on the road and to increase shared ridership in the region. Therefore, the expansion would not result in a long-term regional net increase of criteria pollutants. The project would, however, produce minor fugitive dust emissions from demolition/construction and exhaust from construction vehicles that would contribute to the short-term non-attainment status of the San Diego Air Basin (SDAB). Mitigation measures, however, would be adopted to reduce short-term construction impacts to below significant levels by preparing and implementing a Construction Management Plan prior to construction. Measures such as moistening exposed soils to reduce dust emissions, limiting the amount of heavy
construction equipment onsite at any given time, and reducing the idling time of construction equipment would be implemented to reduce short-term impacts associated with construction activities.

Noise

Noise associated with local industry and business exists in the area. Food distribution trucks and employee vehicles associated with Hot Lunch Truck M.F.G., vehicles and moving vans associated with Sav-On Storage, and MTDB buses and employee vehicles associated with the existing SBMF all currently contribute to noise in the area. The expanded SBMF would have limited nighttime operations and would not impact the residences beyond those impacts associated with the existing SBMF operation. Daytime operations would also not result in any additional impacts not already associated with the site. Most of the buses are offsite for the majority of the day and do not have a significant noise impact on the local elementary school and park. Thus, there would be no significant long-term change to the noise levels at the school or park. Demolition and construction would result in short-term elevations in ambient noise levels. In order to reduce these short-term impacts to below significant levels, the neighboring residences, school, and businesses would be given notice of the construction schedule, and construction activities would be required to comply with local standards regarding construction timing (i.e., construction during the daytime only from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m., Monday through Saturday). Other mitigation measures, such as limiting the number and kinds of construction equipment at the site at any given time, would also be implemented.

A project-specific noise analysis was conducted to evaluate potential noise impacts resulting from the proposed project (Orion Environmental Associates 2003). This noise analysis is contained in Attachment A. The results and conclusions are summarized herein.

The noise analysis concluded that the proposed project could potentially impact the adjacent residences to the north through generation of increased noise during temporary construction activities, operation of the compressors at the CNG fueling station, and bus operations (i.e., arrivals, departures and idling).

Construction Noise

Short-term construction noise impacts tend to occur in phases dominated initially by large earth moving machinery followed by foundation/parking lot construction and finish construction. Based upon measurements at other major construction areas, a worst-case noise level of 89 dBA at a 50-foot reference distance is typically used in assessing construction noise impacts. Because point sources of noise emissions are attenuated by a factor of six dB per doubling of distance, quieter noise sources will reduce to a 65-dBA noise level at approximately 160 feet from the source, while the loudest noise source could require a distance over 800 feet. The presence of any intervening structural barrier would substantially reduce noise propagation. Noise abatement measures would be implemented during the demolition and construction period to minimize construction noise, including (but not limited to) notifying the neighboring residences, school and businesses of the construction schedule; limiting construction operations to between the hours of 7 a.m. and 7 p.m., Monday through Saturday; requiring all construction equipment to be equipped with properly operating and maintained mufflers; and limiting the number and types of construction equipment on site at any given time. Implementation of these measures would ensure that short-term construction-related noise impacts would be less than significant.
Compressor Operational Noise

The addition of a third and fourth compressor to the existing CNG fueling station would not substantially increase existing noise levels generated by the two existing compressors. The CNG fueling station is located in the southeast portion of the site near Main Street away from any noise sensitive receptors and enclosed in masonry concrete block walls to minimize noise emissions. Noise measurements were taken on December 23, 2002 at various distances from the fueling station during operation of the expanded fueling station, as shown in Table 1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance to Unit (feet)</th>
<th>Intervening Barrier</th>
<th>L_{eq}</th>
<th>L_{Max}</th>
<th>L_{Min}</th>
<th>L_{10}</th>
<th>L_{50}</th>
<th>L_{90}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Block Wall</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Block Wall</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>Structures</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Block Wall</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Block Wall</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Main Street truck traffic.

"Technician reports compressor not audible.

The City of Chula Vista has established noise standards within Chapter 19.68 of the Chula Vista Municipal Code, which identifies compatible exterior noise levels for various land use types. Specifically, the daytime noise standard is 55 dBA L_{eq} at residential uses, 65 dBA L_{eq} at commercial uses and 70 dBA L_{eq} at any light industrial use. As shown in Table 1, compressor noise was not audible at a distance of 300 feet when intervening structures are present. The residences to the north are located approximately 600 feet from the compressors and structures located between them. Although the project proposes to remove several of these intervening structures, the buildings associated with the existing SBMF and the northernmost self-storage building would be retained. Given the distance to the compressors and the presence of intervening structures, compressor operational noise would not be audible at these residences. The nearest commercial use lies across Main Street approximately 100 feet from the fueling station. The data in Table 1 shows that the noise level at a distance of 100 feet is 67 dBA L_{eq}, both with and without the compressor running, as compressor noise is masked by prevailing vehicular traffic noise along Main Street. Thus, the addition of the third and fourth compressor would not cause existing noise levels to increase at neighboring commercial uses. Industrial uses are located predominantly east and south of the project site with the nearest approximately 150 feet to the east. As shown in Table 1, the noise level at a distance of 100 feet is 67 dBA L_{eq}, which does not exceed the 70-dBA L_{eq} standard. Therefore, compressor operational noise would not exceed applicable noise standards and associated impacts would be less than significant.
Bus Operations Noise

The modification of the proposed expansion area would place buses in closer proximity to the adjacent residences to the north. In addition, the removal of several self-storage structures would create a more direct line-of-sight between the SBMF and the homes by eliminating noise propagation barriers. As a result, noise generated by bus start-ups and idling during late night and early morning hours could potentially affect residents at these adjacent homes. Bus noise measurements conducted as part of a maintenance facility relocation environmental study were used to evaluate potential noise impacts resulting from bus operations. Data were obtained using an older diesel-fueled model without recent major maintenance. The majority of the buses within the SBMF fleet are CNG buses, which are slightly quieter than diesel engines, but diesel noise data were used to represent worst-case conditions. Measurements were taken at a distance of 25 feet from the rear of the bus simultaneously with measurements 90 degrees off the bus axis in direct view of the exhaust pipe. These measurements are shown below in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Behind (dB)</th>
<th>Side (dB)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start-up (L_{eq})</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slow idle (L_{eq})</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The measurements were used to extrapolate the noise level generated from multiple buses idling in the expansion area adjacent to the residences. A 30-minute idling time was assumed to occur under direct line-of-sight conditions with an assumed source-to-receiver distance of 100 feet to the nearest residential property line. Based on these assumptions, the noise level would be 53 dB without noise barriers. Existing ambient noise levels at 6 a.m. are approximately 48 dBA L_{eq}. An additional reduction of 5 dB from the calculated 53 dB would be required to reduce bus idling noise levels to existing ambient levels. Interruption of the direct line-of-sight with a barrier, or relocation of bus idling activity to no more than 200 feet from any residential property line would effectively reduce bus idling noise to acceptable standards. Because bus exhaust stacks extend to the roof of the coach, the minimum barrier height to achieve the needed line-of-sight break would be eight feet.

The noise analysis states that potentially significant impacts related to bus operations noise could be avoided through implementation of one of the following: (1) Allow only employee vehicle parking within 200 feet of the northern property line; (2) Retain the northernmost self-storage building as a noise barrier; or (3) Construct an eight-foot-high solid masonry wall along the northern project boundary adjacent to any residence. Alternatively, provision of dual-paned replacement windows on south-facing building facades at the nearest homes to the north also would avoid potentially significant impacts related to bus operations noise. As proposed, the northernmost self-storage building would be retained and thus, the proposed project would not result in potentially significant impacts related to bus idling noise.
Water Quality

Two sets of water clarifiers are found at the existing site and they drain into the sanitary sewer system. The first set of clarifiers is located on the northern half of the existing SBMF property and is used for the bus wash area. The second set is located on the south end of the property and is used to handle waste from the steam clean area and the service/fueling area. These clarifiers filter contaminated water before it is emptied into the sanitary sewer system. Existing storm drains on site would be evaluated before construction begins; however, it is not anticipated that major work would need to be done. Additional runoff is expected from the project site, but it would not be significant. The proposed project would not alter land uses and it is not likely the project would modify the character of the drainage basin, the quality of stormwater, or urban runoff. The site is relatively flat and it is anticipated that drainage patterns would remain the same, even after implementation of the proposed project. Since the project site is currently covered by impervious surfaces, there would not be a substantial increase in runoff quantity or a decrease in infiltration of surface water into the water table. Furthermore, the proposed project site is not located within a 500-year floodplain and the risk associated with seiches or tsunamis within the project area is extremely low.

Have Significant Impacts on Travel Patterns

The proposed project would not have a significant impact on travel patterns. The project consists of expanding existing bus storage and maintenance facilities on property located immediately adjacent to the site. Project implementation would result in an increase in buses and employee vehicles traveling to and from the site. This increase, however, would not result in a substantial increase in traffic due to the nature of bus operations, as most bus and bus driver arrivals and departures occur outside of the peak travel periods. The increase in employees vehicle vehicles would be somewhat offset by the elimination of employee and customer vehicles, and delivery trucks associated with the existing small businesses to be relocated and/or purchased. Furthermore, a main purpose of the buses is to reduce the amount of vehicles currently on the road and to increase shared ridership in the region.

Otherwise, Either Individually or Cumulatively, Have Any Significant Environmental Impacts

Environmental Justice

The Executive Order on Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations, dated February 11, 1994, requires Federal agencies to analyze the environmental effects of Federal actions, including effects on minority communities, when such analysis is required by NEPA. Mitigation measures outlined or analyzed in an environmental document, whenever feasible, should address significant and adverse environmental effects of proposed Federal actions on minority communities and low-income communities.

The proposed project is located in a developed, industrial area and would not involve displacement of residences. Within the project vicinity, there is a higher concentration of minority populations compared to the overall population of the San Diego region. The project area has a 48 percent minority population, while the greater San Diego region has a 33 percent minority population (2000 Census). The percentage of the population at or below the poverty level is 11 percent both in the project area and the San Diego region (1990 Census). Where mitigation is required for potentially
significant impacts, it would not disproportionately affect minority and/or low income populations. In fact, the proposed project would benefit the community by providing additional transportation facilities.

**Hazardous Materials**

According to the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) completed for the SBMF Expansion Project (Earth Tech 2001), the expansion area formerly housed two underground storage tanks (USTs). These tanks, formerly located on the Mosier Roofing parcel, stored diesel and gasoline and were removed in 1999. Subsurface soil samples collected from the excavation area of the tanks, however, indicated the presence of diesel and gasoline. Site assessment activities proposed for this portion of the site in an approved workplan (prepared by Donan Environmental Services, Inc. 1999) have not yet been implemented; however, monitoring wells have been completed. Mitigation measures would be implemented that would require MTDB to work with the owners of properties to be acquired to ensure that potential hazardous materials issues are resolved prior to demolition or construction activities. Implementation of the mitigation measure regarding soil remediation would reduce this potentially significant hazards/hazardous materials impact to below a level of significance.

Due to the age of the existing buildings on site, it is likely that ACBM and lead-based paint were used in their construction. Since several existing structures would be removed, potentially significant impact related to release of hazardous materials would occur. Mitigation would be implemented by MTDB that would require completion of a comprehensive ACBM and lead-based paint sampling program prior to demolition activities and implementation of appropriate abatement activities, if applicable. Implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce potentially significant impacts related to ACBM and/or lead-based paint exposure to a level below significance.

The proposed project would not, either individually or cumulatively, have any significant environmental impacts. Thus, given the above findings, the proposed project meets the requirements of 23 C.F.R. 771.177(a).

Thus, given the above findings, the proposed project meets the requirements of 23 C.F.R. 771.177(a):

23 C.F.R. 771.117(d)(8) Criteria

The proposed project also meets the requirements of 23 C.F.R. 771.117(d)(8) which states, "[c]onstruction of new bus storage and maintenance facilities in areas used predominantly for industrial or transportation purposes where such construction is not inconsistent with existing zoning and located on or near a street with adequate capacity to handle anticipated bus and support vehicle traffic," qualify for a NEPA CE following FTA approval.

The proposed project would include the construction of a new bus storage and maintenance facility in order to expand and enhance the existing SBMF. The project site is located in an area predominantly used for light industrial (Hot Lunch Manufacturing) and transportation purposes (the existing SBMF). The proposed project is consistent with the Chula Vista Community Plan, Southwest Redevelopment Area Plan, and with local zoning regulations. Main Street, a four-lane major arterial with a center turn-lane, runs along the front of the project site and is easily accessible via several connecting arterials, including Albany Avenue. The streets surrounding the site currently have the capacity to
handle the buses and support vehicle traffic associated with the existing bus storage and maintenance facilities and other local businesses and would continue to have the capacity to handle such traffic after expansion.

Thus, the proposed project meets the requirements of 23 C.F.R. 771.117(d)(8).

Conclusion

The proposed project meets the requirements of 23 C.F.R. 771.177(a). It has been determined that the proposed project would not, either individually or cumulatively, have a significant effect on the human environment. The proposed project would not require the relocation of significant numbers of people nor would it induce or result in significant impacts to planned growth or land use. It would not have significant impacts on any natural, cultural, recreational or historic resources nor would it significantly impact air, noise and water quality or travel patterns. In addition, the proposed project also meets the requirements of 23 C.F.R. 771.117(d)(8). The project involves the construction of new bus storage and construction facilities in an area predominantly used for industrial and transportation uses. Furthermore, the proposed project site is surrounded by streets capable of handling the vehicle traffic associated with the facility. Thus, upon approval from the FTA, the proposed project is categorically exempt under NEPA and will not require the preparation of an EA or EIS.
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NOISE SETTING

Sound is mechanical energy transmitted by pressure waves in a compressible medium such as air. Noise is generally defined as unwanted sound. Sound is characterized by various parameters that describe the rate of oscillation of sound waves, the distance between successive troughs or crests, the speed of propagation, and the pressure level or energy content of a given sound. In particular, the sound pressure level has become the most common descriptor used to characterize the loudness of an ambient sound level. The decibel (dB) scale is used to quantify sound intensity.

Zero decibels is the threshold of sound presumed detectable by a young person with good auditory acuity. Table 1 shows the range of common exterior and interior noise levels. Because hearing sensitivity covers a wide threshold of sound strength, the decibel scale is a logarithmic progression where each 10 dB increase represents a ten-fold change in sound level. Auditory response is not linearly related to pressure. Each 10 dB increase in sound is subjectively perceived by people to be approximately a doubling of loudness.

Since the human ear is not equally sensitive to all sound frequencies within the entire spectrum, human response is factored into sound descriptions by weighting sounds within the range of maximum human auditory sensitivity more heavily in a process called “A-weighting,” written as dB(A). Any additional reference to decibels in this report written as “dB” should be understood to be “dB(A)” unless otherwise noted.

Time variations in noise exposure are typically expressed in terms of a steady-state energy level equal to the energy content of the time varying period (called Leq), or alternately, as a statistical description of the sound level that is exceeded over some stated fraction of a given observation period. Finally, because community receptors are more sensitive to unwanted noise intrusion during the evening and at night, state law requires that, for planning purposes, an artificial dB increment be added to quiet time noise levels in a 24-hour noise metric called the Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL).

An interior CNEL of 45 dB is mandated for multiple family dwellings, and is considered a desirable noise exposure for single family dwelling units as well. Since typical noise attenuation within structures is about 15-20 dB, an exterior noise exposure of 65 dBA CNEL is typically the design exterior noise exposure for new residential dwellings, schools, or other noise-sensitive land uses in California. Because commercial or industrial uses are not occupied on a 24-hour basis, a less stringent noise/land use compatibility criterion is generally specified for these less noise sensitive land uses.

The CNEL metric generally is used as a land-use decision guideline in approving a given type of land use within an existing or predicted future noise environment. It is most often applied to noise exposures from vehicular traffic, trains or other sources whose control is pre-empted by state or federal agencies. A generating source of non-mobile noise sources such as a bus maintenance facility, however, may be regulated by the municipal code in its originating jurisdiction. This regulation is typically called the "Noise Ordinance."
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Indoor Noise Levels</th>
<th>Noise Level (dBA)</th>
<th>Common Outdoor Noise Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rock Band</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Jet Flyover @ 1000 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inside Subway Train</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Gas Lawnmower @ 3 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Blender @ 3 ft.</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Diesel Truck @ 50 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garbage Disposal @ 3 ft.</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Noisy Urban Daytime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shouting @ 3 ft.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gas Lawnmower @ 100 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacuum Cleaner @ 10 ft.</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Commercial Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal Speech @ 3 ft.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Heavy Traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Business Office</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quiet Urban Daytime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dishwasher Next Door</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Quiet Urban Nighttime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Theater Conference Room (Background)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Quiet Suburban Nighttime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Quiet Rural Nighttime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedroom @ Night</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concert Hall (Background)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcast and Recording Studio</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshold of Hearing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Chula Vista, a noise ordinance was adopted in 1985 as Ordinance No. 2101 adding Section 19.68 to the municipal code entitled "Performance Standards and Noise Control." In "Noise Sensitive Zones," the City standards are very stringent for noise generating sources.

The City of Chula Vista exterior noise limits are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receiving Land Use Category</th>
<th>Noise Level dBA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 p.m. - 7 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All residential except MFU</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Family Residential</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Industry</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Industry</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the ambient level already exceeds any of these standards, the allowable level is equal to the ambient.

City standards distinguish between "environmental noise" versus "nuisance noise". Environmental noise results from land use activities normally permitted under the land use code. Nuisance noise is considered to be an unusual presence that is "annoying, obnoxious and unpleasant". The above standards are for one-hour averages (LEQ) if the noise is environmental, but are never to be exceeded (Lmax) if the source is a nuisance source. For purposes of evaluating standards compliance, the proposed facility expansion would be considered environmental since a maintenance facility already exists at the project site. Relocation of uses around the site would not be considered “new” sources considered to be an “unusual presence.”

Existing noise levels near the project site derive from a variety of sources. Vehicular traffic on Main Street, occasional helicopter overflights, bus maintenance operations, bus idling, and commercial operations on Main Street (auto body shops, upholstery shops, refuse trucks, etc.). The residential uses on Connoley Circle north of the maintenance facility are the closest noise-sensitive receivers. A noise study was previously conducted along Connoley Circle (1993) to assess before and after noise levels associated with initial South Bay Maintenance Facility startup. The noise levels measured on three evenings and nights ranged from 47-53 dBA Leq. There was minimal difference between pre- and post-facility operational startup.

A short-term daytime noise measurement was made on December 23, 2002, at the same Connoley Circle residence. The mid-morning noise level was as follows (dBA):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Leq} &= 49 \\
L_{\text{max}} &= 65 \\
L_{\text{min}} &= 40 \\
L_{10} &= 51 \\
L_{50} &= 43 \\
L_{90} &= 41
\end{align*}
\]
The levels in 2002 were very similar to those recorded 9 years earlier. Because decibels are logarithmically related to the level of source activity, it takes a large change in activity levels to produce even a small change in decibel levels. The fact that the 2002 data was similar to 1993 suggests that changes in the numbers or intensities of any surrounding noise generation have been small over the last decade.
NOISE IMPACTS

Three types of noise impacts are expected to possibly occur from project implementation. These include:

1. Temporary construction activity noise impacts. The primary concern would be for noise-sensitive residences north of the project site.

2. Maintenance and bus warm-up activities during noise-sensitive nocturnal periods.

3. Bus access/egress traffic noise, especially in the late evening or early morning when traffic would occur during noise-sensitive time periods.

Standards of Significance

A project will have a potentially significant noise impact if it substantially increases the noise levels near the site. A "substantial increase" is not defined in any guidelines with any uniformity. For purposes of this CEQA analysis, a substantial increase is defined as:

1. An increase that creates a potential violation of noise standards where standards are currently met.

2. A project increment equal to the baseline conditions if the baseline already exceeds standards.

Construction Noise Impacts

Temporary construction noise impacts from additional site development will vary markedly because the noise strength of construction equipment ranges widely as a function of the equipment used and its activity level. Short-term construction noise impacts tend to occur in discrete phases dominated initially by large earth-moving sources, then by foundation and parking lot construction, and finally for finish construction. The large earth-moving sources are the noisiest with equipment noise typically ranging from 75 to 90 dBA at 50 feet from the source. Figure 1 shows the typical noise emissions associated with specific construction equipment. Based upon measurements at other major construction areas, a worst-case level of 89 dBA at a 50-foot reference distance is typically used in assessing construction activity noise impacts.

Point sources of noise emissions are atmospherically attenuated by a factor of 6 dB per doubling of distance through geometrical spreading. The quieter noise sources will, drop to a 65 dBA noise level by about 160 feet from the source while the loudest could require over 800 feet from the source to reduce the 89 dBA source strength to a 65 dBA level considered as unobtrusive during daytime background conditions at the nearest residences. With any intervening structural barriers, the noise impact "footprint" would be substantially reduced.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>70</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equipment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compactors (Rollers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Loaders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backhoes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tractors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scrapers, Graders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trucks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Mixers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Pumps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranes (Movable)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranes (Derrick)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pumps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compressors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact Equipment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pneumatic Wrenches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackhammers and Rock Drills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pile Drivers (Pneaks)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vibrator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saws</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Construction noise sources are not strictly relatable to a community noise standard because they occur only during selected times and the source strength varies sharply with time. The penalty associated with noise disturbance during quiet hours and the nuisance factor accompanying such disturbance usually leads to time limits on construction activities imposed as conditions on construction and use permits. Although construction noise is specifically exempt from the noise standards in the Chula Vista municipal noise ordinance, grading/construction permits are generally conditioned by city staff to allow heavy equipment operations only during hours of lesser sensitivity. Weekday hours are typically the allowed times for construction activities if there are occupied dwellings within a reasonable exposure zone surrounding the construction site. Given the distance between any site improvements and any off-site sensitive receivers, construction activities will have a less-than-significant noise impact when conditioned to occur during less noise-sensitive hours.

Natural Gas Fueling Noise

An important site noise issue is from compressed natural gas (CNG) generators that are noisy because the gas is compressed to high pressures for bus fueling. A new CNG refueling compressor has been added to the facility. The refueling station is located near Main Street, and includes masonry concrete block walls for noise protection.

Noise measurement of the new station were made on December 23, 2002. Measurement results are summarized in Table 2.

The City of Chula Vista daytime noise standard is 55 dBA Leq at the nearest residential properties, 65 dBA Leq at the commercial uses on the south side of Main Street, and 70 dBA at any light industry zone. Existing noise levels due to the compressor operation are 67 dBA Leq at the nearest commercial uses both with and without the compressor running. Across Main Street, the compressor contribution is masked by prevailing background traffic noise. The compressor noise is inaudible at 300 feet from the source when intervening structures are present. The new compressor station does not cause the City of Chula Vista noise standard to be exceeded. Location of any additional compressor within 300 feet of any residence would require the construction of a suitable barrier that blocks the direct line-of-sight to the closest residences.

Bus Idling Noise

Proposed expansion of the maintenance facility would create an area of idling buses during their morning warm-up in closer proximity to existing residences than from current operations. The removal of the self-storage facility will also increase the line-of-sight for existing activities. Although CNG-fueled buses have shorter warm-up times, vehicle starting and idling noise may be audibly sleep-disturbing at the nearest bedroom windows. Spark-ignited CNG engines may be slightly quieter than compression-ignition diesel engines, but the more conservative diesel noise data was used to establish a small margin of safety. However, the noise level difference between spark versus compression ignition engines is relatively small. Off-site receivers would not perceive any major noise difference between either type of engine warm-up except that diesel engines require a much longer warm-up period.
Table 2

CNG Compressor Noise Monitoring
(December 23, 2002)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance to Unit (ft)</th>
<th>Intervening Barrier</th>
<th>L_{eq}</th>
<th>L_{Max}</th>
<th>L_{Min}</th>
<th>L_{10}</th>
<th>L_{50}</th>
<th>L_{90}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Block Wall</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>90\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Block Wall</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>Structures</td>
<td>72\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>86\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Block Wall</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Block Wall No Compressor</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a}Main Street truck traffic.
\textsuperscript{b}Technician reports compressor not audible.
Bus noise was monitored at a “bus barn” as part of a maintenance facility relocation environmental study (Culver City Municipal Bus Lines, 1999). The bus monitored was an older diesel-fueled model without recent major maintenance. Measurements were made at a 25-foot distance to the rear of the bus simultaneously with measurements 90 degrees off the bus axis in direct view of the exhaust pipe (to the left when facing forward). These measurements of one event were combined into a theoretical noise generation from multiple buses during warm-up idling.

The single bus start-up/warm-up noise sequence was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Behind (dB)</th>
<th>Side (dB)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start-up (L_max)</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slow idle (Leq)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These measurement data were used to extrapolate the noise level from multiple buses idling in the parking and warm-up area. Because the majority of coaches at SBMF are CNG-fueled, and because CNG engines have shorter warm-up periods, a total of 30 minutes of idling time from all buses combined was assumed to occur under direct line-of-sight conditions with an assumed average source-to-receiver distance of 100 feet to the nearest residential property line. The net idling noise in the absence of noise barriers is 53 dB. Background noise levels at 6 a.m. are around 48 dBA Leq. It would require an additional reduction of 5 dB from the calculated 53 dBA Leq noise exposure to reduce bus idling noise levels to background levels.

Interruption of the direct line-of-sight with a barrier, or relocation of the idling activity to no closer than 200 feet from any residential property line, would meet the City of Chula Vista noise ordinance standard. Because bus exhaust stacks are elevated to the roof of the coach, the necessary barrier height is eight (8) feet in order to achieve the needed line-of-sight break.

MITIGATION

Noise mitigation can be achieved by either avoiding staging/idling of buses within 200 feet of the northern property line, or by erecting or maintaining a noise propagation barrier. The hierarchy of potential mitigation is as follows:

1. Allow only employee parking within 200 feet of the northern property line.

2. Retain the northernmost self-storage building as a noise propagation barrier.

3. Construct an 8-foot-high solid masonry wall along the northern site property line shared with any residence.

Selection of any of these measures will reduce idling noise impact potential to a less-than-significant level.
These mitigation measures are designed to achieve an acceptable property line exterior noise exposure in adjacent residential yard areas. Few residents would be using their backyards for relaxation at 6:00 a.m. They would, however, possibly be sleeping with partly open bedroom windows and be disturbed by bus start-up and idling. Provision of dual-paned replacement windows to south-facing building facades at the nearest homes north of the site may be a more meaningful mitigation measure. Interior noise standards will not be violated without window replacement such that there is no clear nexus between impact and mitigation. Post-relocation activity noise, however, could be perceived as a sleep-disturbing nuisance for maximally sensitive people, and justify window replacement as an alternative noise mitigation measure.
February 25, 2008

Peter d’Ablaing
San Diego Association of Governments
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, California 92101

Subject: Second Addendum to the South Bay Maintenance Facility Expansion Project Final Environmental Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration

Dear Mr. d’Ablaing:

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), a Second Addendum to the South Bay Maintenance Facility Expansion Project Final Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) has been prepared for the proposed South Bay Maintenance Facility (SBMF) Expansion Project. This Second Addendum addresses proposed modifications to the SBMF Expansion Project, consisting of the incorporation of an adjacent property into the project. The subject property is a 1.49-acre parcel, located at 3630 Main Street, that was originally included in the expansion area addressed in the adopted Final IS/MND, but subsequently removed in an Addendum to the Final IS/MND in 2005. SANDAG proposes to re-incorporate this 1.49-acre parcel into the project.

Review of the adopted Final IS/MND and Addendum to the Final IS/MND reveal that no new significant environmental impacts or substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant environmental impacts would occur as a result of the proposed modifications to the SBMF Expansion Project. Therefore, the attached Second Addendum to the South Bay Maintenance Facility Expansion Project Final IS/MND has been prepared to provide environmental clearance of the revised project under CEQA. The Second Addendum provides substantial evidence for SANDAG records to support the preparation of an Addendum for the proposed modifications. No additional environmental analysis or review, pursuant to CEQA, is required for the proposed project modifications.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
David W. Claycomb, AICP
Chief Executive Officer

Enclosure: Second Addendum to the South Bay Maintenance Facility Expansion Project Final IS/MND
The San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG), which has assumed project planning responsibilities formerly carried out by the Metropolitan Transit Development Board (MTDB), proposes to modify plans for the implementation of the San Diego Metropolitan Transit System’s (MTS) South Bay Maintenance Facility (SBMF) Expansion Project (herein referred to as proposed project). This proposed project was described in the South Bay Maintenance Facility Expansion Project Final Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (Final IS/MND), adopted by MTDB in April 2001 and amended in May 2003 in the Addendum to the South Bay Maintenance Facility Expansion Project Final Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration. The purpose of this Second Addendum is to provide environmental clearance of the proposed project modifications under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (California Public Resources Code Section 21000 et. seq.). This Second Addendum describes the proposed project, summarizes existing CEQA documentation, addresses appropriate CEQA documentation for the proposed project, evaluates project-specific environmental impacts, and makes a determination that an addendum is the appropriate level of CEQA documentation for the proposed project modifications.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Environmental Setting

The existing SBMF is located at 3650A Main Street in the southwest portion of the City of Chula Vista. The project site is located in a developed, mixed-use area bound by residential land uses along Connoley Circle to the north, industrial uses (i.e., self-storage and truck rental facilities) to the east, Main Street and commercial/industrial uses to the south, and recreational and educational uses (i.e., Otay Recreation Center, Otay Park, and Otay Elementary School) to the west. Interstate 805 is located approximately one mile to the east, Interstate 5 is approximately two miles to the west, and Interstate 905 is approximately two miles to the south. In addition, Otay Valley Regional Park and Otay River are located approximately 0.35 mile to the south. The project site is relatively level at an approximate elevation of 100 feet above mean sea level. Regional location and project vicinity maps are shown in Figures 1 and 2.

The SBMF consists of seven parcels encompassing 9.13 acres that are developed with buildings, surface parking, and maintenance-related facilities. Existing buildings are used for administration, bus maintenance, and parts storage. Large paved surface parking areas accommodate approximately 155 buses, as well as employee vehicles. Additionally, a compressed natural gas (CNG) fueling station is located in the southeast portion of the SBMF, which includes enclosed compressors, dryers, buffer tanks, and backup generators, with dispensers in close proximity. Landscaping occurs along the street frontage of Main Street and around one building used for administration.
Project Background

The SBMF has been operational since 1993 when MTDB purchased two parcels totaling 4.07 acres that were previously used as an automobile auction facility and a San Diego Gas and Electric heavy truck service facility. At the time of purchase, the site contained approximately 17,000 square feet of building space and an additional 6,000 square feet of canopies. These buildings were renovated between 1992 and 1995 to include earthquake retrofitting, installation of natural gas detection systems, and electrical and mechanical systems upgrades. In addition, a CNG fueling station was constructed in the southern portion of the SBMF in 1995, and roofing was replaced in 1997.

In 2001, MTDB proposed the expansion of the SBMF through acquisition of 3.72 acres on five adjacent parcels. The parcels were developed with commercial and industrial uses, including office buildings, a roofing company, a welding supply and gas business, a catering truck business, and associated parking and storage yards. MTDB purchased four of the five parcels, the exception being a 1.49-acre parcel owned by the catering truck business at 3630 Main Street. As a result of previous pending environmental issues, MTDB removed this parcel from their expansion area in 2003, and proposed to acquire an adjacent 2.83-acre parcel at 3650 Main Street to the immediate north in its stead. This adjacent parcel, which contained several self-storage buildings that were part of a larger storage facility to the east, was partially leased by MTDB in 2003, and currently is in the acquisition stage by SANDAG/MTS. Subsequently, buildings on the acquired parcels have been improved or demolished to accommodate existing operations at the SBMF. MTS also affirmed through a major master plan study of the SBMF that both the 1.49-acre parcel at 3630 Main Street and the 2.83-acre parcel at 3650 Main Street would be required to meet short-term and long-term needs for the MTS at the SBMF.

Project Characteristics

The proposed project entails the expansion of the existing SBMF to accommodate bus parking, employee parking, and maintenance activities associated with increases to the MTS bus fleet at the SBMF. Expansion would occur via acquisition of adjacent parcels that are developed with commercial and industrial uses. Existing buildings on these adjacent parcels would be demolished or renovated to accommodate operations at the SBMF. It is anticipated that the expanded SBMF would service between 160 and 190 buses. Additional improvements are proposed, including expansion of the CNG fueling station, fencing, lighting and possibly some landscaping along the Main Street frontage.

SUMMARY OF EXISTING CEQA DOCUMENTATION

Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration

In March 2001, MTDB completed a Draft IS/MND for the SBMF Expansion Project, and adopted the Final IS/MND in April 2001. The Final IS/MND addressed potential environmental effects of the SBMF Expansion Project with regard to the following issues: (1) aesthetics; (2) agriculture resources; (3) air quality; (4) biological resources; (5) cultural resources; (6) geology and soils; (7) hazards and hazardous material; (8) hydrology and water quality; (9) land use and planning; (10) mineral resources; (11) noise; (12) population and housing; (13) public services; (14) recreation; (15) transportation/traffic; and (16) utilities and service systems. The proposed expansion area evaluated in the Final IS/MND included 3.72 acres on five parcels, as discussed above.
Potentially significant impacts were identified in the Final IS/MND relating to air quality, hazards and hazardous materials, and noise. All potentially significant impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels with the implementation of mitigation measures identified in the Final IS/MND.

**Addendum to the Final IS/MND**

In May 2003, MTDB approved an Addendum to the Final IS/MND that addressed modifications to the proposed expansion area. As discussed above, one of the parcels proposed for acquisition in the Final IS/MND (3630 Main Street) was removed from the expansion area, and another adjacent parcel (3650 Main Street) was added to the expansion area. The Addendum documented that the proposed modifications would not result in conditions or circumstances requiring the preparation of a subsequent Environmental Impact Report (EIR) or negative declaration, pursuant to Sections 15162 and 15164 of the State CEQA Guidelines.

**PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE SBMF FACILITY EXPANSION PROJECT**

This Second Addendum addresses the potential acquisition of an adjacent property for expansion of the SBMF. The subject property includes the 1.49-acre parcel, located 3630 Main Street, that was included in the expansion area addressed in the Final IS/MND, but removed in the 2003 Addendum. SANDAG proposes to re-incorporate this 1.49-acre parcel into the SBMF (Figure 3).

The subject parcel contains two buildings and paved surface parking that would be used for employee parking, and limited bus parking. Employee parking is limited at the existing SBMF site and currently provided in the western and northern portions of the SBMF to minimize conflicts with bus circulation. Buses are parked closer to service and fueling facilities near the driveways along Main Street to facilitate on-site circulation and avoid conflicts with employee vehicles. The two existing buildings ultimately would be demolished, but may be utilized in the short-term for storage and light maintenance activities. Other site improvements may include installation of additional lighting and security fencing/walls.

**APPROPRIATE CEQA DOCUMENTATION FOR PROPOSED PROJECT MODIFICATIONS**

In accordance with Section 15164(b) of the State CEQA Guidelines, “An addendum to an adopted negative declaration may be prepared if only minor technical changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR or negative declaration have occurred.” Specifically, these conditions include:

1. Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;

2. Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or

3. New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the negative declaration was adopted such that, the project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the
negative declaration, significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the negative declaration, mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative, or mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the negative declaration would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

In order to utilize an addendum as the appropriate CEQA document for the proposed project modifications, SANDAG, as the lead agency, must make a finding that changes to the Final IS/MND are necessary, but the proposed project would not result in any new significant adverse effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.

ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

As previously stated, potentially significant impacts were identified in the Final IS/MND with respect to air quality, hazards and hazardous materials, and noise. Additionally, impacts associated with project lighting were assessed as less than significant, but a measure was identified to ensure lighting would minimize spillover onto adjacent properties. Implementation of the mitigation measures identified in the Final IS/MND would reduce these potentially significant impacts to below a level of significance. These mitigation measures, as applicable, would be incorporated into the proposed project, as modified. The proposed modifications to the SBMF Expansion Project would not result in any new significant environmental effects, nor would it substantially increase the severity of previously identified significant effects. This determination is based on the analysis below.

Aesthetics

The Final IS/MND concluded that no significant aesthetics impacts would occur due to the implementation of the proposed SBMF Expansion Project. The project site is located in a highly urbanized area that currently includes lighting at the SBMF and at surrounding uses. The addition of lighting would contribute incrementally to urban light sources, but would not create a new source of substantial light or glare. Although associated impacts were assessed as less than significant, the following mitigation measure regarding light and glare was identified in the Final IS/MND to ensure that all proposed lighting would be designed to minimize spillover of light and glare into surrounding land uses.

All exterior lighting sources shall incorporate the use of 25-foot or less, where possible, light standards and shall be directed downwards or otherwise shielded so as to minimize spillover into the adjacent residential areas.

No new significant aesthetics impacts would occur as a result of the proposed modifications because the subject property was included in the analysis presented in the Final IS/MND. No designated scenic vistas or resources would be impacted, as none exist on-site or in the vicinity. As well, the addition of the proposed facilities within a developed industrial area would be compatible with surrounding development. The subject property may require lighting for safety and security purposes, but this was accounted for in the Final IS/MND. Consistent with the conclusions in the Final IS/MND, the proposed modifications would not change the impact conclusions related to aesthetics in the Final IS/MND. Mitigation, as identified above, would be incorporated into the project design to
avoid potentially significant lighting impacts. Therefore, the proposed modifications would not result in any new significant aesthetics impacts, nor would they substantially increase the severity of aesthetics impacts previously identified in the Final IS/MND.

**Air Quality**

The Final IS/MND concluded that the SBMF Expansion Project would result in potentially significant short-term construction-related air quality impacts. Throughout the anticipated demolition and construction period, fugitive dust and construction equipment exhaust emissions generated during structure removal and construction activities would occur. The following mitigation measure identified in the Final IS/MND would reduce potentially significant short-term air quality impacts to below a level of significance.

*Prior to commencement of construction activities, SANDAG (previously identified as MTDB), with the assistance of a qualified consultant, shall adopt and implement a Construction Management Plan to mitigate potential air quality impacts occurring during construction activities. The Construction Management Plan shall require the use of specific techniques during construction to minimize fugitive dust and construction equipment exhaust emissions including, but not limited to, application of water to exposed soils; application of water to and/or provision of effective cover of all materials transported offsite; encouragement of the use of low emission construction equipment; minimization of simultaneous use of construction equipment; and limitation of construction equipment running and idling time.*

Because construction and operational activities at the subject property were accounted for and evaluated in the Final IS/MND, no new significant air quality impacts would occur as a result of the proposed modifications. Although no demolition or construction activities would occur on the subject property in the short-term, the two existing on-site buildings ultimately would be demolished, which would generate construction-related emissions identified in the Final IS/MND. This impact and associated mitigation measure would not change as a result of the proposed modifications. Implementation of the mitigation measure identified in the Final IS/MND and listed above would reduce potentially significant air quality impacts to below a level of significance. Therefore, the proposed modifications would not result in any new significant air quality impacts, nor would they substantially increase the severity of air quality impacts previously identified in the Final IS/MND.

**Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

The Final IS/MND concluded that the proposed project would result in potentially significant impacts related to hazardous materials. As discussed in the Final IS/MND, previous uses and underground storage tanks (USTs) in the project vicinity may have impacted the on-site soils and/or groundwater. Two USTs were previously located on SBMF site, and one occurred on the subject property. Surface soil staining was observed during the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) conducted in 2001, and extensive handling of hazardous substances, such as waste oils and solvents, has occurred on this property. Therefore, the Final IS/MND concluded that the SBMF Expansion Project could result in a potentially significant hazards/hazardous materials impact due to petroleum hydrocarbon soil contamination. The following mitigation measure identified in the Final IS/MND would reduce this hazards/hazardous materials impact to below a level of significance.

*SANDAG (previously identified as MTDB) shall work with the owners of properties to be acquired to ensure that potential hazardous materials issues are resolved prior to demolition or construction activities for*
the proposed project. SANDAG (previously identified as MTDB) shall ensure that the identified hazardous materials workplans for the Mosier Roofing and Hot Lunch Truck M.F.G. properties are implemented to the satisfaction of the County of San Diego Hazardous Materials Management Division. Measures to be implemented will include successful remediation of soil contamination via removal or on-site treatment.

Subsequent to adoption of the Final IS/MND and approval of the Addendum, the subject property was sold, and additional hazardous materials investigations were conducted (Phase I and Phase II ESAs). A case closure letter from the County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health (DEH), dated August 29, 2007, concurred that cleanup goals established for the subject property have been met. It also noted that changes to the existing use (a commercial catering operation) may require reevaluation to determine if the change could pose a risk to public health.

Because site investigations and remediation activities at the subject property, as required by the mitigation identified in the Final IS/MND, were completed during the sale of the property, the potentially significant impact related to soil contamination has been mitigated, and the mitigation measure identified in the Final IS/MND is not required for the proposed modifications. SANDAG, however, would notify the DEH of the proposed land use change for concurrence that the change would not cause public health effects, pursuant to the request in the referenced DEH case closure letter. The proposed project modification would not be expected to pose a risk to public health, as proposed uses on site (i.e., parking, storage, and light maintenance activities) would be similar to, and likely less intense than, existing uses associated with the commercial catering operation (i.e., commercial vehicle parking, truck wash, waste water clarifier, auto repair, and waste oil storage).

The Final IS/MND concluded that existing on-site buildings may contain asbestos-containing building materials (ACBM) and lead-based paint. The release of these hazardous materials during demolition activities would result in a potentially significant impact. The following mitigation measure is identified in the Final IS/MND that would reduce this hazards/hazardous materials impact to below a level of significance.

Prior to commencement of demolition activities, a comprehensive asbestos-containing building materials (ACBM) and lead-based paint sampling program shall be conducted. Existing buildings that are to be demolished shall be thoroughly inspected by a qualified inspector for the presence of ACBM and lead-based paint. Should the inspection reveal ACBM or lead-based paint, SANDAG (previously identified as MTDB) shall implement appropriate abatement activities and shall comply with all federal and state occupational safety and health requirements to fully mitigate this potential effect of demolition.

Although the existing buildings at the subject property would initially be utilized for storage and light maintenance activities, they ultimately would be demolished. Therefore, this impact and associated mitigation measure would not change as a result of the proposed modifications. Implementation of the mitigation measure identified in the Final IS/MND and listed above would reduce potentially significant impacts related to ACBM and/or lead-based paint exposure to below a level of significance.

The Final IS/MND indicates that the subject property contains an electrical transformer. Electrical transformers can contain polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), which is a hazardous substance that can cause adverse health effects. Removal of the electrical transformer could expose humans to PCBs, resulting in a potentially significant impact. The following mitigation measure is identified in the
Final IS/MND that would reduce this hazards/hazardous materials impact to below a level of significance.

Prior to commencement of demolition or construction activities, sampling and analysis for polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) shall be conducted at the location where a transformer was identified on the property associated with Hot Lunch Truck M.F.G. SANDAG (previously identified as MTDB) will implement any recommended measures to mitigate this potential issue.

This impact and associated mitigation measure would not change as a result of the proposed modifications. Implementation of the mitigation measure identified in the Final IS/MND and listed above would reduce potentially significant impacts related to PCB exposure to below a level of significance.

Based on the foregoing analysis, the proposed modifications would not result in any new significant hazards/hazardous materials impacts, nor would it substantially increase the severity of hazards and hazardous materials impacts previously identified in the Final IS/MND.

Noise

The Final IS/MND concluded that the SBMF Expansion Project would result in potentially significant noise impacts related to short-term construction noise. Sensitive noise receptors in the project area, including some residences to the north, and Otay Elementary School and Otay Park to the west, would be exposed to noise generated during demolition and construction activities. The following mitigation measure identified in the Final IS/MND would reduce this noise impact to below a level of significance.

Prior to demolition and construction activities, noise abatement measures shall be adopted, as appropriate, to minimize short-term construction-related noise impacts. These measures include, but are not limited to, notifying the neighboring residences, school, and businesses of the construction schedule; limiting construction operations to the hours between 7 a.m. and 7 p.m., Monday through Saturday; requiring all construction equipment to be equipped with properly operating and maintained mufflers; and limiting the number and types of construction equipment onsite at any given time.

This impact and associated mitigation measure would not change as a result of the proposed modifications. Implementation of the mitigation measure identified in the Final IS/MND and listed above would reduce potentially significant impacts related to construction noise to below a level of significance.

The Final IS/MND concluded that the project would not substantially increase ambient noise levels and thus, noise impacts to the adjacent residences to the north would be less than significant. The project would potentially place buses closer to noise sensitive receptors; however, the northernmost portion of the expanded facility, adjacent to residences, would be utilized for employee parking only. Buses would not be parked in the very north portion of the expanded facility where the catering business currently operates, and buses parked closest to the residences would not be scheduled to leave until 6:00 a.m. Any increase in noise generated by activities at the subject parcel would likely be offset by the elimination of noise generated by the existing catering business. The Final IS/MND, therefore, concluded that the nearby residential area would not be exposed to a substantial increase in
noise levels. Nonetheless, the following mitigation measure was identified in the Final IS/MND to minimize noise at the adjacent residences to the north.

*Buses parked on the southern portion of the expanded facility, closest to Main Street, shall be scheduled to leave the facility in the morning for transit service prior to the buses parked in the northern portion of the facility.*

This impact and associated mitigation measure would not change as a result of the proposed modifications. Implementation of the mitigation measure identified in the Final IS/MND and listed above would ensure potentially significant noise impacts to the adjacent residences to the north would not occur.

The Final IS/MND also concluded that noise levels generated by an additional compressor at the CNG fueling station would not result in significant noise impacts. The Final IS/MND required demonstration that noise levels would not substantially increase as a result of the additional compressor. This requirement was satisfied through preparation of a project-specific noise analysis in 2003 (*Noise Impact Analysis, MTDB South Bay Maintenance Facility Expansion, Chula Vista, California; Orion Environmental Associates; January 23, 2003*). The referenced noise study concluded that compressor noise would not result in significant noise impacts. The proposed modifications would not affect the results and conclusions of this study, as this issue is not applicable to the proposed modifications.

Based on the foregoing analysis, construction and operation of the proposed project would not result in any new significant noise impacts, nor would it substantially increase the severity of noise impacts previously identified in the Final IS/MND.

**DETERMINATION OF APPROPRIATE CEQA DOCUMENTATION**

The following discussion lists the appropriate subsections of Sections 15162 and 15164 of the State CEQA Guidelines and provides justification for SANDAG to make a determination of the appropriate CEQA document for the proposed project, based on the environmental analysis above.

**Section 15162 - Subsequent EIRs and Negative Declarations**

(a) “When an EIR has been certified or a negative declaration adopted for a project, no subsequent EIR shall be prepared for that project unless the lead agency determines, on the basis of substantial evidence in light of the whole record, one of more of the following:”

(1) “Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;”

SANDAG proposes to modify the expansion area of the SBMF, as described in the adopted Final IS/MND and Addendum to the Final IS/MND. SANDAG proposes to incorporate a 1.49-acre parcel, located 3630 Main Street, that was included in the expansion area addressed in the Final IS/MND, but removed in the Addendum. This parcel was previously considered as part of the SBMF Expansion Project in the Final IS/MND, and the associated environmental impacts that were assessed in the Final IS/MND are substantially similar. No new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects would occur.
(2) “Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or”

Circumstantial changes have occurred with respect to the expansion area of the proposed project. SANDAG proposes to include a parcel in the expansion area that was initially included in the Final IS/MND, but removed in an Addendum to the Final IS/MND. Proposed uses within the modified expansion area would be substantially similar to those evaluated in the Final IS/MND. Thus, changes in the project circumstances would not be considered substantial. No major revisions to the Final IS/MND are required, and the proposed modifications would not result in new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.

(3) “New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the negative declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:

(A) “The project will have one or more significant environmental effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;”

No new information has been provided that was not known at the time the Final IS/MND was adopted. Thus, no new significant environmental effects are identified compared to those identified in the adopted Final IS/MND.

(B) “Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;”

Significant project-related effects previously examined would not be substantially more severe than were disclosed in the Final IS/MND as a result of the proposed modifications. The Final IS/MND identified potentially significant effects associated with air quality, hazards and hazardous materials, and noise that would be mitigated to less than significant levels through implementation of mitigation measures identified in the Final IS/MND. No other significant effects were identified in the Final IS/MND. As determined in this Second Addendum, the proposed modifications would not substantially increase the severity of these impacts.

(C) “Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or”

No mitigation measures were previously found to be infeasible in the adopted Final IS/MND, and no alternatives were analyzed in the Final IS/MND.

(D) “Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.”
The Final IS/MND identified mitigation measures that would reduce all significant impacts to below a level of significance. The proposed modifications would not alter the mitigation measures identified in the Final IS/MND. No alternatives were analyzed in the Final IS/MND.

(b) “If changes to a project or its circumstances occur or new information becomes available after adoption of a negative declaration, the lead agency shall prepare a subsequent EIR if required under subsection (a). Otherwise, the lead agency shall determine whether to prepare a subsequent negative declaration, an addendum, or no further documentation.”

Subsequent to adoption of the Final IS/MND for the SBMF Expansion Project in April 2001, minor revisions were made to the proposed project regarding the boundaries of the expansion area in 2003, which were addressed in an Addendum to the Final IS/MND. Since then, additional modifications were made to the expansion area boundaries, which are the subject of this document. Based on the analysis in this document, the proposed modifications would not result in any new significant environmental effects, nor would it increase the severity of significant effects previously identified in the Final IS/MND. None of the conditions listed under subsection (a) would occur that would require preparation of a subsequent EIR.

(c) “Once a project has been approved, the lead agency’s role in project approval is completed, unless further discretionary approval on that project is required. Information appearing after an approval does not require reopening of that approval. If after the project is approved, any of the conditions described in subsection (a) occurs, a subsequent EIR or negative declaration shall only be prepared by the public agency which grants the next discretionary approval for the project, if any. In this situation no other Responsible Agency shall grant an approval for the project until the subsequent EIR has been certified or subsequent negative declaration adopted.”

None of the conditions listed in subsection (a) would occur due to the proposed modifications.

Section 15164 - Addendum to an EIR or Negative Declaration

(a) “The lead agency or responsible agency shall prepare an addendum to a previously certified EIR if some changes or additions are necessary, but none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR have occurred.”

This section of the State CEQA Guidelines does not apply, as an EIR was not prepared for the proposed project.

(b) “An addendum to an adopted negative declaration may be prepared if only minor technical changes or additions are necessary or none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for the preparation of a subsequent EIR or negative declaration have occurred.”

Minor additions to the adopted Final IS/MND are necessary; however, none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR would occur as a result of the proposed modifications. Therefore, an addendum to the adopted Final IS/MND is the appropriate CEQA document for the proposed project modifications.

(c) “An addendum need not be circulated for public review but can be included in or attached to the final EIR or adopted negative declaration.”
This Second Addendum will be attached to the Final IS/MND and maintained in the administrative record files at SANDAG.

(d) “The decision-making body shall consider the addendum with the final EIR or adopted negative declaration prior to making a decision on the project.”

SANDAG will consider this Second Addendum with the Final IS/MND prior to making a decision on the proposed project modifications.

(e) “A brief explanation of the decision not to prepare a subsequent EIR pursuant to Section 15162 should be included in an addendum to an EIR, the lead agency’s required findings on the project, or elsewhere in the record. The explanation must be supported by substantial evidence.”

This document provides substantial evidence for SANDAG records to support the preparation of this Second Addendum for the proposed project modifications.

Conclusion

This Second Addendum has been prepared in accordance with the provisions of the State CEQA Guidelines, and it documents that none of the conditions or circumstances that would require preparation of a subsequent EIR or negative declaration, pursuant to Sections 15162 and 15164 of the State CEQA Guidelines, exists in connection with the currently proposed project. No major revisions would be required to the Final IS/MND as a result of the proposed modifications. No new significant environmental impacts have been identified; neither was a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified impacts assessed. Therefore, preparation of a subsequent EIR or negative declaration is not required, and the appropriate CEQA document for the proposed project modifications is this Second Addendum to the South Bay Maintenance Facility Expansion Project Final IS/MND. No additional environmental analysis or review is required for the proposed project. This document will be maintained in the administrative record files at SANDAG offices.
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Introduction

The North County Transit District (NCTD) SPRINTER Rail Project converts an existing 22-mile freight rail corridor into a Diesel Multiple Unit (DMU) transit system connecting Oceanside, Vista, unincorporated County areas, San Marcos, and Escondido. The SPRINTER is a TransNet-funded project to increase east-west mobility in the Highway 78 corridor. In response to requests from NCTD and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), SANDAG staff is currently providing support and oversight services for the project and has been asked by the SANDAG Board of Directors to report on its progress monthly to the Transportation Committee.

Discussion

Current Progress

The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) granted NCTD permission to operate on March 7, 2008, and revenue service began on March 9. Opening day was successful with no significant problems encountered. Ridership was estimated to be nearly 13,000 passengers.

All 15 stations are open to the public; however, the Nordahl Station parking lot and the eastbound platform at the Escondido Avenue Station are not yet complete. The contractor got a late start on the Nordahl parking lot and his progress has been further delayed by this winter’s rains. It should be complete by mid-April.

The eastbound platform at Escondido Avenue is on the inside of a curved section of track requiring the installation of a deployable plate to close the gap between platform and the vehicle prior to passenger boarding. The plates are being manufactured and should be installed by the end of April. Until that time, eastbound passengers will be bused to and from this station.

Work on stormwater control measures, landscaping, and punch list items will continue through this spring.

Stormwater Issues

On December 31, 2007, the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board issued NCTD a Clean Up and Abatement Order directing NCTD to improve its construction stormwater control measures. On January 31, 2008, NCTD submitted a detailed plan that addresses improvements to both temporary and permanent sediment and erosion control. It committed to have the entire 22-mile corridor fully compliant by May 1, 2008. To ensure compliance, NCTD hired four new construction stormwater inspectors.
On March 4, 2008, the Regional Board issued NCTD a $685,000 fine for violations of the stormwater regulations from October 5, 2007, through January 25, 2008. During this time the Regional Board contends the project lacked adequate best management practices (BMPs) and on at least 25 occasions discharged sediment into adjacent waterways. NCTD will pass this fine along to its Mainline contractor as it did with a similar $160,000 fine last December. The Regional Board did not rule out further fines for violations after January 25.

Since the Regional Board issued the Clean Up and Abatement Order, NCTD has made significant progress to ensure the entire corridor is protected. This has been a primary focus of its Mainline contractor. To further expedite compliance, NCTD recently hired another contractor to supplement the Mainline contractor’s BMP installation.

**Estimate at Completion**

NCTD did not calculate a new estimate at completion (EAC) for January, therefore the final projected cost remains $478.3 million. Before issuing a new EAC, NCTD wants a better estimate of credits to the contract in addition to reducing the backlog of outstanding change orders.

The $478.3 million includes a $7.8 million contingency and assumes NCTD will pay the maximum potential value of the settlement agreement with the Mainline contractor. It also includes a forecasted cost for 179 change orders yet to be negotiated. The project budget set by the NCTD Board, and included in the Amended Recovery Plan for the FTA, is $484.1 million, giving NCTD an additional $5.8 million of capacity between budget and EAC.

For many months, the only risk to budget was the backlog of change orders. However, three new risks have now been identified.

1. Although the stormwater fine is passed along to the contractor, the BMPs being installed to correct the deficiencies are paid for at contract unit prices. NCTD estimated the total additional cost for this and for the new inspection services will be $2.5 million. However, this could grow to between $2.5 million and $4 million.

2. The Mainline contractor did not meet any of the milestones agreed to last spring. There is always a risk the contractor will claim he was delayed and damaged by design and other changes made since that time.

3. The delay to the start of revenue service has increased the staff and construction management costs for the project. This additional cost will be included in the next EAC. The expenditure rates for these items was less than budgeted in 2007 so savings should pay for much of this extra cost.

JACK BODA  
Director of Mobility Management and Project Implementation

Key Staff Contact: Jim Linthicum, (619) 699-1970, jlin@sandag.org
2008 CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM UPDATE

Introduction

SANDAG is required by state law to prepare and regularly update a Congestion Management Program (CMP) for the San Diego region. The purpose of the CMP is to monitor the performance of the region’s transportation system, develop strategies to address near-term and long-term congestion, and better integrate transportation and land use planning. The last CMP update was adopted by SANDAG in 2006.

The 2008 CMP Update will incorporate the results of new 2007 roadway and transit monitoring. In addition, an analysis of Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) improvements on future roadway congestion will be included. The draft 2008 CMP is scheduled to be released later this summer.

Discussion

In order to meet legislative requirements, the CMP provides: (1) ongoing monitoring of the region’s transportation system; (2) a program to evaluate and mitigate the traffic impacts of new development projects; (3) a number of congestion management strategies to mitigate congestion; and (4) a mechanism to prepare “deficiency plans” for roadway segments that do not meet the CMP Level of Service standard (LOS E). The 2006 CMP Update identified 117 miles of highway segments and 23 miles of arterial segments in the San Diego region that are deficient. The purpose of a Deficiency Plan is to evaluate the causes of an existing roadway deficiency and to propose remedial actions necessary to address the deficiency. Under state law, the local jurisdiction or jurisdictions in which the deficiency occurs are responsible for the preparation of the Deficiency Plans. SANDAG and Caltrans are available to assist local jurisdictions in the preparation of these plans.

The recently completed update of SANDAG’s 2030 Regional Transportation Plan includes proposed projects and programs that could eliminate many of the deficiencies identified in the 2006 CMP Update. Therefore, the focus of the 2008 CMP Update is to provide:

- An updated CMP roadway network Level of Service analysis based on 2007 traffic data;
- An updated CMP transit corridor analysis based on 2007 transit data; and
- An analysis of 2030 RTP improvements on the deficient segments identified in this CMP update, including any remaining deficiencies.

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to confirm the approach for the 2008 CMP Update and direct staff to evaluate alternative means of meeting the CMP requirements for future updates.
Staff will work with the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) and the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG) to seek input on the 2008 CMP Update.

**Future Direction of CMP**

As noted in the introduction, the basic legislative requirements of the CMP are to monitor the performance of our transportation system, develop programs to address near-term and long-term congestion, and better integrate transportation and land use planning. SANDAG has addressed these requirements through a CMP document that is updated every two years. Since some of these legislative requirements also are being addressed through other SANDAG monitoring and planning activities, it may no longer be necessary to prepare a stand-alone CMP document in the future. Staff will evaluate using alternative means of meeting the CMP requirements that incorporate existing SANDAG monitoring and planning activities, such as SANDAG’s periodic State of the Commute Report, the Regional Comprehensive Plan Annual Performance Monitoring Report, and “Congestion System Management Plans” that are now being prepared by SANDAG and Caltrans for transportation corridors for which specific Proposition 1B funds are allocated.

**Next Steps**

The draft 2008 CMP is anticipated to be released in summer 2008 and the final report scheduled for approval in fall 2008.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Key Staff Contact: Heather Werdick, (619) 699-6967, hwe@sandag.org
FY 2006/2007 CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY AND REGIONAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM REPORT

Introduction

As part of the transportation funding workshop presented to the Transportation Committee this past September, staff presented various financing tools for the use of Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) and Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds, and committed to providing a report at the end of the federal fiscal year to summarize the use of these actions and their effect on the year-end balances for these two transportation funding programs. In addition to that summary, this report includes a brief synopsis of actions to be taken this year to advance future federal funds on high priority regional projects.

Discussion

RSTP and CMAQ funds are apportioned to the region by formula. Apportioned funds are available for programming in the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), and obligations can be made on eligible projects. Pursuant to state law (AB 1012), regions have three years to obligate apportioned funds or risk losing them. Staff monitors the level of obligations for these apportioned funds and from time to time, takes certain actions to insure that no funds are lost from the region.

RSTP and CMAQ Year-End Summaries

Table 1 below shows that the combined balance between CMAQ and RSTP funds at the beginning of Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2006/2007 was approximately $16.9 million (see row 1). The region received approximately $63.7 million in apportionments during FFY 2006/2007 (see row 2) and obligated nearly $72 million (see row 6) to include $15 million made available through the use of the post-programming authorization for the State Route (SR) 125 Gap and Connector (see row 5).

The region accelerated the obligation of an additional $15.7 million for the Inland Rail Trail, I-15 Managed Lanes and the SR 76 East Widening project through the use of the Expedited Project Selection Process (see rows 7-11). This tool is identified in the 2006 RTIP and it allows for the obligation of funds within the first four years of the RTIP.

Lastly, the obligations were offset by approximately $4.2 million in de-obligations from closed projects (see row 12). The de-obligated funds can be re-obligated through the post-programming authorization process, if projects meeting the specific fund eligibility requirements need additional funds.
Table 1. RSTP and CMAQ Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>RSTP (000’s)</th>
<th>CMAQ (000’s)</th>
<th>Total (000’s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Starting Balance</td>
<td>$15,838</td>
<td>$1,025</td>
<td>$16,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. FFY 2006/2007 Apportionments</td>
<td>33,578</td>
<td>30,142</td>
<td>63,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Programmed Obligations and Adjustments</td>
<td>(28,094)</td>
<td>(28,877)</td>
<td>(56,971)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Post-Programming Authorization</td>
<td>(15,000)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(15,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Subtotal-programmed obligations and post-programming authorizations</td>
<td>(43,094)</td>
<td>(28,877)</td>
<td>(71,971)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Advance Obligations through EPSP:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. SR 76 East</td>
<td>(4,270)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(4,270)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Inland Rail Trail</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(3,256)</td>
<td>(3,256)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I-15 Managed Lanes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(8,160)</td>
<td>(8,160)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Subtotal Advance Obligations through EPSP</td>
<td>(4,270)</td>
<td>(11,416)</td>
<td>(15,686)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. De-obligations and savings from closed-out projects</td>
<td>2,207</td>
<td>1,974</td>
<td>4,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Ending Balance (sum of rows 3, 6, 11, 12)</td>
<td>4,259</td>
<td>(7,152)</td>
<td>(2,893)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Grand Total Obligated (sum of rows 6, 11, 12)</td>
<td>(45,157)</td>
<td>(38,319)</td>
<td>(83,476)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, the combined balance at the end of FFY 2006/2007 for both programs is a deficit of approximately $2.9 million, with CMAQ showing a negative balance of -$7.2 million and RSTP a positive balance of $4.3 million (see row 13).

SANDAG, in cooperation with Caltrans and other project sponsors, worked to maximize our federal obligation authority. The region’s aggressive obligation effort during FFY 2006/2007 was the highest in the state. For this reason, as the state was seeking to obtain unused obligation authority from other states during what is known as the August redistribution, SANDAG received approximately $9.9 million in additional obligation authority, or nearly 25 percent of the additional obligation authority that was distributed to all regions across California. As discussed during the September workshop, additional obligation authority does not increase the amount of apportionment coming to the region, but rather, it provides the region greater flexibility to advance future apportionments as well as to fully obligate federal funds.

Upcoming Opportunities in FFY 2007/2008

Once again, the region will be seeking to obligate in excess of its apportionment level by advancing future year funds. As discussed in previous presentations, NCTD will be seeking to advance a portion of its FY 2008/2009 CMAQ funds for SPRINTER operations. Caltrans plans to submit a very large obligation request that covers programmed funds in FY 2007/2008 through FY 2010/2011, totaling over $130 million. Nearly $100 million of these funds are programmed under Advanced
Construction, which means that the agency advances its own local funds to allow the project to move forward to construction and, as the federal funds become available, these replace the local funds previously used. Staff will work with Caltrans Local Assistance to aggressively manage the obligation level of this large request in order to maximize our ability to receive additional obligation authority through the August redistribution process discussed previously.

RENEE WASMUND
Director of Finance

Key Staff Contact: José A. Nuncio, (619) 699-1908, jnu@sandag.org
Project Summary
- Project limits: Britannia Blvd to Siempre Viva Road.
- Estimated cost to construct: $76.5 million.
- End construction: November 2010.

Recent Activities
- Construction contract approved February 27, 2008.
- Groundbreaking ceremony tentative set for the first week of April 2008.

Risks
- R/W settlement costs may exceed estimated cost/allocated amount.

Right of Way Acquisition/Condemnation Status (Phase 1A and Phase 1B)
- 71 parcels required, 66 acquired, 5 lawsuits pending on remaining 5 parcels.
- Verdict on Roll parcel approximately $12 million over deposit amount of 6.7 million, $2 million lower than expected.
- Total R/W allocation: $219.6 million.
State Route 905 Phase 1B
From I-805 to the Otay Mesa Port of Entry

Project Summary
- Project limits: East of Interstate 805 to Britannia Blvd.
- Estimated Cost: $104.7 million (including support and escalation).
- Construction Start Date: March 2009.
- Construction End Date: March 2012

Funding Sources
- $91.6 million from the Trade Corridors Improvement Fund (TCIF).
- $8.4 million from TransNet Funds for border projects.
- $4.7 million from SAFE TEA-LU earmark.

Risks
- Programming of funds in time to advertise the project in September 2008.

Schedule
- Project Ready to List for advertising August 2008.
- Award December 2008.
Capital Improvement Program

Budget Transfer & Environmental Recommendations

South Bay Maintenance Facility
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Capital Improvement Program
Budget Transfer

• Transfer Funds for Land Acquisition and Yard Expansion
• $2.3M into South Bay Maintenance Facility Expansion Project
• Funds would Acquire Property per Master Plan and Start Improvements
• $2.3M from East County Bus Maintenance Facility CNG Project
• Recommended by MTS Board on March 13, 2008

Project Transfer
Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Existing FY08</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Bay Maintenance Facility Expansion (1048500)</td>
<td>8,133</td>
<td>10,433</td>
<td>2,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East County Bus Maintenance Facility CNG Project (1142700)</td>
<td>3,251</td>
<td>951</td>
<td>-2,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Capital Improvement Program
Budget & Environmental Recommendations

- Approve $2.3M Budget Transfer Shown on Table #1
- Accept CEQA/NEPA Documents by MTS as the Implementing Agency for SBMF
- Approve Addendum No. 2 to Accepted CEQA FIS/MND (No Significant Impacts)

Capital Improvement Program
Budget Transfer & Environmental Recommendations
Current Progress

- Revenue service began March 9th
- Ridership - 7,836 March 18th; no significant problems
- Nordahl Station parking lot to be complete mid-April
- Eastbound Escondido Ave platform complete end of April
- Stormwater, landscaping & punch list work complete this spring
Stormwater Issues

- **Regional Water Board “Clean Up & Abatement Order” - 12/31/07**
  - NCTD’s plan submitted 1/31/08:
    - Full site assessment by mid-February
    - Stations & yards protected by March 1st
    - Entire corridor protected by May 1st
    - Status reports every 15 days
    - Hired 4 new stormwater inspectors
    - New permanent BMP’s

- **New $685,000 fine issued 3/4/08**
- **Similar to December’s $160,000 fine**
- **Violations from 10/3/07 thru 1/25/08**
- **Potential additional fines per the Regional Water Board**
- **All fines passed along to contractor**
Stormwater Issues

- Significant progress since January
- Mainline contractor’s increased efforts
- New contractor hired to assist
Estimate at Completion (EAC)

- No new EAC for January
- Negotiating outstanding change orders
- Estimating credits to contract
- Previous EAC: $478.3M
  - Includes full $15.5M maximum value of settlement agreement
  - Includes $470.5M base cost and $7.8M contingency
- Project budget: $484.1M
- Total funds available: $484.1M - $470.5M = $13.6M
Estimate at Completion (EAC)

Risk to budget

- Backlog of change orders
- Additional cost for stormwater protection measures
- Potential of another delay claim from Mainline contractor
- Additional staff & CM costs due to delay in opening